

Program Evaluation and Assessment Committee (PEAC) Minutes

Date May 18, 2021

Time 9:30 – 11:00AM PST

Attendees **Chair:** Matt Cunningham
Voting members: Michael Campion, Mark Whipple, Sara Kim, Edith Wang, Karen McDonough, Toby Keys, Pete Fuerst, Bekah Burns, Martin Teintze, Zak Yaffe
Guests: Lida Lin, Signe Burchim, Marilyn Cope, Cory Lumsdaine, Jessica Wheeler, Doug Schaad, Kellie Engle, Nick Cheung, Jaime Fitch, Jaime Shandro, Meg-Ann Whitney-Miller

Regrets **Voting members:** Amanda Kost, Kathleen Kieran, Frank Batcha, Anita Samuel, Massoud Saleki, Cody Hansen

AGENDA

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION
1	Approve April minutes	Matt Cunningham	5 min	Yes	Decision
2	E19 Foundations EOP report	Matt Cunningham	45 min	Yes	Discussion
3	2020 Step 2 report	Matt Cunningham	20 min	Yes	Discussion
4	Clerkship grading project	Matt Cunningham	85 min	Yes	Discussion

Next meeting: Thursday June 17, 2021 3:30 PM PT

1. Approve April minutes (00:01)

Decision: Quorum achieved – minutes approved

Action: none

2. E19 Foundations EOP report (01:10)

Discussion: Matt shares E19 End of Foundations Report

- Block Grades
 - Some fluctuation across blocks but within each block grades were fairly consistent
 - MCBBD data shows some students who failed and then left the curriculum
 - All blocks have the same standard for mastery at 70%
 - Matt reviews table with specific evaluation details regarding questions and revisions broken down for each block
- Thread Scores
 - Matt reviews percentage of questions across all blocks pertaining to each thread
 - Matt notes that some blocks may need to consider increasing thread representation in revised curriculum
- Physician Tasks
 - This data reflects Step 1 blueprint prior to October 2020
- Ecology of Health the Medicine
 - Matt reviews completion of assignments – this data shows percentage of students who completed and passed assignments, not student final grades on those assignments
- Foundations of Clinical Medicine
 - Data showing students not meeting a sufficient number of milestones at the end of FCM may indicate the effects of the school year being interrupted by the pandemic
- OSCEs
 - Only 2 stations reflected in this data – OSCE was modified due to COVID
 - Students receiving “ND” were in one station or another – for this cohort no students received ND in both stations
- Course Evaluations
 - This data is reflective of a new evaluation form
 - Signe to revise report to include Research Methods
 - Response rate is particularly low in Seattle across all subjects – low response rates make it challenging to assess the feedback
 - MSK is an outlier in that responses are very high – Matt suggests this may be due to MSK being taught all online and that students may have been motivated to share how difficult it was
 - Student responses are anonymous – it is known which students completed evaluations but it is not known who submitted which responses
 - PEAC members express concern with the limited number of responses as well as response content – is there a plan to improve this process to make it more constructive?
 - Clerkships have a different approach where responses are confidential, not anonymous. Also evaluations have to be submitted in order for Clerkship students to see their grades.

Is it possible to reimagine the Foundations evaluation process in a similar way to motivate students to submit evaluations?

- PEAC members suggest scheduling a future meeting to discuss in more detail
- Foundations End of Phase survey
 - Student satisfaction with general education and training is fairly high –
 - Responses to Learning Environment statements are mostly positive – student responses to 2 of the statements are low which is concerning
 - Student satisfaction to Training in Specific Areas is widely varied – PEAC members discuss why some areas show such high levels of dissatisfaction with students
 - Student satisfaction with FCM is high
- Program Objectives Measure in Foundations
 - Matt suggests a future discussion on Program Objective coverage across domains – do PEAC members feel like coverage is adequate based on this data?
- Standards for Mastery
 - Matt reviews BLO mapping to questions and reviews percentages of student mastery
- PEAC members are satisfied overall with content of report and have no additional feedback at this time

Decision: none

Action:

3. 2020 Step 2 report (55:25)

Discussion: Matt presents Step 2 report –

- 265 students took the exam in 2020 – most of these students were E17 cohort
- Overall performance very good – pass rate is above the national average
- Scores across sites are very similar
- Matt reviews data from Step 2 CK Score by Sum pass/fail grades
- Matt presents correlations of academic variables to Step 2 performance
- Committee discusses data from Regression Analysis
 - Clerkship exam scores in particular seem to be an accurate predictor of Step 2 performance

Decision: none

Action:

4. Clerkship grading project

To be moved to the agenda for the next meeting – scheduled for June 17

Decision: none

Action: