# Program Evaluation and Assessment Committee (PEAC) Minutes

## Date
Tuesday, May 17, 2022

## Time
9:00 AM – 10:30 AM PST

### Attendees
- **Chair:** Matt Cunningham
- **Voting members:** Frank Batcha, Michael Campion, Pete Fuerst, Toby Keys, Kathleen Kieran, Sara Kim, Karen McDonough, Martin Teintze, Zak Yaffe
- **Guests:** Donna Painchaud, Lida Lin, Signe Burchim, Kellie Engle, Jordan Kinder, Rachel Liao, Doug Schaad, Jaime Fitch, Jung Lee, Jessica Wheeler, Meg-Ann Whitney-Miller

### Regrets
- **Voting members:** Bekah Burns, Amanda Kost, Anita Samuel, Elizabeth Stein, Edith Wang, Mark Whipple, Holly Winn

## AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ATTACHMENT</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Approve past minutes</td>
<td>Matt Cunningham</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Update on e-vote: setting standard for achievement of program objectives via clerkship exams</td>
<td>Matt Cunningham</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy on evaluations completed by students</td>
<td>Matt Cunningham</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next meeting: Thursday, June 16, 3:30-5:00 PM PST
1. **Approve past minutes**

Decision: Quorum met – meeting minutes for April approved.

Action: none

2. **Update on e-vote: setting standard for achievement of program objectives via clerkship exams**

Discussion: PEAC committee members previously voted to pass measure to set a standard of achievement for program exams.

- If passing criteria is met on all clerkship exams, student is deemed to have met the program objectives.
- Standard has now been implemented into the final version of competency report and will be reviewed by all relevant committees.

Decision: none

Action:

3. **Policy on evaluations completed by students**

Discussion: Matt introduces discussion about student evaluations and how feedback of their educational experience is interpreted. Matt shares evaluation policy document.

- Major categories of evaluations include:
  - Foundations phase
    - Students required to submit rating items and feedback at the end of each block, for each instructor, FCM workshops, FCM end of term and FCM hospital tutorials.
  - Clinical phase
    - Students required to evaluate clerkships and clerkship instructors.
  - Non course-related
    - BioCPI (biographical and career preference inventory)
    - College Mentor surveys
    - EOP surveys
    - AAMC surveys

- Matt shares table with completion rates of block evaluation surveys for E20 and E21 cohorts
  - Student completion rate is lower than desired.

- Sara shares response rates for surveys distributed by her team, including MS1 and MS2 Foundations Phase Surveys and Explore & Focus Phase Surveys.
  - UWSOM response rates are lower than other schools nationally according to AAMC

- Matt shares Summary of Course evaluations document showing other schools’ policies around completing evaluations.
• Should UWSOM make completion of surveys mandatory? What would the policy look like? How would it be enforced?
  o How to motivate students to complete surveys?
  o Are students being asked to complete too many surveys?
  o Part of the challenge is that student experiences can vary widely across 6 regional campuses.
  o Student survey completion rates for clerkship phase are much higher – 95%+
  o Zak Yaffe shares that students felt there was little incentive/reward to complete foundations surveys.
  o If there were a defined block of time provided to students to sit down and complete the surveys would the response rate be better?
    ▪ Block leads have been resistant in the past to giving up class time in order for students to complete evaluations.
    ▪ Pete suggests that the end of FMR this year may be a good opportunity to try incorporating time for students to do this.
  o Can survey questions be revised so that evaluations are more manageable for students to complete?
  o Is there support for moving forward with developing a policy for mandatory completion?
    ▪ Members express concern over implementing a policy to require completion of surveys.
    ▪ Zak suggests providing an incentive instead – adding survey completion as part of qualifications for the Compliance Award could be an example.
    ▪ Sara suggests forming a workgroup.

• What should policy around release of evaluations to educators be?
  o When and how should educators be able to access student feedback pertaining to them?
  o Concerns are expressed about past student feedback which have included abusive comments towards instructors.
    ▪ Anonymity and lack of a professionalism standards contribute to abusive student feedback.
    ▪ Is there any way to identify and redact inappropriate or abusive commentary prior to releasing feedback to educators?
    ▪ How can students be protected from retaliation so as to be comfortable leaving honest feedback?
      ▪ Anonymity and data release embargos currently in place to ensure confidentiality and prevent retaliatory mistreatment.
  o In the clinical phase data is released to educators through the department.
  o Matt shares evaluation policy examples from UCSF. Committee members voice support for developing a similar policy framework.

Action: none