

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

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION
1	Approve past minutes	Matt Cunningham	5 min	Yes	Decision
2	Update on e-vote: setting standard for achievement of program objectives via clerkship exams	Matt Cunningham	5 min	No	Discussion
3	Policy on evaluations completed by students	Matt Cunningham	60 min	No	Discussion

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?
 - How to motivate students to complete surveys?
 - Are students being asked to complete too many surveys?
 - Part of the challenge is that student experiences can vary widely across 6 regional campuses.
 - Student survey completion rates for clerkship phase are much higher – 95%+
 - Zak Yaffe shares that students felt there was little incentive/reward to complete foundations surveys.
 - 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.
 - Can survey questions be revised so that evaluations are more manageable for students to complete?
 - 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?
 - When and how should educators be able to access student feedback pertaining to them?
 - 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.
 - In the clinical phase data is released to educators through the department.
 - Matt shares evaluation policy examples from UCSF. Committee members voice support for developing a similar policy framework.

Action: none