Program Evaluation and Assessment Committee (PEAC) Minutes

Date Tuesday, September 20, 2022

Time 9:00 AM – 10:30 AM PST

Attendees

Chair: Matt Cunningham
Voting members: Frank Batcha, Bekah Burns, Michael Campion, Pete Fuerst, Toby Keys, Kathleen Kieran, Sara Kim, Amanda Kost, Karen McDonough, Zak Yaffe

Guests: Pam Nagasawa, Martin Teintze, Jordan Kinder, Rachel Liao, Jessica Wheeler, Jung Lee, Doug Schaad, Meg-Ann Whitney-Miller

Regrets Voting members: Kris Calhoun, Janelle Clauser, Edith Wang, 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 WRITE 2.0</td>
<td>Amanda Kost/Frank Batcha</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E20 Foundations EOP report</td>
<td>Matt Cunningham</td>
<td>55 min</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next meeting: Thursday, October 20 @ 3:30-5:00 PM PST
1. Approve past minutes

Decision: Quorum met – meeting minutes for May approved.

Action: none

2. Update on WRITE 2.0 (0:02:30)

Discussion: WRITE program being refreshed – updates will debut with new clinical year in March/April of 2023. Amanda and Frank to present progress to date.

- Amanda provides EPA workgroup updates via PowerPoint presentation
  - Amanda reviews workgroup charge and ongoing timeline of work
  - Amanda highlights completed tasks and progress achieved over the last few months
    - Reviewed entrustment scales and piloted a scale for WBA
    - Members discuss Elentra capacity and options for real time delivery of student evaluations to preceptors
  - Frank adds that his experience with the WBA pilot was very smooth
  - Further updates to be provided to the PEAC committee at a future meeting – likely in January.

Decision: none

Action:

3. E20 Foundations EOP report

Discussion: Matt leads discussion on EOP report, with goals of getting feedback and answering questions about the data. Is this report telling us what we need to know?

- Summary for E20 cohort
- Block grades
  - Matt discusses data interpretation based on “Average block grades by site” chart.
  - This chart gives a useful view of site to site and block to block comparative analysis.
- E20 blocks question data reviewed.
- Thread scores
  - Matt discusses summary data and provides context for question data and how each thread is impacted.
  - Grades for each thread are collapsed and summarized by term.
- Historical data reviewed – Matt says this data has been consistent over the years.
- Physician Tasks data reviewed
  - NBME divides questions into 4 categories
  - Table shows percentage of questions for each block/category
- Application/Recall data reviewed
  - Matt explains that he and the assessment team discuss and approximate which questions fall into the each Physician Task or Application/Recall category.
• **Item difficulty**
  o This is a new addition to the report which shows analysis of distribution of difficulty across all blocks.
  o Matt shares that he and the team are placing some focus on what a “good distribution of difficulty looks like”.

• **Course Evaluations**
  o Matt reviews E20 response rates by site.
  o Overall student survey burden and response patterns discussed.
  o “Block as a whole” ratings data reviewed.
  o Student workload burden data is reviewed.
    ▪ Is there a goal (number of hours/week) in mind for how much time students are expected to spend outside of class?
  o Thread rating data reviewed – overall, ratings are positive.
  o FCM Summary milestone data reviewed.
  o Foundations 2 OSCE results reviewed – scores consistent with historical data.
  o CBSE results reviewed – scores slightly below national average.
  o Foundations End of Phase Survey
    ▪ Student satisfaction data discussed and reviewed.
    ▪ Matt asks for feedback as to whether curricular pieces of survey are valuable or redundant?
    ▪ Matt and Sara to separately discuss how collaboration of data analysis between their teams would be productive.
  o Matt to present EOP report to Foundations committee next week.

**Action:** none