



PEAS Minutes
March 27, 2018 (12:00 – 12:50 p.m.)

Voting Members in Attendance:

William Wright, PhD
Anna Blenda, PhD
Anne Blair Kennedy, PhD
Jamie Zink, M3

Voting Members not in Attendance:

Jamie Zink, M3
Mark Carithers, MD

Other Attendees:

April Buchanan, MD
Kimberly Walker, PhD
Emily Northey
Kimberly Scoles

I. Meeting Minutes from February 27, 2018

- a. A motion was made to approve minutes from the February 27, 2018 PEAS Committee meeting. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.

II. Final 3 of 7 Clerkship DARS – Dr. Wright, presenter

a. Surgery 2018-2019 Year – Proposed changes and Additional Information:

- i. Update date of plan to 2018-2019 Academic Year
- ii. In this report there are targets for faculty evaluation of students, OSAT, SHELF Exam.
- iii. Looking at the report, standard deviations for targets are slightly below the mean. To set the first goal of .25 standard deviations, historical data were reviewed. Faculty are hoping to increase mean this next year.
- iv. A motion was made to approve the changes to the Surgery Assessment Plan. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.

b. Family Medicine – Proposed changes and Additional Information:

- i. Update date of plan to 2018-2019 Academic Year
- ii. Questions 11 (personal limitations) and 13 (written documentation) of the Faculty Evaluation are not mapped to any clerkship objectives but need to be. There needs to be reconciliation between the spreadsheet and DAR. Questions 14-17 of the spreadsheet do not appear in the initial assessment plan.
- iii. Questions 14 and 15 will be on all DARS. These questions will need to be brought back through PEAS Committee once finalized.
- iv. A motion was made to approve the changes to the Family Medicine Assessment Plan. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.

- c. **Emergency Medicine – Proposed changes and Additional Information:**
 - i. Update date of plan to 2018-2019 Academic Year
 - ii. This module does not have an OSCE but has a project.
 - iii. This module is a 2-week elective.
 - iv. This module is now a required clerkship.
 - v. This module has only 7 clerkship goals.
 - vi. A motion was made to approve the changes to the Emergency Assessment Plan. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.
- d. Dr. Buchanan suggested that, moving forward, a spreadsheet like what is used in Curriculum Committee would be an easier way to read information contained in DARS. The spreadsheet would be supplemental material to DARS.
- e. Dr. Wright mentioned that by the next PEAS Committee meeting, a different system may be in place: may no longer be called DAR but will still be assessment.

III. Rubrics – Dr. Wright, presenter

- a. Dr. Wright explained the current rubric process and said that in the past:
 - i. All school rubrics were run through the PEAS Committee for review.
 - ii. In addition to the PEAS committee, one or two people with expertise in a particular area were asked to review rubrics and vet them.
- b. Dr. Wright asked if committee members thought it better for the PEAS Committee to continue reviewing all rubrics or to appoint a separate committee or select group of people to review them.
- c. Dr. Buchanan explained that existing rubrics that USCSOMG has in place are the following:
 - i. Presentations or a part of any grade in M1 or M2 modules
 - ii. OSCEs in M1, M2, M3
 - iii. IPM
 - iv. Presentations in Emergency Medicine
 - v. Presentation in Family Medicine
- d. Dr. Buchanan explained that the current procedure for evaluating rubrics is that the director of each module, the IPM director, and the clerkship director are required to engage content experts in the process to ensure that content is appropriate and/or confirm the validity of a particular test.
- e. Dr. Blenda suggested that input of IPM1 and 2 was needed.
- f. Dr. Kennedy asked to know the scope of what is being asked for in evaluating a rubric.
- g. Emily Northey suggested a deadline.
- h. Dr. Buchanan inquired about whether it would be a good idea to bring on a separate person to cover presentations.
- i. Dr. Wright suggested multiple people with rubric writing experience review them.
- j. Jamie Zink inquired about whether there were Step 2 CS rubrics in place since that is the end goal of all the OSCEs. Dr. Buchanan responded that there were rubrics but that interpretation of the rubrics was up to faculty.

- k. Dr. Wright suggested that presentation rubrics would require a different kind of faculty training.
- l. Committee members agreed to gather data, then talk to important players, and finally come up with a method to review rubrics.
- m. Data and review for the next PEAS Committee meeting is as follows:
 - i. M3/M4 already gathering
 - ii. M1/M2 ask Dr. Pace or Hanna Watts. Ask for well-defined rubrics.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 12:53.