



PEAS Minutes
August 22, 2017 (12:00 - 1:00 p.m.)

Voting Members in Attendance:

Bill Wright, PhD
Anna Blenda, PhD
Allison Young, MD
Jim Sullivan, M2
Ann Blair Kennedy, DrPh
Jamie Zink, M3

Other Attendees:

Mendy Ingiaino
Rick Hodinka, PhD (ex-officio)

Not in Attendance:

Jennifer Trilk, PhD

I. Introduction & Welcome

- a. Dr. Wright welcomed the newest members to the PEAS Subcommittee Meeting.

II. Review of the Minutes

- a. The 7.25.17 and 6.27.17 minutes were reviewed. There was a motion to approve the minutes as they were presented.

III. Discussion of meeting time extension

- a. The current structure was explained and discussion was opened for the team regarding moving the date and extending the time of the meeting.
- b. The team determined that this time was good for the members of this meeting.
- c. If there are times when an additional 30 minutes are needed, this will be communicated in advance.

IV. Voting of the PEAS Subcommittee Chair

- a. There was a motion to elect Bill Wright as the Chair of Peas for 2017 – 2018.
- b. The motion was seconded and approved.

V. Assessment Challenges

- a. The current assessment challenge process was discussed. There was a short explanation on how students are able to challenge ten percent of the exam. Additionally, it was noted that students are not necessarily challenging questions, but are giving their thoughts on how they determined the correct answer.
- b. Dr. Hodinka then began discussion regarding eliminating the challenge process. The need for the challenges historically began due to the fact there weren't statistics on file for the questions. We now have statistics available for determining the quality of the question. Decisions are made based on statistics not due to the challenges of the

students. It was also stated the most universities are not using challenges as part of their testing process.

- c. The question was posed to the students regarding their thoughts on challenges. Jamie asked if the process for making decisions based on statistics was consistent across all faculty.
- d. Another question was asked regarding new faculty and how they would determine their question performance. Again, it was stated that the decision was based on statistics.
- e. Jim Ellis asked about the Pharm questions on the last exam. It was noted that the Pharm questions were eliminated due to the statistics not based on the challenges. Jim also noted that if there were 60 challenges then it was probably already eliminated due to the statistics.
- f. The question was asked if there was value added in this process. Jim noted that the 10% challenge quota was probably not needed. However, in his opinion, he also noted that he would like to have at least 1 or 2 question(s) to be able to challenge to voice his thoughts about a particular challenge..
- g. Dr. Wright asked if the student would like to have the response or if just being able to challenge the question was enough satisfaction for the student.
- h. Jim noted that he didn't even look at the challenges but just reviewed which questions he missed and then reviewed the correct response. His recommendation was to keep 1 to 2 challenges per exam. Dr. Hodinka noted that he did spend a considerable amount of time creating a response to the challenge. If the student did not show up and read them then it did seem to be a process not providing much value.
- i. Dr. Wright noted that he liked the idea of being able to write a challenge and then being able to review the student response.
- j. Jamie also noted that perhaps communication might help regarding the definition of a challenge. Dr. Wright noted that this communication had gone out to students and this had not helped with actually eliminating the notes regarding the challenges.
- k. Dr. Carithers suggested that each student receive a certain amount of challenges per year.
- l. Jim noted that he did not realize that we used statistics to make decisions, however he felt that if his class knew this there would be fewer challenges.
- m. Dr. Carithers asked if the students wanted to discuss with their peers regarding the percentage they would like to see.
- n. There was a final determination that the student representatives would inquire of their peers regarding the percentage and then communicate to Dr. Wright the results of the inquiry.
- o. It was noted that instructors were able to tweak their questions based on the student feedback.
- p. It was also noted that there are two separate functions in Exemplify for notes versus challenges. The student will find out if students valued the ability to take notes during the exam.

q. There was a final decision to make a recommendation at the next meeting.

VI. Meeting Adjournment

a. The meeting was adjourned at 12:55pm.