# MEETING MINUTES

**COMMITTEE:** Assessment Committee  
**DATE OF MEETING:** 10/25/17  
**TIME:** 4:00-5:30 PM  
**LOCATION:** Mayo B646

**ATTENDEES:**
Claudio Violato, Suzanne van den Hoogenhof, Kelaine Haas, Brooke Nesbitt, Kevin Diebel (Duluth), Stephen Richardson, Peter Southern, David Jewison, Sophie Gladding, Cassandra Burt, Kelly Hallowell, Brinsley Davis (OBO Kirby Clark)

## AGENDA AND NOTES, DISCUSSION, ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC AND ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Overview of Assessment and Committee Charge** | Introductions were made. Correction on agenda: David Jewison is co-chair of committee. Claudio Violato opened the meeting with an overview of "assessment" referring to van der Vleuten article, and provided direction/charge of committee which is to recommend assessment and evaluation process improvements to Ed Council. Comments/discussion:  
- Challenge: get valid data and use it in meaningful way  
- Need to implement what we know and invent what we don’t  
- Need to move toward gather inter-related data to include not only student data, but curriculum, faculty, etc., that gives "big picture" |
| **Course Dashboards** | Reviewed dashboards for two courses. Comments/discussion:  
- Need for further integration between foundational and clinical years  
- Introduced "value added" concept - way to get big picture by pinpointing where issues might be throughout all 4 years  
- All agreed that patient involvement in assessments would fit into "value-added" data  
- Recommendation for integrated objectives for each course: Basic Sciences, Clinical, Integration  
- Clarification made: Purpose of committee to approve/not approve assessment/evaluation processes, NOT to help identify issues/problems in the courses. Example: Committee can change a question in the evaluation, but not make changes in the course |
| **Rotations Dashboards** | Reviewed dashboards for two clerkships. Comments/discussion:  
- One suggestion for future would be to move from 3 pt to 5 pt scale - (3 pt not adequate)  
- In reviewing this data, keep in mind the inadequacies  
- To make more sense of the data, more data is needed  
- LICs (RPAP) information not currently included in assessment/evaluation |
| **Programmatic Assessment** | Reviewed van der Vleuten article. Comments/discussion:  
- David commented that tip 10 & 11 were relevant for this committee  
- Claudio encouraged all committee members to become familiar with this article |
| **Other Business** | Claudio pointed out that there are lingering issues from the 2012 LCME visit that Assessment & Evaluation are responsible for one of which is narrative feedback in pre-clinical years. The committee will work on some of these issues for the 2020 LCME visit. |
| **ACTION ITEMS** | Request was made to see overview of the assessments that we are currently doing. |