Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes
Monday, January 27, 2020 @ 2:00 pm
E493 Conference Room & via Zoom

In attendance: Jon Allen, Kurt Borg, Pat Carr, Megan Denis, Clint Hosford, Marcia Francis, Adrienne Salentiny, John Shabb, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski.
Not in attendance: Mark Koponen, Becca Maher, Dev Pant, Ken Ruit.
Minutes submitted by: Alissa Hancock
Reviewed by: Adrienne Salentiny
Approved by: John Shabb and Susan Zelewski

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome	Meeting called to order at 2:02 p.m. by chair Adrienne Salentiny	Information
2. Old Business	**a.) Minutes from December 9, 2019**	**MSC to approve December 9, 2019 minutes Kurt Borg / Marcia Francis // all in favor; carried.**
3. New Business	**a.) Objective Mapping Report** After the last meeting, it was realized that adding the mapping information for objectives from years 3 & 4 would not be very much additional work. Doing so would allow us to say we have fully completed our reporting task instead of just partially, and we won't need to partially duplicate efforts in creating a second report. We will review the full report at one of the February meetings.	Information
	b.) Revised Proposal for Longitudinal Curriculum Threads The discussion of this proposal includes the following highlights: • Domain captains—which were discussed as a possible solution after the original proposal was presented—would be responsible for reviewing a domain throughout the curriculum. This would include the objectives and assessment for that domain. This is a great idea but we do not believe it would adequately serve the evaluation of threads. Threads cross multiple domains and relate to a topic, not a particular domain or competency. A domain captain would have to rely on several people to get thread information; would be difficult to orchestrate.	Information

- Having thread leaders (working term: "thread heads") would mean that one person focuses on how we are evaluating the the content, objective and assessment for ithe thread throughout the curriculum.
- There would need to be a clear definition of this role. For example, this person may be doing an annual report similar to a block or clerkship report. There is concern over who would fulfill these roles, how would we choose those people, and what type of authority or access would they have to successfully keep track of the activities within the thread.

We also need to define threads in our curriculum. What is a thread versus an overall essential element, versus something else entirely? There are currently 19 topics or entities we are calling threads in the new curriculum design. These are related to the names of the design teams and not all of those are true threads (e.g., *Medicine &* Society versus *Assessment*). We need to prove to LCME how we evaluate and track each thread we have in the curriculum, so we need to choose our threads wisely such that we know where to allocate resources.

A suggested starting point for defining a thread as "something that is repeated and distributed throughout greater than one phase of curriculum and represent a longitudinal sequence that is not aligned with curricular content or academic year schedule."

We then need to determine the base level of activity: some hard and fast rules to qualify an element as part of a thread. This would help with consistency in teaching and assessment methods (for example: spending 5 minutes once on a topic, versus integrating parts of a topic into various sessions or activities).

Another logistical concern is how to label activities as related to the thread. In many cases, faculty are going to teach the information regardless if it is a thread or not, and they may not label it as such. Keyword tagging was one suggestion to accomplish this, but we would need to ensure the tagging is being done in consistency with the aforementioned rules for what constitutes thread-related activity. No decisions could be made today.

	ACTION ITEM: Rick Van Eck will narrow down the list of potential threads based on the discussion today. He will draft a recommendation from the CEMS to the MCC (UMEC) stating that if the curriculum will officially have threads, they need to be evaluated. The committee will group-edit this information at a future meeting (February 24) before we forward it to MCC Further discussion of the proposal, definition of threads, and potential role of thread heads will be tabled until after the MCC discussion.	
	Future Tasks: 1. Implementation of Keyword list (tbd with our transition to a new system and curricular change activities) 2. Ongoing activities to course level objectives, gaps, redundancies, and the curricular change process 3. Recommendation on subcompetencies (from SMHS Domains and Competencies document) 4. Review Element 7.2	Information
4. Adjournment	Meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m.	*The next meeting is scheduled February 10, 2020, at 2:00 pm in E493 Conference Room, Grand Forks.*