Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes  
Monday, January 7, 2019 @ 2:00 pm  
E493 Conference Room & via WebEx

**In attendance:** Jon Allen, Pat Carr, Marcia Francis, Clint Hosford, Rebecca Maher, Annie Nickum, Adrienne Salentiny, Kelly Thormodson, Rick Van Eck.  
**Not in attendance:** Kurt Borg, Mark Koponen, Devendra Pant, John Shabb, Susan Zelewski.  
**Minutes submitted by:** Alissa Hancock  
**Reviewed by:** Adrienne Salentiny  
**Approved by:** Rebecca Maher / Annie Nickum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th>ACTION/FOLLOW-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welcome</td>
<td>Meeting called to order at 2:06 p.m. by chair.</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Old Business | **a.) Minutes from December 3, 2018**  
A clarification was noted that there is a curriculum renewal process that is happening, but this committee’s work does not change. The order of our work might change, but our purpose does not. We still need to re-write objectives and map the curriculum. We still need processes to create reports and respond to questions from key stakeholders, including the Dean and LCME.  
**MSC to approve December 3, 2018 minutes as amended Rick Van Eck / Pat Carr // all in favor; carried unanimously.** | |
| 3. New Business | **a.) Keyword (Thormodson)**  
The librarians went through the USMLE content outline and selected appropriate levels for the keywords. One specific level within the outline was not selected. Instead, after listening to the conversations while working on objectives, they set a goal to find a balance between being too specific or too broad. The goal was to select the terms in the middle of the road as possible. The intended result is keywords that are able to be connected to the block objectives easily. Keywords do not need to address specifics – similar to how course objectives do not need a level of specificity that would be found at session level. This list is not perfect and it will be a changing document. We will develop a process for adding, removing, and modifying words on the list.  
This first pass was simply for content from the USMLE outline. There is nothing about assessments or teaching styles. The Medbiquitous list was suggested, and the group took a look at it during the meeting. This list will be more than satisfactory (at least as a starting point) to represent this category of keywords. The AAMC Standardized Vocabulary website | Informational |
also provides a lot of useful information about this process. This and then Medbiquitous list will be shared on Blackboard and for us to use in the future.

After some discussion, it was determined that a separate list of hot topics is the best idea. Dr. Carr indicated that there tend to be two types of hot topics. Some are the type that should be taught indefinitely. Others are more of an emergent need that may not be needed in the curriculum long term. As such, the hot topics list would be maintained as needed, and some hot topics could also be added to the content keyword list via the process we will set up for doing this. This way, when hot topics are no longer considered “hot,” the necessary ones would still be in the content list.

It was also suggested to break phrases from the list(s) down into single words. For example, ‘Abnormal Cells’ would be now listed as two words. An item could then be tagged with both words if applicable. In the end, it would reduce the list of words because many are duplicated several times. It would also remove the redundancy of saying abnormal or neoplasm for all the body systems. We also think that searching would be easier. We could use the boolean system to search if possible, but this capability depends on the system we will be using.

The final lists are:
1. Content Keyword List (source: USMLE, Dr. Carr, EASRS)
2. Hot Topic List
3. Teaching Styles/Activity Types List (source: Medbiquitous)

Becca Maher will look into E*Value and the different ways we can search (By phrase? Boolean?) and Kelly Thormodson will touch base with a library director at Duke about LCMS+ and the capabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b.) Standard 8.3 Review</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone should review this document and we will discuss at the next meeting.</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next meeting:
- Discussion Standard 8.3
- Review the process of how the keyword list was created
- Discussion of the process in which items will be added/removed from the three different lists.
- In the future, we should discuss Standard 8.2. Dr. Van Eck has found several gaps in Block 1 during a “first pass.”

Future Tasks:
1. Determine what data can be extracted from E*Value, and what we need to get somewhere else. Confirm how and where we will get all data. (in progress)
2. Activities surrounding creation of a keyword list. (awaiting objectives process/implementation)
3. Addition of keywords and additional cleanup and organizational work in E*Value. (in process)
4. Try a sample report, to see how long it takes.
5. Discussion and/or related activities to course and session level objectives.
6. Discussion of the course level and session level objectives should be written at the same level or one higher than the other?

4. Adjournment
Meeting was adjourned at 3:08 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled January 28, 2018, at 2:00 pm in E493 Conference Room, Grand Forks.