Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes  
Monday, February 11, 2019 @ 2:00 pm  
E493 Conference Room & via WebEx

**In attendance:** Kurt Borg, Pat Carr, Marcia Francis, Rebecca Maher, Annie Nickum, Adrienne Salentiny, John Shabb, Kelly Thormodson, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski.  
**Not in attendance:** Jon Allen, Clint Hosford, Mark Koponen, Devendra Pant.  
**Minutes submitted by:** Alissa Hancock  
**Reviewed by:** Adrienne Salentiny  
**Approved by:** Kurt Borg and 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 2:05 p.m. by chair.</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Old Business</td>
<td><strong>a.) Minutes from January 28, 2019</strong></td>
<td>MSC to approve January 28, 2019 minutes as amended Kurt Borg / Rick Van Eck // all in favor; carried unanimously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. New Business | **a.) Follow-up on keyword search capabilities**  
- LCMS+ search functionality (Maher/Nickum)  
  LCMS+ does not have a controlled vocabulary but they can set up a sandbox for us. They also allow for us to have assessments and tag competencies.  
  While this was originally explored as a hypothetical inquiry, it was announced that the Dean has approved the purchase of LCMS+. We will also continue to have E*Value until November 2020. Having access to these two systems at the same time will be helpful as we transition into LCMS+ with the new curriculum redesign. | Informational |
|             | **b.) Follow-up on Standard 8.3 (Salentiny)**  
Adrienne Salentiny plans to attend the next EASRS meeting on 2/20 where standard 8.3 will be discussed and is hoping to get some answers and clarifications on some of the concerns the committee has. | Informational |
| CEMS Meeting Minutes  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was concern at the last meeting about whether mapping was getting done, and who was responsible for it. Is it CEMS? To clarify where we stand: there is a difference between mapping and mapped because mapping is a continuous process. We need to have current mapping completed that is in line with the adopted domains and competencies. At that level, the goal is to have an idea of how things are connected. Currently, we have MedEd students reviewing the competencies and connecting them to objectives. Blocks 1-3 were completed with the MedEd students last block and this blocks’ students will pick up from there. Then, the committee can discuss whether we would like to work on these alignments in further detail in this committee or if CEMS members can identify individuals with expert knowledge willing to take on that task. From there, mapping can be updated within e*Value. We are required to have this done regardless of new curriculum development, so we need to make sure that this does not get lost in the shuffle of the new curriculum redesign.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Information** c.) Early planning for “2019 annual report” per Standard 8.3, page 16  
We are responsible for creating this report. Std. 8.3 from 2018 could be interpreted as saying that CEMS was to complete a report to inform the 2019 curriculum retreat. The planning for that retreat is under way and does not require this report. Toward the end of 2019, we will be expected to produce an annual report to inform MCC of curriculum status, and to help with next years’ curriculum retreat. Between now and then, we will work on a procedure for creating this report, and decide what this report will look like and what kind of detail we can and will provide. |
| **Information** d.) Continue working through Block 1 Objectives  
After looking at our timeline and proposed tasks, our ongoing task seems to be working on objectives. There is shared concern about new curriculum redesign and not wanting to waste our time working on objectives that may not apply with the new curriculum. However, as new objectives are written (or existing ones are updated or revised), the committee overall does not feel confident in writing objectives that conform to our adopted taxonomy. As such, we are not ready to divide and conquer objectives being reworked in our specific areas. Furthermore, looking at objectives we should keep in mind the assessment methods.  
**Action Plan:** Review the timeline and come back with a recommendation of how the timeline might better align with the curriculum redesign. The
These tend to go hand and hand because you need to know what you need to assess based on the objectives. So changing our objectives now could be fruitless if other groups are changing assessment items and activities. All of this, combined with overall questions about CEMS’ role in the design of the new curriculum makes it difficult to decide what we should work on next.

Action Plan: Adrienne Salentiny and Rick Van Eck will review the timeline and come back with a recommendation of how to align our work better with the curriculum redesign. The timeline can be found on blackboard under the information tab; a revised one will also be provided before the next meeting.

We will also start to look at objectives that we feel will stay with the new curriculum and we will bring in content experts as we need.

### Future Tasks:

1. Implementation of Keyword list (tbd with our transition to a new system)
2. Cleanup and organizational work in e*Value to insure that current curriculum is mapped to new domains and competencies. (cleanup in progress)
3. Discussion of what data goes into our annual reports, the formatting of the data, and how and where we will get all data. Try a sample report.
4. Discussion and/or related activities to course level objectives.

### Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m.