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

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

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome	Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m. by chair.	Informational
2. Old Business	**a.) Minutes from February 25, 2019**	MSC to approve February 25, 2019 minutes as amended Kurt Borg / Annie Nickum // all in favor; carried unanimously.
3. New Business	**a.) Welcome New Member** Dr. Ken Ruit will be replacing Kelly Thormodson as an advisory member of this committee. In addition, the new librarian, Megan Denis, will also be added. She starts next Monday, March 18th.	Informational
	b.) Objectives: During their time here, two sets of MedEd students looked at all course objectives and how they align with the domains and competencies. The smaller ad hoc group will review these, and then CEMS will review / discuss them to decide who else (subject experts) needs to review them, and then to map them. We continued our work on objectives 2, 3 & 5 from last meeting. The purpose of this is to work on our objective writing skills and develop a process in which we can use to review objectives. One of the main steps is to look at the objectives and decide if they are course	Information

level or really a session level objective. We are still in the process of deciding if we need to list normal and abnormal together or separate in objectives.

The question came up about whether it is better to revise these objectives, or to write new ones. This might be better than trying to combine all these block objectives. We discussed that we could review/revise or write new course objectives, but need to determine how we want to organize them. Organization could be be by discipline, department, or by unit but the goal is to reduce the noise in the objectives on the curriculum. An example given was to use the chapter headings of a textbook – basically, start with topics we know we need to teach and write a few objectives for each. Another thought was to think about what the med students need to know. They use an acronym that is something like e2, p2, t2, p2. Do our topics cover the parts of this acronym? We need to verify with a student, but we believe it stands for:

- Etiology

- Epidemiology

- Presentation

- Patho

- Tests

- Treatment

- Psychosocial

- Prognosis

We had previously discussed not writing the session level objectives, but the problem exists that if we make the course level objectives more all-encompassing / written at a higher level, we lose track of things that definitely need to be taught at session level because each intstructor has different areas of importance that they like to cover. So, another idea is for us to write the course objectives AND the session objectives, and inform the faculty the objectives that they need to address in their lecture. This would ensure that the session level objectives align to the course level. However, from experience, this has not always been received well. If it is approved by MCC first, they may be more receptive. This is a huge task, so it would fall on each unit design team to address the objectives that are related to that unit and re-write them according the standards that we outline. Content experts in this process will be useful because we could find out "the 5 things that are important," regarding a particular topic.

With the above in mind, we need to update our checklist so that that all groups can use it as a guide. When they come together to design unit 1 (or, however it will be described), we need to say "Here is how you construct course objectives. And here are the principles for constructing session objectives. The design units would have content experts involved to help them do most of the work and then we can fine-tune them before MCC approves them. It is likely that some of us will be involved with these unit design teams as well, and this is why we need to continue to work on objective-writing in the meeting. We want to all be very familiar with the process so that through our roles on these design teams, we can make CEMS' job reviewing the new objectives much easier.

Related to the above – in addition to the checklist, it was suggested that we include some kind of list of all of the topics or ideas. Every team would get the entire list. "These are the potential topics," and then they could pick from them for their unit. It is debatable whether this is a CEMS responsibility, however – we need to review our charge. It is a viable idea regardless, so if the responsible parties are not on CEMS we may want to reach out to them with the idea.

	Next Meeting: We will discuss the process/checklist that unit design unit to use when working on objectives. We will also continue our objective writing activity but approach it in a different way, because we really do need to learn how to write objectives without the focus being on reworking the specific objectives we are looking at.	
	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.	Information
4. Adjournment	Meeting was adjourned at 3:41 p.m.	*The next meeting is scheduled March 25, 2019, at 2:00 pm in E493 Conference Room, Grand Forks.*