

Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes  
Monday, April 27, 2020 @ 2:00 pm  
via Zoom

**In attendance:** Kurt Borg, Pat Carr, Megan Denis, Clint Hosford, Ken Ruit, Adrienne Salentiny, John Shabb, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski.

**Not in attendance:** Jon Allen, Marcia Francis, Mark Koponen, Becca Maher, Dev Pant.

**Minutes submitted by:** Alissa Hancock

**Reviewed by:** Adrienne Salentiny

**Approved by:** Jon Allen and Rick Van Eck

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome	Meeting called to order at 2:11 p.m. by Adrienne Salentiny.	Information
2. Old Business	<b>a.) Minutes from April 13, 2020</b>	<b>MSC to approve April 13, 2020 minutes John Shabb / Kurt Borg // all in favor; carried.</b>
3. New Business	<p><b>a.) SIMPLE</b></p> <p>This was started to address domain eight a few years ago due to limited content for student wellness. The goal of SIMPLE is to help build the mindful resilience in medical students. They have based the program after the Mayo’s SMART program, which is a wellness program they have all their employee go through.</p> <p>There are a total of seven sessions, one for each block and they build upon each other. They are laid out based on the tendencies of each block, so the students can utilize the knowledge in their everyday lives. There is also have one assessment question on their end of block exams, which Dr. Jane Dunlevy and Michelle Montgomery grade. Objectives are mapped to multiple sessions as well as domains. In the presentation, they listed the obvious ones, along with those that are not as clear but could be possible connections.</p> <p>CEMS discussed the wording in the objectives. The measurement component states that a program professional would determine the competency level of the student and how that is determined. It was stated that because these are personal skills that we are observing in a variety of ways, we cannot rely only on a test percentage. The idea of having a checklist that can be used to track the students use of skills would be helpful in showing that the student</p>	Informational

Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes  
 Monday, April 27, 2020 @ 2:00 pm  
 via Zoom

	<p>achieved 80% competency of those skills. Overall, the committee agrees that this is an excellent program and the objectives are nearly ready for approval.</p> <p>Rick Van Eck, Adrienne Salentiny will work with Jane Dunlevy and Michelle Montgomery to tweak the wording of the objectives (changing or rewording the part discussing program professionals making distinction of whether or not students have passed) and we will vote on them at the next meeting.</p>	
	<p><b>b.) Phase Objectives</b></p> <p>Currently, the curriculum has a set of 3<sup>rd</sup> and a set of 4<sup>th</sup> year objectives that state what we want the students to learn during that year. With curriculum 2.0, we are working on phase objectives and have questions about the how specific the course objectives should be for phase 2 &amp; 3. Would they be considered course objectives, with clerkships and elective objectives to be session objectives? The problem with this is that clerkship and elective objectives don't really fit the definition of session objectives. We also need to consider longitudinal threads that could go across phases – how are these objectives to be written and classified?</p> <p>We have three levels of objectives, so we need to decide where things fit best. One such level is the phase objective, plus course objectives and session objectives. So if objectives do not fit the definition for a session level objective, what are they and how will they map and be reported on? There was agreement that keeping the process simpler is best because this decision will benefit us in the long run. Clerkships currently do assess some of the year objectives and in this case, those year objectives aren't listed as a clerkship objective.</p> <p>It's important to consider that when LCME visits, we need to be able to explain this to them. Keep it simple and easy to track. If we did not have phase objectives, then we would be able to more consistently review across all objectives.</p> <p>Instead of phase 2/3 objectives, they could all be clerkship objectives. However, we do not control the clerkship objectives. That is why we have a list of year 3 and year 4 objectives. We could use milestones that do not sit in the objective category for both year 3 &amp; 4 to evaluate</p>	

Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes  
Monday, April 27, 2020 @ 2:00 pm  
via Zoom

	<p>how students are progressing in their competency, but that would mean another process that we would have to review/track. Objectives need to have an assessment component to them in order to be part of the curriculum.</p> <p>Tentatively we think that course and clerkship objectives are the same level and objectives need to be written with an assessment component as required by our approved format. The question remains whether we can integrate the phase objectives into the clerkships or not. We will continue this discussion next meeting.</p>	
	<b>c.) Systems whitepaper and CEMS Role</b>	Tabled
	<b>d.) Proposal for Mapping Keywords</b>	Tabled
New Business		Informational
	<p>Future Tasks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implementation of Keyword list (tbd with our transition to a new system and curricular change activities)</li> <li>2. Ongoing activities to course level objectives, gaps, redundancies, and the curricular change process</li> <li>3. Recommendation on subcompetencies (from SMHS Domains and Competencies document)</li> <li>4. Review Element 7.2</li> </ol>	Information
4. Adjournment	Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.	<i>The next meeting is scheduled May 11, 2020, at 2:00 pm via Zoom.</i>