Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes
Monday, June 8, 2020 @ 2:00 pm via Zoom

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

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome	Meeting called to order at 2:08 p.m. by Adrienne Salentiny.	Information
2. Old Business	**a.) Minutes from May 11, 2020**	**MSC to approve May 11, 2020 minutes Rick Van Eck / Pat Carr // all in favor; carried.**

3. New Business	**a.) Systems whitepaper and CEMS Role (Van Eck)**
	    a. Does the whitepaper represent what the committee believes is best practice?
	    b. Does the committee believe we can do what the whitepaper specifies? If so, what resources are needed to support these activities?
	    c. Who will be in charge of each report or activity? (Who will do the work?)
	
	Starting with the processes on page 2, this whitepaper draft shows all the reports that we must do on a regular basis according to LCME. We will need to decide how we will get them completed – who will do it and what resources will be needed? Requests for additional resources would need to be made. Some of these reports should be completed within BSCS and CSCS. CSCS already does most of these reports - they just need to be compiled together.
	
	Clint Hosford would be involved in creating some of these reports but would like a better understanding of what is expected from these reports. Which brings up a good point: some of the reports that are currently being done are not the most effective. CEMS will be creating templates for these reports so that we can get the needed information: what will be the most helpful in improving the curriculum. A template wil also reduce the time involved.
	
	Then, we consider the report types and how we gather the data. The important question is 'How are we evaluating the students learning and how do we know? VS 'What's the
		Informational

	student's perception of their learning'. When surveying the students, we should be purposeful with the questions we ask and when we are asking about their perception of their learning (versus measuring actual learning). As we evaluate our assessment methods and how we can link those to the domains/competencies, sorting by topic may the most consistent because the NBME and shelf exams don't show us the actual questions, so we would be unable to link these to a domain/competency. We do get to see the score by topic. We can connect that to our vocabulary list to map to the domains/competencies: it is imperfect but doable. However, we will have to go into each student's text score for each clerkship to gather that information. Our assessments for the revised curriculum will be about 60/40 NBME and our own created questions. After this last year, we have found out that 12 out of 46 questions will need to be replaced from the CAS. In this case, we can choose the questions because those questions have been retired. The CAS questions about be available for the current MCQ and there is a time for short answer questions to be created. We want to be able to say in our responses to the DCI and see in our evidence, that the students are receiving a well rounded education. In part this is because we are able to find the gaps and are constantly looking for them to correct them once we find them. On the topic of content: the curriculum content or topics will be mapped to course objectives, which are mapped to domains/competencies. So the in the document, we will replace 'topic' with 'curriculum content' and no longer refer to the vocabulary list but have assessment methods. In the future we need to decide on the resources needed to create these reports and verify there is no duplication of work within the reports. There is a concern about the deadline in which we must have these completed and the time it will take to get them done.	
New Business	**Future agenda item**: • Where and when we are asking students for their perception of their learning.	Informational

	• Subcompetencies: are they needed and/or how they fit into our mapping • Resources needed to create reports	
	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 3:42 p.m.	*The next meeting is scheduled June 22, 2020, at 2:00 pm via Zoom.*