# Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes
## Monday, July 23, 2018 @ 2:00 pm
## E493 Conference Room & via WebEx

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

| AGENDA ITEM | SUMMARY | ACTION/FOLLOW-UP |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Welcome | Meeting called to order at 2:04 p.m. | Informational |
| 3. Old Business | **a.) Minutes from July 9, 2018** | MSC to approve minutes as amended Rick Van Eck / Rebecca Maher // all in favor; carried unanimously. |
| 4. New Business | | |
| | **a.) Working Objective: Vasoactive Drugs**<br>The conversation continued from the last meeting regarding objectives. It was agreed upon that the we will use the three components, created at the last meeting, when writing objectives. Discussion on how to assess a mastery of an objective. Would it be rubric or percentage? What is the fair way to assess the students?<br><br>Clint Hosford brought up the concern that if mastery level is 80%, but we only have one MCQ question for that assessment item, this is not accurate because students do not have the opportunity to actually achieve 80%. (They can only get 0 or 100%). However, the alternate view is that 100% is what we would LIKE them to achieve (perfection) – although we do allow for less than 100% overall. Rick Van Eck asserts that a decision (regardless of what it is) should be made so that we can explain why we've done what we have done. This will ensure consistency, even if we can't always control how many assessment items there are per topic. One suggestion was to determine an overarching goal for criteria of the objectives. In other words, instead of writing | Informational |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | each objective to reach a certain percentage of mastery, or a certain performance criteria, we could set an overall performance criteria or mastery percentage for all objectives. This may or may not be the appropriate solution for all; it may have to be case by case.<br><br>Pat Carr questioned whether the objectives should be a tool for students to use in their self directed learning (in addition to the faculty using them to guide their lecture and assessment activities). The answer is yes: the students should be able to look at the objectives and understand what it is they are to learn from the course or session. The goal of writing these objectives is to reduce the noise in the curriculum and to create linkages throughout the curriculum at all levels. We also need to keep in mind our limitations of time and resources. John Shabb and Rick Van Eck discussed the amount of session level objectives (4000-5000); it may be more feasible to begin at course level, for now.<br><br>Next meeting: Adrienne Salentiny will bring a draft of the operational sheet for objectives for discussion. This will serve as an informative tip sheet or guide for those who will be updating objectives. This may also serve as a draft of the committee's recommendation to MCC regarding the standard we should follow for writing objectives at each level.  She will also bring an updated timetable this committee is to be following. | |
| | **b.) E*Value Tool**<br>Becca Maher, Adrienne Salentiny and Rick Van Eck have start to meet and work with E*Value to accumulate questions that Becca can ask at the E*Value conference she is going to this fall. If you have questions you would like to add please let Alissa or Becca know. | Informational |
| | **c.) Appropriate Tool Discussion** | Tabled |
| | Future Tasks:<br>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.<br>2. Activities surrounding creation of a keyword list.<br>3. Addition of keywords and additional cleanup and organizational work in E*Value.<br>4. Try a sample report, to see how long it takes. | |

|  | 5. Discussion and/or related activities to course and session level objectives.<br>6. Discussion of the course level and session level objectives should be written at the same level or one higher than the other? |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 8. Adjournment | Meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m. | *The next meeting is scheduled for August 6, 2018, at 2:00 pm in E493 Conference Room, Grand Forks.* |