Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes  
Monday, August 8, 2018 @ 2:00 pm  
E493 Conference Room & via WebEx

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

<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 2:03 p.m.</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Old Business</td>
<td>a.) Minutes from July 23, 2018</td>
<td>MSC to approve minutes as amended John Shabb/Mark Koponen // all in favor; carried unanimously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. New Business | a.) Objectives  
  a. Operational Sheet for Objectives (Salentiny)  
This document covers the basics for standardizing how we write objectives. There was continued discussion on how to state how we assess components of an objective. Do you list a percentage or be more vague with “ideally the student should be able to demonstrate at 100%” or “With no or minimal error.” This is hard to set because the content experts will know what mastery of a component looks like in their field. The 3rd component needs to be able to be assessed, but further discussion determined that a percentage may not be the most appropriate way to display this. Other options, such as criteria that needs to be met or a process that needs to be followed are also acceptable.  
When training people how to write objectives following this standard, a few more examples should be included. For presenting this document to MCC for approval, this is sufficient as it is written. | MSC to recommend to MCC the approval of the Standard for Writing Outcomes-Focused Objectives, Principles of Good Objectives and Learning Capability Verb documents. John Shabb/Dawn Hackman // carried. |
When we look at implementing we will need to keep in mind the questions we want to ask about our curriculum and what our reports will look like.

### b.) Update on e*Value subgroup finding (Van Eck)
Dr. John Shabb showed a smaller group pivot tables and it looks promising. It is something we might need to demo in this committee. Becca Maher is reaching out to e*Value to see if they can add two columns so that we can add the new domains and competencies without replacing the old mapping of the domains and competencies. The hope is that we can delete the old mapping once we are in a good place with the new/updated mapping.

### b.) Timeline (Salentiny)
We are not too far behind on our timeline overall. We need to get our recommendations for objectives and for the USMLE keywords on an MCC agenda soon. Once MCC approves our recommendations, then we can start the implementation process. One change in the timeline would be that we are not going to start with session level objectives. Instead, course level and above, for now. Session level can be addressed at a later time. They really need each involved faculty member to work on them as a content expert, and thus it is a longer term project.

### Future Tasks:
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. (in progress)
2. Activities surrounding creation of a keyword list. (awaiting objectives process/implementation)
3. Addition of keywords and additional cleanup and organizational work in E*Value.
4. Try a sample report, to see how long it takes.
5. Discussion and/or related activities to course and session level objectives.
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 3:12 p.m.