

Medical Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes

SMHS

Wednesday, October 25, 2017- 4:30 PM, Room E493, via telecomm, and video

In attendance: Jim Beal, Pat Carr, Chen Xuesong, Joy Dorscher, Jonathan Geiger, Dawn Hackman, Mark Koponen, Kay McCollough, Thad Rosenberger, John Shabb, Chernet Tessema, Steve Tinguely, Chris Tiongson, Rick Van Eck

Voting members not in attendance: Marc Basson, Raymond Goldsteen, Scott Knutson, Heide Philpot, David Schmitz, Susan Zelewski

Minutes Submitted by: Dawn Hackman

Minutes Reviewed by: Rick Van Eck

Minutes Approved by: Jonathan Geiger/Mark Koponen

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome/call to order	Dr. Van Eck called the meeting to order at 4:46p in room E493 on the Northeast Campus.	Informational
2. Consent Agenda	<p>a. Minutes from 8/23, CSCS Summary Report, Clerkship Director’s Annual Checklist, Peds Ortho SE Campus, NE Campus FM Residency AI, 4th Year AI Grand Marais</p> <p>-Discussion: none</p> <p>-All consent items were approved.</p>	MSC to approve all consent agenda items – Thad Rosenberger/Mark Koponen/all in favor; carried unanimously.
3. New Business	<p>a. Deletion of PED 9513</p> <p>-Discussion: now incorporated in a Pediatrics Subspecialty Elective. No action from MCC needed.</p> <p>b. Curriculum Evaluation Discussion (R Van Eck) [Note: moved to end of agenda]</p> <p>-Discussion of <i>LCME Standard 8.3 Report and Action Items</i>, the latter of which is being used to populate future agenda items and will be discussed during subsequent meetings. Chair brought to the attention of the MCC that two elements of 8.3 are problematic: 8.3.B.4 (review of entire curriculum) and 8.3.C (examples of how monitoring of curriculum has been used to identify gaps and redundancies). Those would be difficult for MCC to do, as it is supposed to provide oversight of committee but its processes and functions only evaluate curriculum incrementally. Also unresolved are the questions of whether and how MCC can map; mapping to the level that is needed by the standard (from competencies down to assessment) requires a different set of skills than is</p>	<p>Informational</p> <p>Rosenberg/Koponen move to table; all in favor/carried unanimously.</p>

	<p>available in the current committee structure.</p> <p>-Discussion of document, <i>Curriculum Evaluation Management Subcommittee Proposal Description</i> Chair recommends creating a permanent group (subcommittee) with the expertise required to map/evaluate the curriculum, identify gaps/redundancies, make recommendations to MCC, and generate reports from the MCC as requested. The subcommittee would be formed primarily from staff and faculty from Education Resources and Library Resources. Members would act as liaisons for the MCC and its subcommittees.</p> <p>Comments and concerns expressed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subcommittee charge should be clear that its role is providing recommendations and not making decisions, thereby infringing on the MCC's charge of providing oversight over the curriculum. Its first priorities should be identified by MCC, including establishing a process for mapping and what objectives should look like. • Creating subcommittee formalizes mapping and would provide the MCC structure and process for tacking this critical function. • Alternative is to train faculty in processes of curriculum and information mgmt. • Is the proposed subcommittee and its structure ideal? Suggested alternatives to the CEMS included PhDs from the School of Education. • Would faculty be involved in this process? It was suggested that with a solid template and training, faculty would be able to write higher quality objectives. <p>Discussed document, <i>Recommended/Suggested Tasks for CEMS</i>. This document reflects examples of types of tasks that the CEMS could be involved in, with the MCC's approval.</p> <p>Discussed document, <i>MCC Bylaws Modification</i>. Changes to MCC Bylaws would be needed to add CEMS liaison members to the MCC.</p> <p>In interest of time, Chair recommends tabling for future MCC meeting.</p>	
	<p>c. Preclerkship Clinical Science Co-Director Position Update (Pat Carr) Discussion of the current shortage of clinicians in the SMHS med curriculum. Several faculty clinicians have retired within the past couple years, or are soon to retire, who were heavily involved in curriculum. These positions totaled 3.0 FTE. All are important to the success of the current curriculum, but a full-time Director of Year 1 & 2 Clinical Sciences is especially critical. The job description has been created and the Request to Recruit is ready to move forward by early next week. Carr strongly encourages words of support from MCC, emphasizing the importance of filling this position with a clinician. There was a suggestion from the membership that a letter</p>	<p>Informational</p> <p>Action item: Chair will write MCC letter of support for Director of Year 1 & 2 Clinical Sciences</p>

	of encouragement be written by MCC to accompany the request to the Dean. Letter should include that although only 1 position is being requested now, that won't be sufficient to carry the curriculum and 4 positions will be needed or risk losing accreditation. MCC will delegate letter to Chair to write letter, in consultation with Carr, and to be included in packet to Dean next week. Letter will be distributed to committee as FYI by end of this week.	position.
	d. Meeting Times and Committee Support (R Van Eck) -Discussion – Education Resources is finding it challenging to find staff to provide longterm full-time meeting support for all committees and subcommittees. All but BSCS meet after hours, which presents problems for staff without the option of flex/comp time. Might have to consider rescheduling meetings to fall within normal business hours. It was pointed out that an earlier meeting time would not work for CSCS, which schedules its meetings outside of work hours to allow clinicians to be able to participate. No action needed from MCC currently; Chair will keep MCC advised on this issue.	Informational
4. Standing Agenda Items	a. Review of action item table (Van Eck) There was not enough time to review or discuss the action item table.	
	b. Big MCC Discussion Questions (Van Eck) There was not enough time to discuss the big questions.	
5. Old Business	a. Policy Discussion Update (R Van Eck) Discussion: met as group. In process of drafting solutions. There is a policy on policies, including how policies should be routed and would require changes to bylaws in order to change.	Informational
6. Other Business	None	
7. Next MCC Meeting	Next Clerkship Report Review meeting – November 8, 2017 – 4:30 PM, Room E493 & Video Fargo Next Regular Meeting – November 29, 2017 – 4:30 PM, Room E493 & Video Fargo	Informational
8. Adjournment	Meeting was adjourned at 6:19 pm	Informational