

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Date	Oct. 7, 2019
Time	4:00-5:30 PM
Location and/or connection info	A-325 https://uw-phi.zoom.us/j/414136379
Governance Website	http://blogs.uw.edu/somcurr4/committees/
Co-Chairs	Michael Ryan Margaret Isaac
Attendees	Voting members: Michael Ryan, Margaret Isaac, Heidi Combs, Cassie Cusick, Peter Fuerst, Laura Goodell, Amanda Kost, John Scott, Mark Whipple, Brandt Buckner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QUORUM REACHED [11] voting members required for quorum	
[13] 60% Threshold	Guests: Edith Wang, Karen Segerson, Nick Cheung, Marj Wenrich, Sara Kim, Kelley Goetz, Marilyn Cope, Kathy Young, Michael Campion, Geoff Jones, Leanna Muzquiz, Kim Jong, Matt Cunningham, Kellie Engle
Regrets	Voting members:

Agenda

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION	VOTE
1	Approval September minutes	Margaret Isaac	5 min		Decision	
2	Medical education objective subcommittee bylaws	Nick Cheung	5 min	Attachment A	Decision	Quorum
3	SOAP Q Pilot	Karen Segerson	15 min	Attachment B	Discussion	
4	USMLE Step 1 Policy Revision	Raye Maestas/Michael Ryan	10 min	Attachment C	Decision	
5	PEAC Bylaws	Matt Cunningham	10 min	Attachment D	Decision	Quorum
6	USMLE Step 1 UW data by regional campus and CBSE	Matt Cunningham	15 min	Attachment E	Discussion	
7	Humanities Pathway	Andrea Kalus	15 min	Attachment F	Decision	Quorum

Next Meeting: November 4, 2019

1. Approval September minutes		
Discussion: The September minutes were not approved due to a lack of quorum and an e-vote will be sent to the committee.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[0] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST

2. Medical education objective subcommittee bylaws		
Discussion: Medical education objective committee was approved by Curriculum Committee in December 2017. Returning to Curriculum committee for bylaws to be approved. Bylaws are patterned after PEAC. Committee is important to say that we are teaching what we are teaching nad oversight of the curriculum. In context of LCME this committee will oversight mapping of program level objectives block and session level objectives. First year the committee will make sure all objectives are mapped and are looking good and are we teaching what we should be teaching. Curriculum management and objective and monitoring and management. Decision will be sent by e-vote.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[12] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The Curriculum Learning Objective Oversight and Management Committee bylaws were approved via e-vote on 10/22/2019.		

3. SOAP Q Pilot (Karen Segerson)		
Discussion: Entering class of 2017 was first class to complete EHM curriculum for six quality aims for knowledge and comprehension of quality improvement. Last we discussed that there was a policy of resources for quality improvement resources and there are faculty development challenges which are not unique to our institutions, so we created four objectives goals in the patient care curriculum. We modeled our approach after SOAP-V used at other medical schools which is designed to create a pause in the student encounter. We included a session in week five of EHM. Students were trained in SOAP Q and ready to use upon entering family medicine clerkship. Still piloting in Family Medicine. Students were well prepared. Family Medicine is very enthusiastic and concept is well received at AAMC and AMA meetings. Where we need to improve is at operational level in expectations with students and faculty understanding. Voluntary with site involvement. Follow-up with evaluation. Hope that as students go into fourth year, they will implement these concepts. Recommend to continue pilot and create standards for SOAP-Q. AIM that all Family Medicine sites will engage with SOAP Q by next March and return that ask that SOAP Q is a requirement. Goal is to have "Q" to be used when most useful and goal to use all or a deep dive into one of the aims so the presentation is not too lengthy. Feedback from students has been positive and no concern about evaluation.		

4. USMLE Step 1 Policy Revision		
Discussion: Students felt they needed more guidance during the Step 1 study and they were cancelling their first clerkships. Students were off line and also needed more tracking and monitoring. For E17 and E18 we said we would not mandate this policy for students and we would not mandate a delay of Step 1 date. For 19 class this discussion is about whether we should mandate this policy for the E19 class. After discussion with leadership it was felt that we were premature to mandate this policy for the E19 class and we need more data to understand how the E17 and E18 students are performing and is the CBSR course successful? Are there more accurate ways to be decided?		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[12] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The committee endorsed the change in the mandated enrollment in the CBSR and delay in Step 1 for E2019 students via e-vote on 10/22/2019.		

5. PEAC Bylaws		
<p>Discussion: PEAC initiated in 2016 and vision put forward in bylaws and work the committee has undertaken has shifted. Bylaws have been revised to call out LCME standards related to assessment and program evaluation. Grade appeals and objectives have been peeled off from the original bylaws. Changes to some of the voting members (Director of Educator Development have been removed) and other roles have been added. Any concern please contact Matt Cunningham.</p>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[12] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
<p>Decision: The committee accepted the revision to PEAC Bylaws via e-vote on 10/22/2019.</p>		

6. USMLE Step 1 UW Data by Regional Campus & CBSE		
<p>Discussion: Data represents entering class of 2017. The UW mean is very high this year. The national data is established by calendar year and differences by sites are relatively small. CBSR: 24 students accepted and participated in CBSR omits the 5 who have not yet taken Step 1. Broken out by students who offered CBSR but declined. These students look like CBSR students. Regression analysis looking at data once students matriculate and two biggest predictors are: 1) CBSE and 2) average block score. MCAT data and another group is looking at that. Predict that the MCAT data will be accounted for during CBSE.</p>		

7. Humanities Pathway		
<p>Discussion: Dr. Kalus came to speak to us about a year ago about a humanities pathway and at that time it was decided that the pathway would move forward as a Triple I in the literature review. Now with changes in the Triple I the request is to move forward as a pathway pilot. The request is to start as a pilot in Seattle with five students and expand to region in the future. Above five students a letter of intent would be submitted to Dr. Kalus and a selection based on that process. Participate in existing electives. The pathway administration would be handled by Dr. Kalus. This is meeting a student driven need and would include a mentored driven project. Regional development for visual thinking experiences are being taught in Spokane and Alaska and other activities could be developed as module based. Peer mentors for areas of interest across region could be developed. Another opportunity to present work would be in Transition in Residency in poster session or gallery setting. No Triple I component to the pathway.</p>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[12] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
<p>Decision: The committee approved establishing the Humanities Pathway Pilot in Seattle and returning to Curriculum Committee for report in September 2020 via E-vote on 10/22/2019.</p>		

Adjourn: 5:30 PM PDT