

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Date	June 8, 2020
Time	4:00-5:30 PM
Location and/or connection info	https://uw-phi.zoom.us/j/414136379 Telephone: +1 669-900-6833 or +1 646-558-8656
Governance Website	http://blogs.uw.edu/somcurr4/committees/
Co-Chairs	Michael Ryan Margaret Isaac
Attendees	Executive Chair: Michael Ryan Voting members: Amanda Kost, John Willford, Laura Goodell, Malika Hale, Margaret Isaac, Mark Whipple, Peter Fuerst, Ruth Lewinski, Sherilyn Smith, Zach Gallaher, Eric LaMotte (11) Guests: Matthew Cunningham, Timothy Robinson, Jaime Fitch, Sarah Wood, Martin Teintze, Geoff Jones, Raye Maestas, Maya Sardesai, Bruce Silverstein, Kathy Young, Kellie, Engle, Cynthia Sprenger, Larry Kirven, Sara Kim, Signe Burchim, Devin Sawyer, Nick Cheung, LeeAnna Muzquiz, Judy Swanson, Kelley Goetz, Brenda Martinez, Michael Campion, John McCarthy, Marilyn Cope, Meghan Kiefer, Leo Morales, Jeff Seegmiller, Emily Cox, Marj Wenrich, Edith Wang
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QUORUM REACHED [10] voting members required for quorum [12] 60% Threshold	
Regrets	Voting members: Brandt Buckner, Brenna Ostertag, Eva Jahan, John Scott, Kristine Calhoun, Leanne Rousseau, Mara Rendt, Tim Chestnut

Agenda

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION
1	Approve May Minutes	Margaret Isaac	5 min	Attachment A	Decision
2	Review COVID Changes	Margaret Isaac	5 min	Attachment B	Announcement
3	Introduction: New Director of Scholarship (Cynthia Sprenger)	Michael Ryan / Margaret Isaac	5 min	-	Announcement
4	New Policy Template	Kelley Goetz	10 min	Attachment C, D	Discussion
5	Pre-work for Matriculated Students	Emily Cox	15 min	-	Discussion
6	PEAC: Foundations Assessment	Matt Cunningham	25 min	Attachment E	Decision
7	Comprehensive Cohort Competency Report	Matt Cunningham	25 min	Attachment F	Decision

Next Meeting: July 13, 2020

1. Approve May Minutes		
------------------------	--	--

Discussion: The committee voted to approve the May meeting minutes.		
--	--	--

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[11] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
--	----------------	-------------------

Decision: The committee approved the May meeting minutes.		
--	--	--

2. Review COVID Changes		
-------------------------	--	--

Discussion:		
--------------------	--	--

The May Actions and Decisions document includes a summary of COVID related decisions approved by the governance committees over the past number of months for your reference.		
---	--	--

3. Introduction: New Director of Scholarship (Cynthia Sprenger)		
---	--	--

Discussion:		
--------------------	--	--

Over the last several years, Shobha Stack has been the Director of Scholarship, but she will be stepping away from this role in July. Cynthia Sprenger has agreed to step into this role.		
---	--	--

Cynthia Sprenger is an Assistant Research Professor in Geriatric Medicine. She has hosted medical students and graduate students in the past. She's also been volunteering with Scholarship for medical students for several years, reviewing abstracts and submissions.		
--	--	--

The Scholarship Committee is a sub-committee of the Curriculum Committee. Cynthia will now be leading the Scholarship Committee.		
--	--	--

4. New Policy Template		
------------------------	--	--

Discussion:		
--------------------	--	--

In the prior LCME Accreditation cycle, it was observed that there were inconsistencies in our policies in terms of language, format, ownership, and where the policies reside. Dr. Allen charged a workgroup to develop recommendations to track, monitor and increase structure around our policies. As a result, a Policy on Policies was developed, along with a new policies template. (See policy document and template for details).		
--	--	--

A smaller workgroup has transferred existing policies into the new template and is currently working with stakeholders to approve them. The intent was to transfer the policies as is, without making any changes to the actual policies.		
---	--	--

There will be a new website to serve as a single place for all policies. There will also be a single public facing document. The goal is to have everything completed for the E20s this summer.		
---	--	--

When this committee drafts new documents, please keep in mind the new template/format. If you need help, reach out to Kelley Goetz or Marilyn Cope.		
---	--	--

5. Pre-work for Matriculated Students

Discussion:

Background:

MSA has a quarterly school-wide survey across all classes, called the We Heard You Survey. The survey results are compiled into a single document for the Deans to review and respond back to the students. One topic that came out of this year's survey was regarding the curriculum for anti-racism.

Proposal:

The MSA proposes that the pre-matriculation book that was optional for E19s, be required for E20s. There appears to be variation across sites on background knowledge on racism and the experience of our black peers and peers of color. We believe that having the book be a pre-matriculation requirement would set a common foundation for students.

- MSA is proposing that the reading be required but is not proposing the exact book.
- The book was provided to students. MSA is proposing that an audiobook is also provided to students who may be working or commuting to make the book more accessible.
- MSA recognizes that not all students can complete the book assignment. The proposal is for it to be mandatory, but also not have any penalties/repercussion for students who cannot complete the book.

Book:

The pre-matriculation book is set by the ARAC committee. This is separate from the "Common Book", which is a book set for Health Sciences. E19 books are "Fatal Invention" and "How to be An Anti-Racist". It's not clear which was the Common Book and which was the ARAC recommended book. It is believed that "Fatal Invention" is still the ARAC recommended book going forward but need clarity from ARAC. The ARAC recommended book has assigned chapters that are intended to be discussed and reviewed at different times in the curriculum (e.g., in EHM).

Implementation ideas/options:

- Incorporate sessions/discussions about the book at orientation and within EHM.
- Assign a self-reflection for students to complete. It's helpful to have assigned work related to the book so students understand the expectation for what they need to complete.
- As the book is discussed further in the curriculum, it's important to think about who is equipped to facilitate these discussions.
- Facilitated discussions for E19s occurred in Seattle and maybe Spokane. Is this something that can be for all sites?
- One advantage of using the same book as last year, "Fatal Invention", is that the facilitation guide has already been created and can be reused.
- ARAC book should also be made available for faculty to read. If all students develop a common foundation based on this book, faculty could be caught off guard if they haven't read the book.
- Reflections questions should also be made available to faculty.
- Health Equity group offered to arrange faculty development by hosting a facilitated discussion around this book.
- "Fatal Inventions" is available from the UW Library.

Admissions:

- An E20 student got a hold of a link about "Fatal Invention" and posted it on a wider group site for E20s.

- The website implied that this book is for incoming students, but admissions has not directly sent any information out about this book or about such a pre-matriculation requirement.

Action:

Decide offline who will take the lead to work out the logistics and details to make the pre-matriculation reading a requirement and how it will be incorporated into the curriculum.

6. PEAC: Foundations Assessment

Discussion:

Background:

In September 2018, the Curriculum Committee had a retreat where they prioritized three projects to complete. One of the projects was to address Foundations Assessments. After another retreat to discuss details, PEAC (Program Evaluation and Assessment Committee) was charged with this project. The results of this project are the recommendations being presented today.

(See Foundations Assessment for details.)

Recommendations:

1. The practice of asynchronous, unproctored exams should be ended, except when there are extenuating circumstances.
 - Most blocks are already following this. There are a few blocks that still have take home exams and we are working with them on this.

Decision: The committee votes to approve this recommendation.
2. Cumulative final exams should be implemented in all blocks longer than 3 weeks.
 - It is suggested that Recommendation #1 and this one (#2) is communicated to the Foundations 2022 Data Workgroup to include in their analysis. However, it was also brought up that we should address this earlier because starting this in E22 is another two cohorts away.
3. Time should be built into the curriculum at regular intervals for review and consolidation.

Action: This should be communicated to Foundations 2022 Data Workgroup
4. Expand formative or diagnostic usage of National Board of Medical Examiners (NBME) exams.
 - If this is passed, it would be up to leadership to find budget to support this.
 - Student suggests that we look at whether NBME exams are actually higher quality questions. NBME questions could be retired for a reason. We should consider whether cumulative exams may be better.
5. The content that is considered testable should be communicated clearly to students. The learning materials that contain testable content should be as standardized as possible across blocks and campuses.

Decision: The committee votes to approve this recommendation to be discussed and implemented by a workgroup.
6. Criteria for whether or not individual exam questions are rescored after an exam, as well as the method of rescoring, should be standardized as much as possible across blocks.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was suggested that we should also discuss criteria or guidelines for setting the pass threshold. Decision: The committee votes to approve this recommendation to be implemented by a workgroup. 		
<p>7. The remediation process, including communication to students, coverage of block content, exam format, faculty oversight, and timeline should be more standardized across blocks. Decision: The committee votes to approve this recommendation to be implemented by a workgroup.</p>		
<p>8. Requirements for student mastery of thread content outside of the context of block grades should be reduced or eliminated.</p>		
<p>9. Blocks should have specific block learning objectives (BLOs) for thread content covered in the block.</p>		
<p>10. Drafts of all block exams, comprised of questions approved by the Assessment team, should be completed prior to the beginning of the block. Final versions of all block exams should be completed one week prior to the exam date. Decision: The committee votes to approve this recommendation.</p>		
<p>Action: The committee agrees to send recommendations #2, #3, #4, #8, #9 to Foundations Committee for their input. The Foundations Committee’s input will come back to Curriculum Committee to review and then vote on this recommendation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was suggested that since PEAC is a subcommittee of Curriculum Committee, that the Foundations Committee input can first go to PEAC to review. PEAC can then include any additional input/recommendations and present it all to Curriculum. A comment was made that the Foundations Committee may not want to impose some of the recommendations on themselves because of the resulting work required. The Foundations Committee can provide their input, but Curriculum Committee will make the final vote considering the explicit reasons they provide. If there is a resource issue, that can be discussed and addressed. 		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[11] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
<p>Decision: The committee votes to approve the following recommendation:</p> <p>1. The practice of asynchronous, unproctored exams should be ended, except when there are extenuating circumstances.</p>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[11] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
<p>Decision: The committee votes to approve this recommendation to be discussed and implemented by a workgroup:</p> <p>5. The content that is considered testable should be communicated clearly to students. The learning materials that contain testable content should be as standardized as possible across blocks and campuses.</p>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[11] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
<p>Decision: The committee votes to approve this recommendation to be implemented by a workgroup:</p> <p>6. Criteria for whether or not individual exam questions are rescored after an exam, as well as the method of rescoring, should be standardized as much as possible across blocks.</p>		

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[11] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
<p>Decision: The committee votes to approve this recommendation to be implemented by a workgroup:</p> <p>7. The remediation process, including communication to students, coverage of block content, exam format, faculty oversight, and timeline should be more standardized across blocks.</p>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[11] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
<p>Decision: The committee votes to approve this recommendation:</p> <p>10. Drafts of all block exams, comprised of questions approved by the Assessment team, should be completed prior to the beginning of the block. Final versions of all block exams should be completed one week prior to the exam date.</p>		

7. Comprehensive Cohort Competency Report		
<p>Discussion: This item was not discussed.</p>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision:		

Adjourn: 5:30 PM PDT