UW Medicine
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Date	August 3, 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 ☒ QUORUM REACHED *[10] voting members required for quorum* *[12] 60% Threshold*	***Voting members:*** *John Scott, John Willford, Laura Goodell, Leanne Rousseau, Malika Hale, Margaret Isaac, Mark Whipple, Peter Fuerst, Ruth Lewinski, Sherilyn Smith, Zach Gallaher (11)* <u>Note:</u> *Some voting members attended late and were not counted in votes earlier in the meeting.* ***Guests:*** *Kathy Young, Edith Wang, Jaime Fitch, Sara Kim, Rebekah Smith, John McCarthy, Heidi Combs, Devin Sawyer, Brenda Martinez, Frank Batcha, Gerald Tolbert, LeeAnna Musquiz, Darryl Potyk, Larry Kirven, Leo Morales, Cynthia Sprenger, Sarah Wood, Nick Cheung, Jeff Seegmiller, Haya Jamali, Michael Campion, Maya Sardesai, Kelly Goetz, Meghan Kiefer, Martin Teintze, William Sayres, Bruce Silverstein, Matt Cunningham*
Regrets	***Executive Chair:*** *Michael Ryan* ***Voting members:*** *Amanda Kost, Brenna Ostertag, Eric LaMotte, Kristine Calhoun, Mara Rendi, Tim Chestnut*

Agenda

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION
1	Approve July Minutes	Margaret Isaac	5 min	Attachment A	Decision
2	Course Name: "Themes in Medicine" for E20	Edith Wang	5 min	-	Decision
3	Foundations 2022 Data Workgroup Guiding Principles and Recommendations	Edith Wang / Meghan Kiefer	25 min	Attachment B	Discussion /Decision
4	PEAC Foundations Assessments Recommendations	Matt Cunningham / Edith Wang	25 min	Attachment C	Decision
5	Clerkship Grading to Pass/Fail	Mark Whipple	30 min	Attachment D	Discussion /Decision

Next Meeting: September 14, 2020

1. Approve July Minutes		
Discussion: The committee voted to approve the July meeting minutes.		
☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[9] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The committee approves the July meeting minutes.		

2. Course Name: "Themes in Medicine" for E20		
Discussion: Background: • The Ecology of Health and Medicine course is being restructured. • The restructured course will have a new name. Proposed course name: • "Themes in Medicine" • Without the details of the restructured course, we wanted a generic name that is still reflective of the content. • This name will be changed now and will apply to cohorts hopefully by Winter 2021. Discussion: • Since we already have "themes", would the name "Themes in Medicine" be confusing? • All the "themes" are represented in the EHM course, so that may be fine.		
☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[9] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The committee votes to approve the new course name "Themes in Medicine".		

3. Foundations 2022 Data Workgroup Guiding Principles and Recommendations		
Discussion: See Foundations 2022 Data Workgroup slides for details.		
☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[9] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The committee votes to approve the eight guidelines presented by the Foundations 2022 Data Workgroup.		

4. PEAC Foundations Assessments Recommendations
Discussion: See PEAC Recommendations Summary for details. Background: • PEAC presented 10 recommendations regarding Foundations Assessments to this group. • We (Curriculum Committee) approved five recommendations and sent the other five recommendations to Foundations Committee for their input. • Foundations Committee discussed and then sent recommendations to the Block/Thread/Themes (B/T/T) Leadership group for their input.

- The input we're reviewing is a summary from Foundations Committee, B/T/T Leadership, and specific key individual input.

#2 Cumulative final exams should be implemented in all blocks longer than 3 weeks.
- <u>Summary of Foundations input</u>: There is general agreement about implementing final exams. The concern was mainly around what it would take (e.g., removing content) to implement final exams if certain blocks were not given more time.

#8 Requirements for student mastery of thread content outside of the context of block grades should be reduced or eliminated.
- <u>Summary of Foundations input</u>: There is general agreement that there is a thread governance issue. Thread leaders feel they do not have sufficient authority over how their material is taught and assessed. If we reduce or eliminate the requirement for thread mastery, thread leads feel that thread content would be deprioritized even more. There is also general empathy that students have to track thread scores and that there is double counting where students have to pass both blocks and threads.
- Student opinion is that receiving feedback on threads is important. Tracking thread scores is tricky and it would be helpful if that is a more streamlined process.
- Student opinion is that it's frustrating that points are not distributed evenly among exams and blocks. There are times when students need to suddenly study harder for threads because of the number of questions on an exam.
- If the requirement for thread mastery is removed, students would still receive thread feedback.
- Matt Cunningham has been working with Academic Learning Technologies to solve the problem of tracking thread scores.
- In MCBD, thread leads are allocated hours of instruction which are linked to a number of assessment questions.
- At times, there is thread content that is so integrated into the block, it's hard to identify them as separate hours and then translated into questions. Integration is good, but we also need the content tagged so there can be corresponding assessment on it.

Motion: Create a workgroup charged to work on the interface between blocks and threads with a focus on:
- Governance of thread instruction time.
- Governance of the number of thread assessment/exam questions.
- Process to account and tag existing exam questions for threads.

Block/Thread workgroup
- HFF lets students know upfront how many thread questions will be in each block. It would be great if we could have that for all threads.
- Interested individuals for this workgroup: Zach Gallaher, Mark Whipple, Laura Goodell, Meghan Kiefer, John Willford (unless a WY thread lead is interested), Ruth Lewinski
- Suggested individuals: Cat and Max have done some data work on understanding threads.

Action: There should be communication to the Foundations Committee about this workgroup.

Action: Send out an Evote:
- For recommendation #2, implementing final exams for 2020 should be part of the vote.
- Evote options should be: "Approve", "Not approve", "Defer for further discussion"

☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[11] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The committee votes to charge a workgroup to work on the interface between blocks and threads.		

5. Clerkship Grading to Pass/Fail

Discussion:

Background:
The discussion is about whether to keep clerkship grading as it is now (Honors/High Pass/Pass/Fail) or to change it to Pass/Fail. When clerkships began, some students were quarantined or missed time due to COVID.

Patient Care and Explore & Focus committees voted to delay submitting Summer A grades to buy some time to see how COVID is doing throughout the region, see if faculty felt they were able to reasonably assess students, and see how other schools were approaching this nationwide.

Decision process:
- Have Patient Care and Explore & Focus committees discuss and weigh in with their decisions.
- Explore & Focus committee evoted to keep the current grading (YES: 12; NO: 0; No response: 6).
- Patient Care committee is scheduled for Monday 8/10/2020. They will review data/information they've gathered from Summer A and so far in Summer B and take a vote.
- Curriculum Committee will make the final vote for this.
    - This decision has ramifications across other phases. For example, if required clerkships move to Pass/Fail, this has ramifications for Step 1 and ramifications for Explore & Focus clerkships, so it makes sense for Curriculum Committee to make the final decision.
    - There are students on the Curriculum Committee, but not currently in the Patient Care and Explore & Focus committees.
- After the Patient Care Committee on 8/10, if there is a vote to change grading to Pass/Fail, the Curriculum Committee will hold a special session to decide whether to ratify the decision.

See **Student Survey slides** for details on student responses to clerkship grading.

Curriculum Committee Special session:
- Mark Whipple would attend as the Executive Co-Chair of Patient Care and Explore & Focus committees to present a summary of thoughts and any votes from both committees.
- Curriculum Committee can further discuss the issue at the special session.
- Curriculum Committee would decide whether to ratify or vote on a decision. Curriculum Committee's decision would be the deciding decision.

Suzanne Allen attends a weekly call with other schools nationally. Their discussions include clerkship grading. Latest update is:
- Prior to COVID, 11-12 schools had Pass/Fail grading for any or all clerkships. These are highly selective schools (e.g., Stanford, Harvard, Vanderbilt, UCSF)

- Since COVID: 14 additional schools have moved to some form of Pass/Fail. We do not know which schools these are.

Residency competitiveness:
- If more schools move toward Pass/Fail, it makes residency competitiveness less of an issue.
- It's still an issue if a student's Step 1 scores are not as high as they'd like.
- We can't really compare ourselves to the highly selective schools. Those schools are much smaller and have higher scores.

Hybrid grading model:
- Can students/faculty select whether they want Pass/Fail or tiered grades?
- This is not currently allowed in a professional school.
- This is potentially doable but would be an extremely large undertaking.

Clerkship Huddles are held Tues/Thurs at 5pm. This may be a good place for people to attend. There would be key stakeholders available at these calls.

Adjourn: 5:30 PM PDT