# Curriculum Committee Minutes

**Date** | December 5, 2022  
**Time** | 4:00 – 5:30PM  
**Co-Chairs** | Heather McPhillips, Laura Goodell  
**Attendees** |  
☑ QUORUM REACHED: **Academic Co-Chair:** Laura Goodell; **Executive Chair:** Heather McPhillips  
**Voting Members:** Audrey Massman, Cindy Knall, Courtney Francis, Eric LaMotte, Esther Chung, John Wilford, Kris Calhoun, Leanne Rousseau, Matt Cunningham, Ryan Richardson, Zach Gallagher  
**Guests:** Mark Whipple, Martin Teintze, Scott Bailey, Edith Wang, Cynthia Sprenger, Jordan Kinder, Darryl Potyk, Debbie Blackstone, Jung Lee, Kathy Young, Janelle Clauser, Sarah Wood, Meghan Kiefer, Kellie Engle, Sara Kim, Emily Schmitt, Michael Campion  
**Regrets** | Voting members: Elizabeth Buhler, Peter Fuerst

## Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ATTACHMENT</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 E-vote approved: Revisions to Clerkship Scheduling Policy</td>
<td>Jessica Wheeler</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td>Announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Clinical Assessment Workgroup</td>
<td>Heather McPhillips</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td></td>
<td>Announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Approve November Minutes</td>
<td>Laura Goodell</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Grade Appeal Committee: Annual Report</td>
<td>Eric LaMotte</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Attachment C</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Program Evaluation Discussion</td>
<td>Heather McPhillips</td>
<td>25 min</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 LCME Report: Element 3.2 Community of Scholars/Research Opportunities</td>
<td>Sara Kim / Heather McPhillips</td>
<td>25 min</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **E-vote approved: Revisions to Clerkship Scheduling Policy**

**Announcement:** Curriculum Committee approved changes to the Clerkship Scheduling Policy via e-vote. The approved revisions acknowledge that clerkships can be scheduled for 3-week timeframes for the WWAMI Rural Integrated Training Experience Program (or WRITE) program. This change is effective for the new program launch in Spring 2023.

The WRITE program is a Longitudinal Integrated Clerkship (LIC) that offers selected third-year medical students a mix of ambulatory and hospital training through a clinical education experience at a rural primary care teaching site. In January 2022, Curriculum committee approved WRITE as an outpatient Longitudinal Integrated Clerkship (LIC) experience structured as a 21-to-24-week clerkship administered by the Department of Family Medicine. Twenty-one to 24 weeks is predicated on whether the clinical location can offer an OB/GYN experience. The WRITE inpatient clerkship experience will be six weeks of Internal Medicine, three weeks of Pediatrics, three weeks of Psychiatry, three weeks of OB/GYN, and six weeks of Surgery, administered independently by respective departments.

See meeting handouts for details.

2. **Clinical Assessment Workgroup**

**Discussion:** The clinical assessment workgroup will begin work soon, discussing competency-based clinical assessments that are equitable and reduce bias. Workgroup members include staff, administrators, clerkship directors, career advisors, students, and regional WWAMI representation. The workgroup aims to create recommendations that:

- Create equitable and transparent assessments.
- Encourage a growth mindset and lifelong learning.
- Reduce the number of grade reviews and challenges.

Curriculum Committee will receive updates as work progresses.

3. **Approve November Minutes**

**Discussion:** The meeting minutes were reviewed.

[DECISION REQUIRED?][8 VOTES FOR][0 VOTES AGAINST]

**Decision:** The Curriculum committee approved the November meeting minutes.

4. **Grade Appeal Committee: Annual Report**

**Discussion:** In 2018, Curriculum Committee established the Grade Appeal Committee to manage the grade appeal process and determine whether a petitioning student’s grade and/or clinical evaluation summative comments were awarded arbitrarily or capriciously by the instructor/department. As a subcommittee of Curriculum Committee, the Grade Appeal Committee provided an annual report for the previous two academic years.

**Historical background:**
• Before 2018, students could challenge their grade to the clerkship director, and appeal to the department chair.
• In October 2018, Curriculum Committee adopted a new process to improve consistency between departments, forming two new appeal committees (one for the Foundations Phase and another for the Clinical Phases).
• In January 2021 with Curriculum Committee approval, the Clinical Grade Appeal Committee subsumed the Foundations Grade Appeal Committee to form the Grade Appeal Committee.

Grade appeal process:

Grade Review
• The student is given an appointment to review grading information and better understand the ultimate grading decision.

Grade Challenge
• The student meets with the clerkship director and makes their case for changing the grade.

Grade Appeal
• The Grade Appeal Committee reviews the decision made by the clerkship director.

The Grade Appeal Committee structure:
• Eight faculty seats representing diverse departments and WWAMI sites.
• Two students: one in the Foundations Phase and one in the Patient Care Phase.
• The committee has been delegated authority to have final say in grades/comments being disputed.
  o Important note: The committee is not involved with grade reviews or challenges.

Key takeaways:
• The numbers of reviews have remained stable over time.
• Grades and comments are mostly upheld, three out of 19 cases led to an action being taken (for example, allowing the student to retake an exam).
• The concerns most commonly cited in appeals include:
  o Too few evaluators
  o Exam-related
  o Inconsistent mid-clerkship feedback
  o Bias

Looking forward:
• Clarify and refine grade challenge procedures to reduce the burden on clerkship directors and administrators.
• Changes in committee leadership and membership.

See meeting handouts for details.
5. Program Evaluation Discussion

Discussion: Curriculum Committee will hold a retreat in Spring 2023 for voting members. To prepare for the retreat, the committee discussed best practices for continuous quality improvement of the medical education program’s curriculum. One potential tool for assessing the program is an annual report card (a common tool used in Graduate Medical Education (GME)). Annual report cards could:

- Track key metrics identified by the Curriculum Committee to monitor the success of the curriculum.
- Track trends overtime.
- Identify areas for the governance committees to focus on/develop.
- Be made available to faculty, staff, and students to improve communication and transparency.

The committee discussed and identified possible metrics for assessing the program. This list will be reviewed at the retreat:

- End-of-Phase reports
- Pass rates
- Residency Match results
- Graduation Questionnaire results
- Performance on Step 1
- Performance on Program Level Objectives (PLOs)
  - Important note: PLOs are currently reviewed in the Comprehensive Cohort Competency Report (CCCR) after students graduate as a cohort, we don’t have real-time data.
- Learning Environment data
- Grading inequities
- Curriculum Committee should consider:
  - What’s important to different stakeholders (students, faculty, various Foundations campuses, regional, etc.)
  - Metrics of success for each year of the curriculum.
  - The UW School of Medicine’s strategic priorities.

6. LCME Report: Element 3.2 Community of Scholars/Research Opportunities

Discussion: The UW School of Medicine (UWSOM) received updates on four outstanding citations from the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME), the accrediting body for medical schools in the USA:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Element Title</th>
<th>2021 LCME Finding</th>
<th>2022 LCME Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Community of Scholars / Research Opportunities</td>
<td>Satisfactory with a need for monitoring (SNM)</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Study / Lounge / Storage Space / Call Rooms</td>
<td>SNM</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>SNM</td>
<td>SNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Student Access to Health Care</td>
<td>SNM</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee discussed the Element 3.2 citation –
Issue:
- Persistent student dissatisfaction with research opportunities.

Problems:
- Focused on Scholarship of Discovery and Integration (excluding RUOP and GHIP).
- The MS1 data was below average and revealed new challenges/areas of student dissatisfaction, including:
  - The Triple I is now required. In the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Triple I requirement was waived (2020) and made optional for the E-20 cohort (2021).
  - Financial concerns (tuition and compensation for research).
- The central oversight of Triple I operations and data monitoring are unclear.

Required Data:
- Satisfaction with ease of access to research opportunities.
- Satisfaction with sufficiency of information about research opportunities.

Required Narrative:
- Root causes of ongoing dissatisfaction at the campus level.
- Ongoing modifications/enhancements being planned.

The committee discussed the findings and how to move forward:
- Utilize the student comments and data to conduct the root cause analysis.
- Broaden the definition the school is using for “research.”
- Data collection must be streamlined.
- Clarify language around research in student surveys.

The next status report for Element 3.2 is due December 1, 2023. The committee discussed the timeline of current data collection dates, when interventions could be implemented, and when to hold another round of data collection in autumn 2023. Interventions should:
- Ensure equity in access.
- Resolve MS1 financial concerns (tuition and requests to be paid for research).
- Resolve whether Triple I should be required or optional (scholarship is a graduation requirement).
- Improve communications to students (what’s available, how to seek financial support, how to access desired projects, etc.).

The committee recommended utilizing INBRE (the IDeA Networks of Biomedical Research Excellence) to bulk up research opportunities in the region. Additionally, the Educational Quality Improvement (EQI) unit should connect with to the Scholarship Subcommittee for their immediate assistance as the local experts and the governance subcommittee responsible for scholarship.