Curriculum Committee Minutes

Date	June 5, 2023
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:*** Laura Goodell, Matt Cunningham, John Willford, Cindy Knall, Zach Gallaher, Ryan Richardson, Esther Chung, Kris Calhoun, Leanne Rousseau ***Guests:*** David Pfeiffer, Joshua Jauregui, Martin Teintze, Edith Wang, Sarah Wood, Mary Sargent, Gerald Tolbert, Jerome Graber, Janelle Clauser, Jordan Kinder, Michael Campion, Gina Franco, Jung Lee, Geoff Jones, Electra Enslow, Gabe Sarah, Bruce Silverstein, Kellie Engle, Cynthia Sprenger, Brant Schumaker, Darryl Potyk, Kathy Young, LeeAnna Muzquiz, Ellen Stone.
Regrets	***Voting members:*** Audrey Mossman, Courtney Francis, Eric LaMotte

Agenda

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION
1	Reminders: • Summer break • Next meeting: September 11, 2023	Laura Goodell	2 min		Announcement
2	Approve May Minutes	Laura Goodell	3 min	Attachment A	Decision
3	Clinical Assessment Workgroup: Update	Heather McPhillips	40 min	Attachment B	Discussion
4	Innovations in Curriculum Design and Delivery: Final Recommendations	Michael Campion / John Willford	45 min	Attachment C	Decision

1. Reminders
Announcements: The curriculum governance committees will be taking a summer break (no meetings in July or August). The next Curriculum Committee meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2023.

2. Approve May Minutes (E-Vote- June 11, 2023)		
Discussion: The meeting minutes were reviewed.		
☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[8] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The Curriculum committee approved the May meeting minutes by E-Vote.		

3. Clinical Assessment Workgroup Endorsement Clinical Assessment Phase 2 Workgroup
Discussion: In early 2023, a workgroup was formed to discuss and develop competency-based clinical assessment recommendations that are equitable and reduce bias. As a reminder the Curriculum Committee charged the workgroup committee to look at an overall assessment committee and in scope is required clinical clerkships and out of scope is electives and APCs. Workgroup members include staff, administrators, clerkship directors, fellows, 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.   Why the change at UW? Our grading system is not equitable and how clinical grades are determined is not transparent and lack of student trust in grades. Total of four meetings and over of 15 hours and outside experts and UW experts spoke about up to date innovations and collaboration with CLIME who brought in Dr. Justin Bullock. The first meeting set priorities from all perspectives. The second meeting was focused on values such as equity to develop competence. Dr. Dan Schumacher spoke about competency based medical education. Dr. Karen Hauer spoke about experience changing clinical assessment system at UCSF. At first, they increased cap on Honors, established core clerkship committees and eliminated threshold for knowledge exam score for honors eligibility and then in future years eliminated core clerkship grades and increased focus on direct observation and feedback and stronger narratives and letters of recommendation. Data which was shared was the inequities have been eliminated and theory is that the third year has leveled the playing field for the four year. Dr. Bob Englander discussed Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs) which mirror things we need students to as they enter residency and reflect what we truly do. Pass/Fail model was voted by 78% of workgroup and EPA model was voted by 69%. Goal is to Implement in spring of 2025 for incoming class of Entering 2023 class.

Discussion: At what point in time do students find out how competitive they are for residency match? UCSF and Minnesota did not see changes in their match rates with move to new assessment. We had residency program directors on the UW workgroup and since most residency programs have gone to holistic review the thought is this move won't affect our match rates. In terms of implementation this is a very important question to look into. Electives and APCs will remain as tiered grading at the UW to build other ways for students to differentiate themselves.

How is training for clinical faculty approached at other schools? Training clinical faculty is an important implementation. We have a natural pilot with the WRITE 2.0 program. Preliminary feedback is that the faculty like the EPA framework. Clinical competency committee and coaching program to write MSPE comments to formulate summary will be another key to success. At UCSF using QR code with student conversation with faculty and email confirmation has worked well with student driving learning.

Items which will come back to Curriculum Committee after Phase 2 for approval and approach: narrative writing, faculty development, coaches for students to integrate feedback, promotion committees.

How to differentiate with increased focus on research? Focus on extracurricular activities will assist in this area. Track outcome measures.

☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[9] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: Endorsement for Phase 2 Workgroup for design and implementation of a program of clinical assessment for required clerkships that is pass/fail (non tiered grading).		
☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[9] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: Endorsement for Phase 2 Workgroup for design and implementation of a program of clinical assessment for required clerkships that uses the EPA framework.		

---

4. Innovations in Curriculum Design and Delivery: Final Recommendations

Discussion: In May 2022, The Foundations Phase Committee charged a workgroup of diverse stakeholders to provide recommendations to the Foundations Committee about an optimal way to deliver Foundations content. Preliminary recommendations are due to the Foundations Committee by January 2023. Recommendations would be implemented for the E-23 cohort (starting in July 2023) with potential small pilots/tests before then to inform work. Recommendations should:

- Be based on a design mindset and emerging best practices in education.
- Incorporate principles of equity/use equity tool.
- Support active learning with balance between content delivery and interactivity.
- have clear attendance expectations (and how to or whether to track) and expectations for student time commitments.
- Promote well-being to the extent possible (consider impacts of time, cost, learning, burnout on staff, faculty, and students).
- Recommendations must adhere to individual campus rules/funding/space/technology.
- Capitalize on standardizing curriculum while allowing for individual site optimization.
  - Congruence is important for the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) and the school's continued accreditation.

- Adhere to legislative requirements in each state.

Out of scope for the workgroup:
- Block content including hours taught
- Large investment of new technology, space, materials (although this request could be included in the workgroup's future vision)
- Recommendations that do not adhere to university, regional campus, or national (LCME, etc.) rules.

The workgroup chairs presented final recommendations for the committee's review, feedback, and endorsement. These final recommendations were presented at the May 22, 2023 Foundations Phase Committee meeting for review and endorsement.

Since September 2022, the workgroup has focused on the following:
- Course design concepts, adult learning theory, and cognitive load
  - Maximizing student and facilitator engagement
  - Reducing extraneous cognitive load through consistency
- Broad coverage of content vs. application of concepts for deep learning
- Supporting students and the learning environment
- Leveraging the strength of each WWAMI Foundations campus while maintaining consistency where essential
- Equity impact tool
- Attendance benefits and barriers and the differences between Foundations campuses
- Collecting feedback from faculty, staff, and students on draft recommendations, including live feedback sessions and surveys.

Final draft recommendations overview:

Pedagogy
- Active learning
- Longitudinal faculty
- Session plans
- Faculty development

Student Support
- Identify students in difficulty
- Academic support integration (formerly student support)
- Remediation

Curriculum Infrastructure
- Goal of the Foundations phase
- Cross-block consistency
- Rules of the road
- Faculty FTE
- Evaluation of recommendations
- attendance

All recommendations require significant investments in faculty FTE, faculty development, educational technology, student support, and administrative staff. The committee reviewed each of the 13 final draft recommendations in depth. See the meeting handouts for details.

Foundations Committee identified overall support.

The Foundations Phase Committee voted on the priority level of each recommendation.

Discussion: For Faculty FTE- since WWAMI faculty do not work for UW, that has impact for how to hire. Some sites are farther down the road than others. Maybe there is a sliding scale for sites. A lot of the discussion around faculty FTE is about Seattle and making sure there is an expectation about time.

Recommendations are presented for approval in concept to develop implementation plans with resources to be allocated and pilot ideas.

☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[8] VOTES FOR	[] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The Curriculum committee approve twelve recommendations for ICDD		