



## Curriculum Committee Minutes

<b>Date</b>	January 8, 2024
<b>Time</b>	4:00 – 5:30PM PT
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Academic Co-Chair:</b> Laura Goodell; <b>Executive Chair:</b> Heather McPhillips
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QUORUM REACHED:	<p><b>Voting Members:</b> Laura Goodell, John Willford, Cindy Knall, Seth Pincus, Catt Pittack, Esther Chung, Eric LaMotte, Courtney Francis, Leanne Rosseau, Ryan Richardson, Matt Cunningham</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> Cynthia Sprenger, Jerome Graber, Electra Enslow, Bruce D. Silverstein, Maya’s, Sara Kim, Mary Sargent, Martin Teintze, Janelle Clauser, Edith Wang, Gerlad Tolbert, Andrea Kalus, Jordan Kinder, Meghan Kiefer, Jung Lee, Kathy Young, LeeAnna Muzquiz, Luke’s, Sarah Wood, Karla Kelly, Rachel Liao, John McCarthy</p>
<b>Regrets</b>	<b>Voting members:</b> Colette Inaba, Chris Jons, Kristine Calhoun, Zach Galleher, Cat Pittack

### Agenda

ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION	
1	Approve December Minutes	Laura Goodell	5 min	Attachment A	Decision
2	Humanities and Art Pathway Permanent/Regional Status	Andrea Kalus	20 Min	Attachment B	Decision
3	Triple I Improvement Report	Heather McPhillips	15 min	Attachment C	Discussion
4	Curriculum Committee Annual Report Card Discussion	Heather McPhillips	30 Min	Attachment D	Discussion
5	Integrations Week Update	Heather McPhillips	5 Min	N/A	Announcement

1. Approve Meeting Minutes			
<b>Discussion:</b> The meeting minutes were reviewed.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?		[6] VOTES FOR	[1] VOTES AGAINST
<b>Decision:</b> Curriculum committee approved the December meeting minutes.			

2. Humanities and Art Pathway Permanent/Regional Status	
<b>Discussion:</b> The summary details a discussion focused on the Humanities and Art Pathway, a program integrating the humanities into medical education. Initially, the conversation is casual, with participants sharing personal anecdotes, including comments about weather conditions.	



As the conversation progresses, the primary topic becomes the Humanities and Art Pathway. A key speaker, responsible for leading the program, outlines its structure and objectives. This program is designed to incorporate elements of the humanities into medical training, aiming to enhance students' observational and communicative skills, and to foster collaborative abilities. It includes specialized modules, various student projects, and clinical electives that are grounded in humanities. The speaker emphasizes the program's role in enriching the medical education experience and its potential in aiding the prevention of burnout among medical students.

The meeting also delves into discussions about expanding the program to a regional level. Concerns and queries are raised regarding the resources required for such expansion, especially in a remote or hybrid learning format. The speaker addresses these points, detailing the program's current standing, its capacity for accommodating more students, and logistical considerations for remote participation.

The impact of integrating humanities into medical practice and patient care is touched upon, though detailed outcomes specific to these areas are not extensively examined in the discussion.

Towards the conclusion of the meeting, a motion is put forward to grant the Humanities and Art Pathway a permanent status with an allowance for regional participation. This motion receives support and is subsequently approved.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[9] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
--	---------------	-------------------

**Decision:** The Committee Approve Regional/Permanent status of the Humanities and Art Pathway

### 3. Tripple I Improvement Report

**Discussion:** The discussion involved a detailed discussion about the III Improvement Workgroup's report and recommendations. A key point of the conversation was the recommendation to explore the possibility of waivers for students with substantial previous research experience from the III requirement. This idea, however, faced challenges due to university policies around graduation requirements and the associated financial implications, such as tuition fees that students would still incur even if they received a waiver.

There was a broad consensus on the need to improve the III experience, especially for students without a research background. Suggestions included more preparatory work in the spring before the summer quarter, assisting students with IRB processes, and providing basic knowledge on designing research projects. The committee also recognized the need for better support in helping students find research mentors, which is being addressed through database improvements and specific outreach efforts.

Another significant recommendation discussed was finding ways to provide stipends for students. This point was particularly pertinent in light of concerns raised about the cost of the III and the financial burden on students who have to pay for research instead of being compensated.

The conversation also revisited the history of the III requirement, noting how it had shifted from being optional to mandatory, with temporary changes during the COVID-19 pandemic due to the closure of labs and the shift to remote research opportunities.



Members of the committee discussed various aspects of implementing these recommendations, including potential administrative challenges and the feasibility of different approaches. One idea was to define criteria for significant research experience that would merit a waiver, followed by pursuing the necessary administrative changes to implement such a system.

The discussion also touched on the diversity of experiences that the III requirement offers, such as the opportunity for students with advanced degrees to gain new experiences in different research fields or through rural and underserved clinical environments.

In concluding the conversation, there was an agreement to at least explore the possibility of granting waivers for students with a robust background in science and scholarship. Additionally, there was a consensus on the need to enhance the transparency of the database for students doing summer research at different campuses, clearly outlining the requirements and resources needed for these projects.

The discussion ended with a resolution to continue exploring these recommendations and their feasibility, acknowledging that any significant changes would require time and may not be implemented in the immediate future.

<input type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	<input type="checkbox"/> VOTES FOR	<input type="checkbox"/> VOTES AGAINST
---	------------------------------------	--

**Decision:** Curriculum Committee decided to continue exploring these recommendations and their feasibility, acknowledging that any significant changes would require time and may not be implemented in the immediate future.

#### 4. Curriculum Committee Annual Report Card Discussion

**Discussion:** The discussion on the annual report card centers around how to effectively measure and evaluate the performance of the committee curriculum. The idea is to create a high-level report card, which would be presented annually in September. This report would compile data from various sources to provide a comprehensive overview of the curriculum's performance in the previous year. The intention is to use this report to identify two to three priority areas for the committee to focus on each year.

Key components of the proposed report card include:

- National benchmarks like the AAMC GQ survey, ACGME reports, USMLE Step 1 and Step 2 pass rates, and the match report.
- Internal data sources such as the IROC report, block grades, student evaluations, and faculty retention.
- Potential new data points like unimpeded progress rates, burnout rates, and clerkship grades by demographic variables.

The goal is to use existing data in a more actionable way, repackaging it for ease of understanding and decision-making. This approach aims to identify trends over time rather than focusing on data from a single year. The report card is envisioned not as a traditional grading system but more as an indicator (red, yellow, green) to highlight areas needing attention.



There is a consensus on the importance of considering how to present this data effectively and engagingly. The committee acknowledges the need for this information to be digestible and understandable to a broad range of stakeholders, not just those deeply involved in the curriculum.

A concern raised during the discussion is the use of residency outcomes in the report card, such as SOAP and residency match rates. It's noted that these metrics should be used thoughtfully, considering the nuances and complexities involved.

The committee also discusses the timing of the report card. It is suggested that a fall timeline would be most suitable, as most phase reports for the year should be completed by then. However, there's a need to balance the committee's focus on the report card with other ongoing activities, such as the LCME accreditation work and student surveys.

In conclusion, the committee agrees to move forward with the idea, recognizing that it will be a continuous process of improvement and refinement. Any further thoughts or suggestions are welcomed via email. The discussion then briefly touches on integration weeks and potential changes to the schedule, with plans to revisit this topic in a future meeting.

<input type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	<input type="checkbox"/> VOTES FOR	<input type="checkbox"/> VOTES AGAINST
---	------------------------------------	--

**Decision:** The Curriculum Committee agrees to move forward with the idea, recognizing that it will be a continuous process of improvement and refinement.

#### 5. Integrations Week Update

**Discussion:** During the discussion about integration weeks, the focus was on potential changes to the schedule for Integrations Week 3. This specifically related to the content covering head, neck, and gut areas. The conversation had been substantial at the foundations committee meeting, but there was no opportunity for a detailed discussion or formal motion on this topic. Consequently, it was suggested that this subject should be revisited at the upcoming January foundations meeting for further exploration and possible decision-making.

<input type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	<input type="checkbox"/> VOTES FOR	<input type="checkbox"/> VOTES AGAINST
---	------------------------------------	--

**Decision:** Curriculum committee decided to revisit the conversation after the Foundations Phase Committee Meeting.