

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Date	February 03, 2024
Time	4:00 – 5:30PM PT
Attendees	Academic Co-Chair: Laura Goodell; Executive Chair: Heather McPhillips
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QUORUM REACHED:	Voting Members: Guests: Bruce Silverstein, Cynthia Sprenger, Darryl Potyk, Edith Wang, Electra Enslow, Erica Brice, Erik Malmberg, Jerome Graber, Jordan Kinder, Julien Goulet, Jung Lee, Justin Magee, Karla Kelly, Kelly Rush, Kathy Young, Kellie Engle, Kim Kardonsky, Laura Ortiz, LeeAnna Muzquiz, Mary Sargent, Meghan Filer, Micheal Campion, Sara Kim, Todd Guth

Voting Members			
Laura Goodell (ACC)	x	Alexandra Collis	
Matt Cunningham	x	Rachell Ellenbogen	
Rebekah Burns	x	Jelena Svircev	x
Kristine Calhoun		Collette Inaba	x
Esther Chung	x	Chris Jons	x
Sarah Gerrish	x	John Willford	x
Zach Gallaher	x	Cindy Knall	
Cat Pittack	x	Leanne Rousseau	x
Seth Pincus		Nick Cheung	x
Meghan Keifer	x	April French	x
Shelby Snyder		Raymond Hsu	
Zakyrie Mohamed	x	Abigail Petty	x
Prabhat Aluri	x	Byron Kim	x

Agenda

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION
1	Approve January Meeting Minutes	Laura Goodell	5 Min	Attachment A	Decision
2	Report Card: ICDD workgroup: Student Services	Erica Brice/Janelle Clauser	25 min	Available at meeting	Discussion
3	Introduction to the E-20-G-24 Comprehensive Cohort Competency Report	Kellie Engle	5 Min	N/A	Announcement
4	E-20-G-24 Comprehensive Cohort Competency Report	Matt Cunningham	25 Min	Attachment B	Discussion
5	Introduction to the E-22 USMLE Step 1 Report	Kellie Engle/Laura Goodell	5 Min	N/A	Announcement
6	E-22 USMLE Step 1 Report	Matt Cunningham	25 Min	Attachment C	Discussion

1. Approve Meeting Minutes (Dr. Laura Goodell)

Discussion: The meeting minutes will be reviewed and approved through e-vote

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[16] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
--	----------------	-------------------

Decision: The Curriculum Committee approved the January Meeting Minutes.

2. Report Card: ICDD Workgroup; Student Services (Dr. Erica Brice)

Summary:

The Committee Discussed key points regarding remediation policies and processes, as presented by Dr. Erica Brice. The discussion focused on improving clarity for students and faculty, ensuring proper tracking of remediation progress, and aligning support systems across all curriculum areas. Key concerns included the timing of remediation, communication of expectations, and faculty guidance on organizing remediation exams.

Questions and Concerns:

- **Remediation Expectations:**
 - How can students be better informed that remediation must take place outside of class time?

- What communication strategies can be used to clarify that multiple remediations may result in a restart?
- How does the short remediation turnaround in Term 3 impact students' Step One completion timeline?
- **Policy Clarity:**
 - Should the term "mastery" be removed from all policy language to improve clarity?
 - How can faculty and students gain a clearer understanding of remediation expectations?
- **Tracking System:**
 - How can real-time tracking of remediation status be implemented to support learning specialists in managing student appointments?
 - Who should be responsible for tracking remediation completion?
- **Canvas Integration:**
 - Should all curriculum threads have dedicated Canvas pages for remediation resources?
 - How can these pages be standardized to ensure consistency?
- **Faculty Support:**
 - What steps should be outlined for students to clearly understand the remediation process?
 - What guidance should be provided to faculty on when and how to organize remediation exams?

Resolutions and Actions:

- **Communication Improvements:**
 - Emphasize to students that remediation must occur outside of class time.
 - Clarify that multiple remediations may result in a restart.
 - Outline the impact of Term 3 remediation on Step One completion.
- **Policy Updates:**
 - Remove the word "mastery" from all remediation-related policy language.
- **Tracking System:**
 - Develop a real-time remediation tracking system.
 - Ensure learning specialists have immediate access to tracking data to manage student appointments effectively.
 - Track which students need remediation and who has completed it.
- **Canvas Integration:**
 - Require all curriculum threads to establish Canvas pages for remediation materials.
- **Process Clarity:**
 - Provide students with a clear list of steps for remediation.
 - Develop a structured guide for faculty on when and how to organize remediation exams.

Conclusion:

The Committee agreed on the need for clearer communication and more structured support systems for both students and faculty. Moving forward, priority will be given to improving policy language, implementing real-time tracking, and standardizing Canvas resources. Additionally, faculty will receive explicit guidelines to ensure consistency in organizing remediation exams.

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

3. E20-E24 Comprehensive Cohort Competency Report (Dr. Matt Cunningham)

Summary:

The Committee Discussed the **Comprehensive Cohort Competency Report**, which evaluates student achievement of medical education program objectives (MEPOs) based on assessment data. The report is a key requirement for LCME accreditation and provides insight into how students meet competency standards throughout their medical education. The discussion included an overview of assessment mapping, gaps in evaluation, and areas for improvement in tracking student progress, particularly for students who expand their curriculum timeline.

Questions and Concerns:

- **Purpose and Scope:**
 - What does the report evaluate, and how does it align with LCME accreditation requirements?
 - How well does it capture student achievement of medical education program objectives?
- **Assessment Data and Mapping:**
 - What assessments are mapped to each MEPO, and how comprehensive is this mapping?
 - How can assessments be better distributed across all competency domains, especially beyond knowledge-based assessments?
 - How do different assessment methods (block exams, OSCEs, clerkship evaluations, etc.) contribute to competency evaluation?
- **Gaps and Areas for Improvement:**
 - What MEPOs currently lack clear assessment data, and how can this be addressed?
 - Are some MEPOs only assessed in a single format, and does this impact reliability?
 - How well are foundational and clinical phase assessments aligned?
- **Student Cohort Representation:**
 - Does the exclusion of expanded students (those who take more than four years) impact the accuracy of competency assessment?
 - What percentage of students expand their curriculum, and should their performance be evaluated separately?
- **Workplace-Based Assessments (WBAs) and EPAs:**
 - How will the transition to Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs) impact competency assessment?
 - Will WBAs cover the same breadth of MEPOs as existing clerkship assessments, or will gaps emerge?
- **Faculty and Curriculum Oversight:**
 - How should faculty ensure that course objectives map effectively to MEPOs?
 - Should new courses be required to document how their objectives align with MEPOs?
 - How much alignment between clerkship assessments and MEPOs is necessary for compliance?

Resolutions and Actions:

- **Assessment System Enhancements:**

- Review and improve mapping of assessments to MEPOs, particularly for under-assessed competencies.
- Expand tracking of clinical assessments to ensure broader coverage beyond foundational knowledge.
- Ensure workplace-based assessments (WBAs) and clerkship evaluations maintain breadth in competency coverage.
- **Addressing Gaps:**
 - Conduct a second pass on assessment mapping to ensure all MEPOs are adequately assessed.
 - Identify and implement additional assessment tools for MEPOs that currently lack summative evaluations.
 - Consider incorporating the Triple I poster assessment as evidence for research-related MEPOs.
- **Student Progress and Data Inclusion:**
 - Explore methods for incorporating students who expand their curriculum into competency evaluations.
 - Assess whether expanded students demonstrate different competency patterns compared to those who progress in four years.
- **Curriculum Oversight:**
 - Require that all new courses and clerkships document how their objectives align with MEPOs.
 - Clarify faculty expectations for mapping and assessing MEPOs across different learning environments.
 - Ensure that competency assessment remains robust as new evaluation methods, such as EPAs, are implemented.
- **Future Improvements:**
 - Enhance granularity in OSCE mapping to MEPOs to provide more precise competency evaluation.
 - Establish a clear process for continuous review and refinement of competency assessments.

Conclusion:

The Committee recognized the **Comprehensive Cohort Competency Report** as a vital tool for ensuring students meet accreditation standards but identified several areas for improvement. Key next steps include refining assessment mapping, addressing competency gaps, and ensuring that evolving assessment methods (such as EPAs) maintain comprehensive coverage. The importance of tracking **expanded students** was also noted, with future efforts needed to ensure all students' competency development is accurately assessed.

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

4. E22 USMLE Step 1 Report (Dr. Matt Cunningham)

Summary:

The Committee Discussed the USMLE Step One report, focusing on student performance, completion rates, and the impact of policy changes. The report examined data from the E-22 cohort, including demographics, pass/fail rates, exam timing, and the effects of new support programs. Notably, this was the first cohort under the March 8th deadline for Step One

completion, intended to reduce late clerkship drops. Additionally, the transition from CBSSR to the Step One Advanced Study Course (SASC) was reviewed to assess its effectiveness in supporting students.

Questions and Concerns:

- **Step One Completion Timing:**
 - Has the March 8th deadline improved on-time completion rates?
 - Have late clerkship drops decreased as intended?
 - Are there any unintended consequences of this policy change?
- **Performance Trends:**
 - How do Step One outcomes for E-22 compare to previous years?
 - Are there significant disparities in pass rates based on student demographics, regional sites, or academic background?
 - What factors contribute to delays or failures on Step One?
- **Trust Program Impact:**
 - Why did a lower percentage of Trust students take the exam on time?
 - Are Trust students facing unique challenges that impact their Step One performance?
- **Support Program Effectiveness:**
 - How did the transition from CBSSR to SASC affect student outcomes?
 - Are students in SASC successful than those who did not participate?
 - Should additional support mechanisms be implemented for at-risk students?
- **Predictive Factors for Success or Delay:**
 - Do academic indicators (e.g., block averages, thread failures, integration exam scores) reliably predict Step One outcomes?
 - Can early interventions be designed to support students who are at risk of delaying or failing the exam?
- **Data Gaps and Further Analysis:**
 - Should future reports include historical comparisons to better understand trends?
 - How can the assessment of expanding students (those taking longer than four years) be incorporated into future analyses?

Resolutions and Actions:

- **Policy Evaluation:**
 - Continue monitoring the impact of the March 8th deadline on late clerkship drops and on-time Step One completion.
 - Assess potential unintended consequences of the policy, particularly for students in specialized programs like Trust.
- **Data Tracking & Reporting Improvements:**
 - Enhance historical comparisons in future reports to identify long-term trends.
 - Include analysis of students who take longer than four years to complete the curriculum.

- Examine Step One performance disparities in greater detail, particularly among different demographic and academic groups.
- **Support System Enhancements:**
 - Review the effectiveness of SASC in providing adequate preparation for Step One.
 - Explore additional targeted support for students with multiple block or thread failures.
 - Strengthen early intervention strategies based on predictive factors from academic performance data.
- **Trust Program Considerations:**
 - Investigate whether Trust students experience unique challenges that affect their Step One performance.
 - Determine if adjustments to the Trust curriculum or additional resources could better support these students.
- **Further Research & Workgroup Analysis:**
 - The Step One Workgroup will conduct a deeper review of these findings, ensuring that support mechanisms are optimized for student success.
 - Future analyses will refine predictive models and explore factors influencing student success in greater depth.

Conclusion:

The Committee acknowledged the importance of analyzing Step One data to guide policy and support improvements. While the new deadline appears to have influenced exam timing, further research is needed to understand its full impact. Disparities in performance, the effectiveness of the new SASC program, and the role of academic predictors in student success will be key areas for ongoing review. The Step One Workgroup will play a crucial role in refining support strategies and ensuring that all students receive the necessary resources to succeed.

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