Virtual Meeting was called to order at 3:02 pm


Absent: M. al’Absi, R. Harden, K. Nelson (TC), M. Statz

Welcome:
- K. Nordgren entertained a motion to approve the edited May minutes.
  - S. Stover seconded the motion. All in favor of approval, none opposed, none abstained.

Student Updates:
MS1 (J. Lasswell)
- There are a lot of good conversations taking place. Excited to see how current events can be incorporated into the curriculum more.

Curriculum Office Updates (K. Diebel)

Curriculum response to the murder of George Floyd
- Some curriculum content adjustments were made in response to the murder of George Floyd and the events surrounding his death to both Art of Science in the End of Life and Rural Medical Scholars Program (RMSP) I courses.
- Really proud of faculty for their flexibility in making these changes to curriculum, and also of the students for their initiative in creating a draft curriculum

Step 1 Update
- We have received one score, that student has passed.
- University of Minnesota may be able to run some Step 1 examinations. TC is looking at running up to 40 tests at a time, and Duluth could potentially run up to 8 exams at a time in room 68. There are still a number of variables on whether or how soon this will happen.

LCME Site Visit update
- Virtual site visit has been shortened to 2 days: July 15 & 16 rather than July 15, 16, 17.
- Providing additional details to LCME on narrative assessment, learning objectives, and prove students are engaging
- One page information on Education Council

Plans for Fall Instruction
- President Gabel sent out a message last week outlining what she will be bringing for vote to the Board of Regents tomorrow, June 9, 2020
- Cannot accommodate large group instruction but hoping to come together for small group instruction (physical exam skills, etc)
  - The size of these groups will be determined/capped based on the square footage of the rooms to allow for proper social distancing. The campus will be providing maximum capacity for each space on campus.
  - We will have to apply for an exemption in the social distancing policy for the teaching events that would require closer contact than social distancing standards. We are anticipating that exemption will be approved.
- Question: Do we need smaller learning communities to meet this requirement? No. Actually need to divorce assessment from learning community advisor, in order to be in compliance with LCME requirements.

Learning Management Transition 1-Year Report (link to document)
- E. Onello requested a brief report on the transition to Canvas, now that we’re nearly finished with the academic year.
- Reviewed the document as a group and discussed positives, challenges, and needs.
- Students loved the digital format of PBL.
Potential to shift to examination in Canvas, due to its enhanced security features and the formation of a shared assessment item bank with the Twin Cities.
  ○ Would this require students to be connected to the internet for the entire exam?
    ■ K. Diebel will follow up on this. With small group in-person teaching this fall, we may be able to accommodate students by placing them on campus
  ○ Faculty expressed difficulty determining what and who needed to be graded in Canvas by which instructor. Is there a way for faculty to receive more clarity on this?
We will put together a google form for people to provide feedback on the transition to, and use of, Canvas.
Some concern expressed over the time commitment of transitioning to a different assessment platform and learning a new technology.
  ○ Would we be able to evaluate questions using the same psychometrics? Historical psychometrics will be exported out for either the upgraded ExamSoft platform or a database that could be used with any assessment platform.
Discussion about how to send official communication about courses, so loops are closed and communications aren’t lost. Should communication be sent via email or Canvas?

Course and Clerkship Feedback (K. Diebel)
● A policy on course and clerkship feedback will be going up for vote at Ed Council (this month??).
● LCME requirement that we give timely feedback to students as they progress through a course. Specifically, if a course is 4 weeks or longer, there will be a requirement to provide midpoint feedback to allow sufficient time for remediation. For courses fewer than 4 weeks, it is recommended but not required.
  ○ Current policy
  ○ Proposed Policy
  ○ Summary of Significant Changes
Suggestion for Course Directors to be able to work with the Curriculum Office on a course-by-course basis.
Discussion about potential implementation of a course pre-brief in addition to the course debriefs, to let course directors know exactly what “boxes need to be checked.” K. Diebel and A. Seip will determine if it is a good option.
What is the expectation for this midpoint feedback? What would that procedure look like, and would it be standardized across courses?
  ○ The more meaningful feedback you can provide students, the better. What is in the policy, is the minimum expectation.
Question: Would the feedback provided during RMSP while grading reflections, after they return from the RMSP sites, satisfy the policy? Yes.

Neurological Medicine (Neuro) Annual Course Report (ACR) (P. Fernandez-Funez)
● Reviewed the Neuro ACR
● Over on hours. May help if we integrate SBM content and decompress the course over more time.
● Changes in exam resulted in lower averages, led to a lot of frustration for students which may have led to the lower satisfaction of students in category ‘Graded assessments appropriately tested the course objectives’.
● Challenging to figure out how to incorporate cumulative assessment without making exams too long.
● Course average for exams was lower than average, but everyone passed the course, which is the first time that has happened since P. Fernandez-Funez has been here. Exams were more difficult but students received points from other course components and activities.
● Course is very intense for both students and faculty. Faculty developed a lot of additional practice questions which students were appreciative of.
● Students would like fewer PBLs, but P. Fernandez-Funez felt that having them in Neuro made them very confident in their ability to succeed at them in IHO and future courses.
● Would like to increase the value of PBL and iPBL to reflect the significant time invested by students in researching, learning and creating the mechanisms.
Gastrointestinal Medicine (GI) Annual Course Report (ACR) (A. Skildum, R. Christensen)

- Reviewed the GI ACR
- Students, overall, expressed satisfaction with the course.
- Clinical relevance was appreciated, there are a lot of pathology and GI physicians that bring in their perspectives.
- Schedule is fairly decompressed, which allows for more board-study. Students expressed appreciation of no PBL.
- Students expressed a desire for more practice questions and just something we need to encourage faculty to provide. Additionally, better question-tagging.
- First time switching to Friday exams, to allow weekends for board study. This added some stress for students.
  - Some of this dissatisfaction may come from the overlap with CCM on Thursdays.
  - R. Harden is trying to reschedule CCM for 2020-2021 to not conflict with course exams.
  - Suggestion to allow open exam times from Friday-Sunday to help accommodate the CCM overlap.
    - Family Medicine Board exams have adopted this strategy.
- Reduce number of slides and replace Simulation essay with quiz. Some students did not take this component seriously.
- Discussion over the decrease in the number of case-based sessions in this course. How has this impacted the course?
  - Cases weren’t really clinically-based but more reading of primary literature.
  - R. Christensen responded that from the clinical standpoint it is still fine.

Virtual Teaching (K. Diebel, A. Shaw, S. Stover)

- Concern on how to move forward with female and male sensitive examinations while allowing for appropriate safety measures for students, faculty, and models. Should this be moved to Spring semester?
- Concern expressed about scheduling issues, with recommendation to be off campus by November break.
- There will be an exemption process for any activity that would require close contact, and require proper PPE.
- Anatomy lab scheduling: may need to increase lab sessions from 2 hours to 3 hours, if unable to accommodate more than 10 students at a time.
- Large group sessions will need to be done as asynchronous content.
  - This may allow students to start anatomy lab sessions sooner, prior to the start of Skin/MS.
- RMSP - the question is not only whether our students can go, but whether the health systems will be willing to take them.
- Family Medicine Preceptorship Course/Anatomy lab scheduling collaboration - perhaps this model could work for scheduling female and male sensitive exams as well.
  - Twin Cities teaches all of their sensitive exam content at the end of first year.
- Need to think creatively on how to transition some of this content to a virtual space.
- Undergrad campus is discussing an earlier start date (August 31) so using other spaces on campus may not be an option.
- Can we explore partnerships with local health systems and clinics for space after hours? Is Kitchi Gammi Club still an option?

Future Meetings (A. Shaw)

- Following the typical CUMED schedule, the next meeting would be July 13, 2020, which would be the week of the LCME site visit.
- As soon as K. Diebel has more details, we will begin reaching out to Course Directors. This work can start prior to our next meeting.
- Students have been discussing having monthly meetings and discussions around topics they are interested in: articles/chapters/videos on anti-racism, LGBTQ health, etc.
  - Suggestion to share course proposal process and form with students. K. Diebel and A. Seip can serve as resources in this.

Meeting adjourned at 4:51pm. Next CUMED meeting: **July 13, 2020**

Minutes transcribed by A. Seip and reviewed by A. Shaw (Chair) & K. Diebel (ex-Officio)