



CUMED 10/8/2018

Meeting was called to order at 3:04 pm

**Attended:** *B. Borg, K. Diebel, P. Fernandez-Funez, A. Greminger, Rachel Hansen, B. Holbrook, R. Michaels, K. Nordgren, E. Onello, A. Seip, A. Shaw, M. Statz, S. Stover*

**Absent:** *R. Harden, K. Nelson (TC), M. Owen, M. Patregnani, A. Skildum*

### Welcome:

- Dr. Shaw entertained a motion to approve the September 12, 2018 meeting minutes.
  - Dr. Statz seconded the motion: All in favor of approval, none opposed.
- Dr. Shaw introduced new MS I representative Rachel Hansen and MS I alternate Bethanie Borg.
- Dr. Shaw introduced Dr. Sandra Stover, Clinical Course Director for Skin & Musculoskeletal System Course

### Student Updates:

#### *MS II*

- Update on session with Dr. Nikceovich. SNaHP invited State Representative Jennifer Schultz to speak, Wednesday, October 10, 2018 on the basics of health care economics: Health Care Econ 101. Will wait to invite Dr. Nikceovich until after that session.
- Question why the two exams for CRRAB I were not available to review during final review session.
  - Dr. Nordgren stated she and Dr. Greminger decided for security and logistical reasons to limit it to questions, as there had been already been a formal review process for each exam.
  - Blake stated that in the past, review procedure involved a locked room (generally SMed 68) with 1-2 copies of the previous exams at each table for students to review.
  - Dr. Greminger said her understanding was the exam policy had changed over the past year to be more secure. The tradeoff is extra practice exam questions. Less access to exams, but more access to practice questions.
  - Dr. Greminger asked whether the class has found the practice questions helpful? Blake said, yes.

#### *MS I*

- For the most part it has been a pretty smooth transition into medical school.
  - Received a lot of positive feedback around how Dr. Skildum is using Turning Point questions during lecture and case-based studies at the end that really bring everything together. Opportunity to apply information.
  - Some confusion with how material is presented in Dr. Trachte's antibiotic sessions. Students are required to research antibiotics and their drug mechanisms, but are getting their information from varied sources which leads to confusion over what is the correct answer and mechanism.
  - Dr. Shaw asked Dr. Trachte to provide specific resources for students to use and indicate which have unknown mechanisms. Dr. Shaw also mentioned that there are two reliable sources listed in the syllabus.

## **Around the Room**

- Dr. Shaw expressed frustration with way last meeting ended, as some comments seemed personal rather than focused on committee's role in providing the best curriculum possible for students. She acknowledged the limited number of faculty means faculty often take on roles outside their content expertise, but everyone is here because they were chosen to be representatives of the curriculum, and we need to support each other and bring each other up rather than looking at someone's choices and saying this is a bad decisions because you are not the expert on that.
- Dr. Diebel thanked Dr. Shaw for leading the way with transparency by opening CUMED up to the entire school, allowing everyone the opportunity to have a voice.
- Discussion about Aquifer, a full curriculum outline with all of the learning objectives, disciplines, etc. for medical school. UMN Medical School Twin Cities campus will be spending their next meeting looking at it to consider if it's something they might be interested in. <https://www.aquifer.org/>

## **Roles of CUMED and Course Directors**

- Course Directors are in charge of everything inside their course - learning objectives, content, teaching faculty, and developing fair assessments. Committee reviewed 2017-2018 Course Director Guidelines information found on Blackbag: [Duluth Resources for Course Directors, Faculty & Staff](#)
- CUMED responsibility is looking at the integration, timing, and overlap of the courses. Additionally, there is potential for tasks from time to time from Education Council.
  - There are standing rules that a course will be reviewed in CUMED at last every other year and a full curriculum review will take place every six years. Dr. Shaw noted that a full curriculum review was due in 2018 but has been delayed until after LCME.
  - Links to [Course Committees](#) information.

## **HRM 2018 Course Report**

- Overall, course went really well. No major changes, everyone passed, and no students had to remediate.
- Improves pharmacology and physiology, which is presented by the same instructor. Previously these had been covered during same session, but this year separated into separate sessions which helped give each topic a fair amount of time.
- Pathology was greatly improved, thanks to Dr. McGary. Dr. McGary gave a one-hour lecture and then assigned one-hour of pathoma for each of the endocrine glands. At the end of the endocrine section, Dr. McGary did clinical cases, which was very well-received. Might be a good way to go from here on out: Lecture-based content with pathologist + Pathoma time + cases to pull it all together.
- Towards end of course, before Final Exam, did a course review with board-style questions using Turning Point (TP), which was well-received. Pulled questions from Board Review book and had faculty available too for students to ask questions. Will continue doing something similar this year, too.
  - Blake said it would be worth doing something similar for each course.
- Dr. Onello asked for clarification on number of hours taught in each discipline - table formatting was unclear.
- Dr. Diebel asked for clarification on number of exams for course, which lists 10. Dr. Shaw said this is a typo and will update to reflect the 3 exams.
- Future directions: continue to provide non-graded practice questions as often as possible and TP-style questions in weekly course review each Friday (1 question per hour of content from faculty sessions). Teaching faculty invited to attend weekly review. First half is TP questions and second half hour is Q&A.

- Rachel stated Dr. Skildum has also incorporated TP questions into lecture, which has been helpful. 20 minutes of information --> TP questions --> if students get them correct, then move on with content. If not, go back and clarify.
- Dr. Diebel added that now in TP, you can ask people to submit their name and do graded quizzes.
- Dr. Onello asked whether possible to re-run the TP session since most clinical faculty were at a meeting that day.
  - Mediasite recording and supplemental documents were sent out by Jason Schneeweiss September 13, 2018 and will be in the October 2018 Faculty Development Opportunities - Office of Curriculum, Assessment, and Evaluation email that goes out tomorrow, October 9, 2018. Please review, and if you feel you would still prefer a live session, please contact Dr. Diebel.

### **Update on SBM & Neuro Sessions**

- Original intent was to align and integrate content of Neuro and Social & Behavioral Medicine (SBM) I courses, where there was a strong overlap. Administratively, complete integration of the courses is not possible at this time.
- New acting director of SBM I, Dr. Paula Termuhlen, is supportive of changes discussed previously and has agreed it will still be possible to align content without the full integration of courses. Since this is only modifying content within a course, it falls within the purview of the course directors.
- Specifically, all the pharmacology taught by Dr. Matt Slattery in Neuro during AY 2017-2018 will move to SBM I to align with the behavioral content: depression, anxiety, drug and alcohol abuse. Additionally, physiology neuroscience content from SBM I will move to Neuro to align with content there: eating disorders, insomnia, developmental disorders - autism, intellectual disabilities, etc.
- Allows alignment of content without merging courses at this time. That conversation is still ongoing and will involve more people once the course director is set for SBM I for AY 2019-2020. Main objective for this intermediate step is to demonstrate that basic scientists and behavioral researchers can work together and will build trust moving forward.
- Dr. Shaw read comment by Dr. Jean Regal from CUMED Google Form: "I strongly support the integration of topics in SBM and Neuro courses. It is the best thing for the students to learn the material across the disciplines. It may be harder for the faculty to deliver the material, because it requires working with colleagues and reviewing other material, but I strongly feel it is best for the learner."
- Dr. Onello said the alignment sounded good but asked for further clarification on the integration, specifically whether Neuro would still be an 8-week course and SBM I a 2-week course.
  - Dr. Fernandez-Funez stated the course length would remain the same, just swapping material.
- Blake said from student standpoint, the biggest issue had been disconnect between neurocognitive disorders and treatments/pharmacology, which had been separated by a month or more. Happy, that at least temporarily, the problem has been solved.
- Dr. Greminger asked if all neuropharmacology will go into SBM I? Dr. Fernandez-Funez clarified only the ones linked to psychiatric disorders, about 5 sessions in total.

### **Discuss CUMED Goals for AY 2018-2019**

- Dr. Shaw listed some suggestions at bottom of agenda, but these are not comprehensive. Question posed to group, what big things would you like to try to accomplish this year?
- Dr. Fernandez-Funez asked whether we have policies for first two items on list: Security of exam & post-exam review and Non-graded assessment questions for students

- There is a policy for secure exam review that was voted on and approved last year ([link to policy](#)) for the incoming first year class, but there is not a policy on non-graded assessments. The latter was a suggestion in CUMED but not voted on.
- For MS2 this year, it is up to Course Directors whether to follow new policy, as current MS2s were “grandfathered” in. To alleviate confusion among second year students regarding exam review policy, Dr. Shaw recommended Course Directors make it clear on their syllabus.
- Dr. Nordgren asked whether students can come to Course Director and do 1:1 of individual exam?
  - Yes. Also, if working with Phyllis Lindberg, there is an exclusion that she can review exam with student (areas of weakness, Strengths & Opportunities) in a closed room, closed door.
- For non-graded assessment there is not an approved policy.
  - Dr. Greminger asked what is the best way to incorporate non-graded assessments: attached to sessions on Blackbag, or via email? Blake suggested posting as link on Blackbag calendar session and notifying students.
  - Dr. Shaw said that for ILTs she puts together a single word document with all resources and instructions for “required” and “optional” etc.
  - Dr. Onello asked whether non-graded assessment questions could be used as formative feedback? Dr. Diebel said, yes, if there’s an answer key that provides rationale. For Turning Point, this rationale can be included under notes, for Google quizzes, include under feedback.
- Dr. Onello suggested that if formative assessment is one of the CUMED goals for this year, we should look at ways to provide formative assessment outside of multiple choice questions. Dr. Diebel added that there are not technology limitations either - ExamSoft allows for long-answer essay questions. Suggestion to put together a list of all the ways formative assessment is being provided currently (take-home PBL, EKG labs, etc.)
  - Dr. Diebel requested that access is shared with Amy Seip so she can keep track of formative assessment resources for students, for LCME purposes.
- Suggestion for discussion about standardizing PBL assessment. Dr. Nordgren asked if CUMED would be interested in collectively developing a rubric to be used in all team-based/small-group sessions. Currently using rubric to assess and provide formative feedback on “soft skills” and reinforce those concepts in CRRAB PBL. Dr. Michaels also suggested looking at TBL for peer-feedback ideas.
  - Blake suggested a mid-semester 1:1 with faculty. Dr. Michaels suggested having student fill out assessment, and then faculty filling out assessment and then coming together to compare and discuss. Dr. Nordgren said that would be very valuable, but do have limited faculty time
  - Discussion about how students that faculty find point breakdown for CRRAB PBL rubric.
- Dr. Greminger suggested CUMED goal of addressing how to optimize use of faculty and student time.
  - Dr. Onello suggested looking at present culture of how much lecture, ILT, etc. is best. What’s most efficient?
- Dr. Nordgren interested in seeing where Duluth aligns and doesn’t align with Twin Cities curriculum.
  - [Public calendar](#) is available, but would have to get access from IT or session instructors to see TC Blackbag content.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm . Next CUMED meeting: **November 12, 2018 @ 3:00pm (298 Med)**  
*Minutes transcribed by Amy Seip and reviewed by Dr. Shaw, (Chair) & Dr. Diebel (ex-Officio)*