

NOTES FROM THE CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT AND POLICY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

April 13, 2006 at 7:00 a.m. in 133 MacNider

Members Present/Absent: Dr. McCartney, Chair; Drs. Byerley, Chaney, Cross, Dent, Hobgood Hoole, Ingersoll, Rao, Shaheen, Yankaskas, Lewis, Osmond, Patel Jeff Keyes Sutton

1. **Future topics:** Attendees were asked to submit unfinished end-of-year business to the CMPC as you finish the academic year.
2. **Second Look Saturday:** thanks were extended to those faculty who attended this event. The request was made that invitations to such events be extended to CMPC members more than two weeks ahead of time. It was recommended that the current schedule and structure of Second Look Saturday be reconsidered to ensure it reflects current curriculum governance structure
3. **New leadership appointments:** Dr. McCartney announced the appointments of Drs. Runge and Pisano to vice dean positions and expressed enthusiasm about future support the educational mission will enjoy under their leadership.
4. **Software purchase protocol:** Alfred Reid presented an MSTL decision-making protocol to regulate the purchase of new software by faculty. The protocol includes comprehensive review of utility and sustainability of such purchases and comparison with competitors as well as evaluation of initial deployment. Data from the protocol will be supplied to the end-of-course review process so it can be included in annual self-study. It was noted that the protocol should be amended to include a way to capture time investment required to learn and use new software. Also highlighted were possible conflict of interest issues that should be asked about and the importance of reviewing freeware and other sources (i.e., MedEd Portal) before making purchases.

New software purchase protocol unanimously accepted by the CMPC with amendments as discussed.

5. **Curriculum mapping update.** Chris Osmond shared a mapping instrument that he proposed be used to gather course data from all SOM instructors. Based on the AAMC's CurrMIT fields, it seeks to collect contact hours, objectives, assessment and instructional methods, hot topics, and keywords at the session level. Concern was expressed regarding the viability of requesting such fine-grained data from instructors. It was proposed that such requests be made of each course director instead. It was noted that only instructors possess the "ground-level" perspective to make this mapping project more robust than existing databases and generate content sufficient to meet the long-term objectives of the CurrMIT project (scope and sequence of the entire curriculum, elimination of gaps and redundancies, facilitation of preparation of LCME documentation). Dr. Hobgood and Mr. Osmond agreed to further consider the proposal and report back at the next CMPC about benefits and drawbacks of each approach, including historical context of how such projects have been accomplished at peer institutions.