

# Comments on MedEdPORTAL Taxonomy

I've reviewed the MedEdPortal taxonomy to see how well it gels with the current draft of healthcare lom and if there are implications for the standard. The table below describes some observations regarding how the MedEdPORTAL taxonomy would map to the current draft of healthcare lom and some proposed followups for the working group. You can also look at the [excel spreadsheet with embedded comments](#).

MEP Taxonomy	Comments	Follow up
<b>Format type</b>	Level 1 seems to overlap with learning resource type. The evaluation tools overlap with the assessment methods we've defined for Curriculum Inventory - activityFormat is likely the right place for that.	Map Level 1 to learning resource type. Map level 2 to assessment method.
<b>Instructional method level 2</b>	This is more the topic rather than the method.	None
<b>Specialties</b>	<del>If this is being used to describe the content (as opposed to audience), keyword would be the place, and this could be represented as its own vocabulary if desired.</del>	None
<b>Competencies</b>	Our other working groups are using a "linked data" approach to tagging competencies - we could adopt that.	Present proposed format for competencies to working group
<b>Intended Audience</b>	Our values for audience category are general, patient, caregiver, professional. Should that change? Should we add student? Should we eliminate the recommended list for profession and point to HRSA, encouraging agreement on vocab in a best practices guide?	TBD