

# 2011-06-29

## Meeting Information

<b>Date:</b>	June 29, 2011
<b>Time:</b>	8 PDT/11 EDT/16 BST

Please note: the conferencing service will ask you to enter the pound sign. Press # for pound. To mute, press \*6.

Attending: Tim Willett, co-chair; Susan Albright, Matt Cownie, Simon Grant, Valerie Smothers

## Agenda Items

### 1. Review [minutes of last meeting](#)

Valerie reviewed the minutes of the last call. The group reviewed the discussion at the annual meeting and spoke at length about the feedback on separating performance levels/milestones and competencies into two different standards.

Tim agreed that milestones will be a subsequent specification. He added that Rosalyn had arranged for authors of the pediatric milestones document to join the call in August. We can hear more about how they developed the milestones, and the types of data relations they see.

The minutes were accepted.

Valerie added that the MedBiquitous Executive Committee had approved the performance framework proposal. She agreed to distribute the proposal to the working group after the call. She explained that approval is necessary to begin any ansi standards development project.

### 2. Discuss open issues - see [CFs within CFs - Examples](#)

- Use 'includes' for all competency objects in a framework and remove the use of 'broader/narrower' than for relations of framework to top competency objects
- Allow "competency object broader than competency framework".
- Allow "framework includes framework".
- If using 'broader than', the broader thing must be a competency object
- See also <http://groups.medbiq.org/medbiq/display/CWG/Unresolved+issues+and+questions>

The group discusses outstanding issues regarding how the framework is organized. How do we indicate which competency objects are included in the framework? How do we incorporate competencies developed by another group into a framework?

The first proposed change would provide one section to list competency objects included in the framework. Some frameworks just have a list of competencies with no hierarchy, and this would accommodate those frameworks.

Susan spoke with Isarin about this. He has concerns about putting frameworks within frameworks. She asked why one would include one in another.

Tim described how University of Ottawa developed its framework. They developed a framework for UME. Canmeds has 7 professional roles. They adopted those as is and added an eighth role and additional competencies below that.

Susan commented that is extending a framework. Simon replied that is another way of saying the same thing.

Tim added that if someone developed a framework for IV insertion, another group developing a framework for nursing competencies may want to include the competencies on inserting an IV. If a framework already exists, you would want to leverage it.

Susan questioned whether a scenario where you have mix and match, some of one framework, some of another, would be valid. How could you stop that from happening?

Tim replied that if a framework includes a framework, it includes all of a framework. If you want to take bits, some competencies but not all, you would have to restate the relationships.

Susan voiced concern about the pedagogical integrity of a framework that uses a piecemeal approach. Valerie commented that was a risk in developing any object-oriented approach. She added that best practices could provide guidance and make the use cases clear. Matt agreed.

Susan asked if someone wanted to look at a complete framework, would that be expressed in one xml file or two. Tim replied that if a competency framework is included via reference, that would constitute two files.

Valerie asked if the added work is feasible. Susan replied that it is not that much added work, and that is seemed worthwhile.

The group cautioned against creating cyclical references where you have something that has a relationship (includes/broader than/narrower than) to itself. Valerie agreed to add something to the specification to indicate that cyclical references are not allowed.

Susan added that she would ask Isarin to look at these proposals in more detail. Tim replied that we would look forward to his feedback.

### 3. Tasks to proceed in standards development process

### 4. Open discussion

**Decisions**

**Action Items**