

**SMHS Dean’s Quality Improvement Panel (DQIP) Meeting
May 11, 2022 1:00-3:00 PM (Zoom)**

Attending: Steve Tinguely, Sheila Bosh, Josh Wynne, Judy Solberg, Pat Carr, Marc Basson, Ken Ruit, Jim Porter, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski, Namil Choi, John Shabb, Anja Selland (MS4)

Absent: Laura Nichols

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
Call meeting to order	Meeting was called to order by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, Committee Chair.	
Review of Minutes	Reviewed April 13, 2022 minutes. Minutes are also posted to Blackboard.	Minutes approved.
Introduction of New Members	Dr. Grove has decided to step down as faculty representative. He has been replaced by Dr. John Shabb and Dr. Laura Nichols. Anja Selland (MS4) has joined as the student representative replacing Ryan Norris who recently graduated.	
Post ISA2 Student Review and Committee	Anja Selland (MS4) has agreed to lead the student ISA2 review efforts. She attended today’s meeting to provide an update on her committee’s work. They are in the early preliminary stages. They had their first meeting last week with ten students attending and representing all four classes. They will meet again tomorrow to start a deeper dive. Dr. Van Eck attended their first meeting to explain the documents that they are to review. Their plan is to break the questions into different categories with certain students assigned. She’s hoping that this committee can do a good job of communicating information to the other students by providing summaries as they go along. Dr. Van Eck asked if they plan to pull in the qualitative comments. Anja said it depends on the number of students and the time constraints. The Dean suggested that they convey information and provide constructive suggestions. It’s noted that some of the students on this ad hoc committee will also be on the student survey committee next year. Sheila Bosh commented on the work that OMA is doing to review monitoring elements (on DCI Table 1.1 f.) and looking at both the quantitative and qualitative data. She suggested that she and Dr. Van Eck and Anja work together to determine relevant comments rather than duplicating efforts. Dr. Van Eck agrees that this may help to eliminate extra time and effort.	Sheila will communicate with Dr. Van Eck and Anja to determine next steps.

<p>Review of Survey Team Exit Report</p>	<p>Dr. Tinguely shared a table that he constructed with his “guesses” of the findings. The committee reviewed his table along with the LCME Exit Report.</p> <p>Element 2.4 Sufficiency of Administrative Staff Suspect SM The Dean pointed out that this is a national discussion (LCME) as the element addresses <i>sufficiency</i> of administrative staff. Anja suggested that the vast majority of dissatisfaction is Step 1. Review of comments will be beneficial in this area.</p> <p>Element 2.6 Functional Integration of the Faculty Suspect this will be SM Most clinicians don’t want to participate due to distance and time commitments. Dr. Basson suggests that we determine which committees would benefit most from western campus involvement. He suggests using the campus deans to recruit members and also suggests setting a target. He doesn’t think incentives would work as that would require additional funding. Dr. Tinguely suggests bringing it to a campus deans meeting. Dr. Zelewski said that’s an option though she doesn’t think this will yield the outcome that we need.</p> <p>Element 3.2 Community of Scholars/Research Opportunities Suspect this will be SM. Dr. Wynne suggests we challenge this on factual grounds. Dr Basson agrees with Dr. Wynne. He would like us to start working on this response now. Noted we will need to quote the ISA2 satisfaction and emphasize that 1 and 2 were one year apart.</p> <p>Element 4.2 Scholarly Productivity Suspect this will be a U Dr. Basson commented that the LCME said they didn’t need it broken down by department when they asked for the documents during the visit. He also noted that every department had at least one publication in 2021. We have new data now that wasn’t available at the time of the visit. Dr. Ruit and Dr. Basson suggest that we provide them with the new data and divide it by department. The dean says he is fine trying to dispute on a factual basis providing they had the information. Further exploration needed per Dr. Wynne.</p> <p>Element 5.6 Clinical Instruction Facilities Suspect SM Dr. Zelewski noted although the student lounge was emergently closed, an alternate room was designated within a few weeks. She suspects the monitoring finding will</p>	
---	--	--

still be given even with this information. The Dean agrees that this will stay in place until the new facility in Minot is complete or student satisfaction improves significantly.

Element 5.11 Study/Lounge/Storage Space/Call Rooms

Suspect U

Dr. Zelewski confirmed date of completion for Minot Trinity Hospital is March 2023. Altru will be receiving new furniture within the next month. No current plan in place for Fargo per Dr. Basson.

Element 6.3 Self-Directed and Life-Long Learning

Suspect SM

Dr. Carr commented that we did improve this even more since the time of the ISA2. There is a question of whether the biggest issue is the unscheduled time for self-directed learning. Dr. Carr suggests that we discuss this with the students.

Element 7.1 Biomedical, Behavioral, Social Sciences

Suspect SM

Persistent and *recent* are the key words according to the Dean. The LCME will want a follow up survey in 1 year. Graphs with block reports were provided to the LCME during the visit. This showed substantial improvement over the past 2 years. The Dean suggests that this one is worth a try on factual basis.

Element 7.6 Cultural Competence and Health Care Disparities

Suspect SM

No factual basis to disagree with this. The Dean commented that he wants to make sure that we're doing whatever we can in this area. Noted once the DEI curriculum group gets going it will help (under UMEC), we also can leverage more AI sites such as GPIHS. Dr. Zelewski suggested that we distribute info to students about how cases have been changed – share doc that Dr. Eickman and Dr. Dunlevy created.

Element 8.3 Curricular Design, Review, Revision/Content Monitoring

Suspect SM

The dean commented that they will want more follow up data. No action we can take, just see what happens with 2.0. Dr. Basson asks what happens if students are still unhappy at the end of the year. The Dean commented that students group should be asked about how to best monitor this – Anja's group.

Element 8.5 Medical Student Feedback

Suspect U

The Dean asked if we're being cited for the exact same thing in two different elements. This was also cited in 2.4. He suggests that we challenge this and comment this is best cited in 8.5 rather than 2.4 if that's what we agree on.

Element 8.8 Monitoring Student Time

The Dean suspects this is SM rather than a U

This same question wasn't asked in the ISA2; therefore, no data is available. There is an overlap in this and 6.3 due to student interpretation. Need to do a follow up student survey showing satisfaction with overall workload. Dr. Zelewski later commented that we have this and have been tracking this year.

Element 9.7 Formative Assessment and Feedback

Suspect U

No ISA2 data for this question. i-spiral isn't getting us what we need per Dr. Basson. He commented that we need to do better. Dr. Zelewski commented that students all meet with their PCL coordinator. Dr. Ruit thinks this is a faculty development issue and Dr. Van Eck commented that this is also an enforcement issue. Dr. Zelewski asked if there's a template. Dr. Van Eck noted we don't currently utilize one. Dr. Carr noted there's 80 faculty so lots of variability. Dr. Basson suggests getting a group together to brainstorm. Dr. Basson requested that Dr. Carr arrange a meeting. Dr. Van Eck suggested that we find out what students think about mid-course feedback.

Element 9.8 Fair and Timely Summative Assessment

Suspect SM

Dr. Basson suggests we challenge this on a factual basis. Dr. Zelewski commented that they asked for the current academic year data which didn't indicate compliance. We have an entire calendar year of data, though it's not an entire academic year. The Dean agrees that we should challenge this one.

Element 9.9 Student Advancement and Appeal Process

Suspect U

Dr. Basson commented this is an easy fix; we just need to pull the policy and revise it to reflect our intent. For the first part, we need to have a hearing before we suspend students. The Dean says it's not worth arguing about this. Dr. Basson suggests we send this back to the policy committee. The Dean requested that Dr. Porter talk to Beth Hellwig at UND level to ask her advice first.

Discussed the data threshold for element review. Dr. Wynne suggests 20% for monitoring elements.

	<p>The following were not reviewed due to time constraints.</p> <p>Element 11.1 Academic Advising Suspect U</p> <p>Element 11.2 Career Advising Suspect U</p> <p>Element 12.6 Student Health and Disability Insurance Suspect SM</p>	<p>Add to June agenda.</p>
<p>Announcements/Next Meeting</p>	<p>June 22, 2022.</p>	

Submitted by Sheila Bosh, RN, Accreditation Manager
Approved by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, Chief Accreditation Officer