

**SMHS Dean’s Quality Improvement Panel (DQIP) Meeting
June 22, 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, John Shabb, Anja Selland (MS4)

Absent: Namil Choi

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
Call meeting to order	Meeting was called to order by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, Committee Chair.	
Review of Minutes	Review of May 11, 2022 minutes. Minutes are also posted to Blackboard.	Minutes approved.
Post ISA2 Student Review	<p>Anja Selland (MS4) provided an update on the work of the ad hoc student committee. The student group has met five times. She acknowledged that meetings occur as student schedules allow; noting that students are very busy with their school commitments. They are creating breakout groups who will prepare summary reports. Much of their focus will be on communication, mentorship, spaces, and diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI), as well as career counseling. They are in the process of reviewing the ISA2 data, so possible that other focus areas will come to light. She noted that there are volunteers from all classes. Anja will connect with the students that are on the DEI (UMEC) committee.</p> <p>Discussed <i>the Book</i> (now called the Student Guide). Madison Burgaard and Emily Evers are working on this with a group of students. Dr. Porter reported that students completed the draft work on book and gave it to Emily for branding. Someone in his office proofed it for editing. Dr. Zelewski suggested that the appropriate faculty members review the book for accuracy before publication. Dr. Porter will send it to Dr. Zelewski and others as deemed appropriate. Dr. Tinguely inquired about the ownership of the project and asked if this is a Student Affairs document or a student document going forward. Anja commented that she will discuss this with Madisson and the working groups. Dr. Wynne suggested it be student led with school support. Dr. Zelewski suggested that the mid-year survey be distributed in January as was previously done (omitted during ISA year).</p>	Add to July agenda.

	<p>Anja will send out a communication to fellow students with updates. Discussed the use of Teams for student communication. Anja noted that her class doesn't use Teams. Dr. Zelewski noted that IT made the decision to use Teams as it was the easiest way to grant access to students.</p> <p>Dr. Van Eck commented that they are working on a grad student position with a role in data analysis. This would be beneficial for data review with the mid-year survey and possibly with future LCME surveys.</p>	
<p>Central Repository</p>	<p>Briefly discussed the addition of a central repository for reports. Sheila spoke with Brian Schill and Nathan Clough regarding the use of passwords for access. Nathan suggested that we use the UND username and passwords. It's noted that this option would allow all users across campus to access should they wish to do so. The other option is to set up designated user groups with access. This option would require maintenance. Dr. Basson suggested that we table the item again as he and Dr. Wynne and others will be meeting with representatives from the University of Tennessee to discuss their software and creation of a school dashboard. This may allow for secure customized access.</p>	<p>Add to July agenda.</p>
<p>Review of Survey Team Exit Report</p>	<p>Element 11.1 Academic Advising Suspect U</p> <p>Finding: The 2021 AAMC Graduation Questionnaire demonstrated a satisfaction rate with academic advising below the national average (UND 38%, national 74%). ISA data demonstrated overall respondent dissatisfaction of 20%, and M4 respondent dissatisfaction of 37%. Dissatisfaction was higher among M4 respondents at the Fargo campus (45%) and Bismarck campus (42%). In response, the school made enhancements to the academic advising system, including an academic success program. A follow-up survey one year later demonstrated improvement in overall student dissatisfaction (16%), with respondent dissatisfaction falling rates (16% for all four classes combined), but no data were provided regarding satisfaction at the regional campuses.</p> <p>In her review of ISA2 Data, Sheila noticed that the LCME has added definitions to the full survey 2023-24 DCI glossary for academic advising and academic counseling. There is no definition for career advising. In the previous DCI the LCME used the words advising and counseling almost interchangeably. We noted our students are conflating career advising and academic advising - in part due to the confusing definitions and interchangeable words. There may have also been a possibility of double jeopardy as both elements previously referenced electives. It's noted that the new definition of academic advising refers to "discussing career plans". While this</p>	

	<p>might be part of the discussion, this could cause further confusion. These changes also create some ambiguity about who can provide academic advising vs academic counseling given that the person cannot have a role in assessment or promotion decisions. It was concluded that Dr. Wynne will discuss this matter with the LCME.</p> <p>Element 11.2 Career Advising Suspect U Finding: AAMC GQ data demonstrate persistent low respondent satisfaction with career advising, including the 2021 data (UND 25%, national 67%); ISA data demonstrated dissatisfaction with career advising among M4 respondents (54%) and M3 respondents (30%). In response the school implemented a system where students are assigned to a career advisor early in Year 1 with mandatory meetings across the span of the curriculum. Follow up student survey performed mid-way through the 2021-22 academic year demonstrated improvement</p> <p>Element 12.6 Student Health and Disability Insurance Suspect SM Finding: ISA data demonstrated that 36% of respondents in the M4 class were dissatisfied with the availability of counseling on student health insurance. Respondent data from other classes revealed satisfaction with the availability of counseling, as did comments from students who met with the survey team.</p>	
<p>DQIP AY 2022-23 CQI Element Review Assignments and Procedures</p>	<p>Dr. Tinguely shared the proposed schedule for element review. Dr. Wynne recommended that we review in order of priority starting with unsatisfactory, followed by satisfactory with monitoring and then the others that were not cited in chronological order.</p> <p>As an aside, Dr. Wynne commented that the LCME has taken the process of tabling reviewing 1.1 until the end of their discussions if the school is issued many citations. The thought is that if there are a lot of citations, the CQI process isn't working. Additionally, he noted that the LCME listened about 2.4 and 8.5 as these were conflated. 2.4 only addresses sufficiency. LCME has now clarified this. Schools now will avoid double jeopardy.</p>	
<p>Announcements/Next Meeting</p>	<p>July 20, 2022.</p>	

Approved by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, Chief Accreditation Officer