

**UND SMHS Educational Accreditation Standards Review Committee (EASRC) Meeting
Wednesday March 15, 2023 4:30 – 6:00 pm via Zoom**

Attending: Ken Ruit, Sheila Bosh, Pat Carr, Susan Zelewski, Rick Van Eck, Kurt Borg, Bryon Grove, Bryan Delage, Erika Johnson
Absent: Jim Porter

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
Call meeting to order	Meeting was called to order by Dr. Ken Ruit, Committee Chair.	
Review of Minutes	February 15, 2023 minutes were reviewed. Minutes posted to Blackboard.	Minutes approved.
Old Business: Element 6.6	Dr. Zelewski will follow up with Dr. Porter to ensure that we have added an update of student service learning/community service activities to the career advising template as stated in our action plan in the minutes from February 15 th .	
Element Review	<p>Element 8.4 Evaluation of Educational Program Outcomes, Reviewed by Dr. Grove. Different examples will need to be chosen. Tables are complete and accurate but will need to update data. Dr. Van Eck suggested jotting down examples annually or at a minimum, listing categories of examples; keeping track of the examples three years before next visit so we have time to collect data.</p> <p>Element 8.5 Medical Student Feedback, Reviewer Dr. Carr. Satisfactory with Monitoring. Tables will need to be updated. The procedures and processes used to inform students about actions taken based on their input to the last ISA must be updated as we improve that process. We require a summary of Phase 1 unit and clerkship “end of course” report results and response rate (100%). We do not have a mechanism in Phase 1 for medical students to provide evaluation data on individual faculty, residents, and others who teach and supervise them in required courses other than if students choose to mention a particular individual in a constructed-response section (8.5.b; same question as in 2022).- The principle discussed was that all faculty should be evaluated when they teach and these evals must go to the program in addition to the faculty member and their chair. Discussed change in process regarding evaluations. Also noted that in narrative 2., the response will need to be rewritten for Phase2/Phase 3. Some of the content is no longer accurate.</p>	

Reviewer stressed that incorporation of our yearly “ISA-like” survey results and how we communicate those results must be included in this element. Discussed the value of student satisfaction data and its use in CQI and how that aligns with the LCME expectations. Noted that student satisfaction, student perceptions of their own learning, and student outcomes are three very different things.

8.7 Comparability of Education/Assessment, reviewed by Dr. Delage. This was not a cited element. Tables accurate now though the departments should review this and respond if they have made any changes in their dissemination of information or the responses in Table 8.7-1. The reviewer inquired if the clerkships have been asked this year if there have been any changes. The follow up of the grading review from this last academic year (2021-2022) needs to be updated to be included in the response as we did say we would review annually. Can we ask each department for their grading data and breakdown so we can add it to the past data and analyze? Dr. Zelewski responded that this is included in the yearly clerkship reports now, so we no longer need to ask departments for this data separately. This is our method of monitoring this element.

Element 8.8 Monitoring Student Time, reviewed by Dr. Van Eck, this was a cited element (U) This element now includes a table from 6.3 regarding self-directed learning and element narrative item “b” from element 6.3 is now part of 8.8. Table 8.8-1 is new (from 6.3) and must be completed with current data. No new data are available for ISA at this time, but data from the Mid-Year Survey indicate some improvement. Some of the elements have minor changes in wording and will require some additional narrative to fully address. Will need to determine how to integrate the new table and element narrative from 6.3 into this element and how ISA data demonstrated respondent dissatisfaction with workload in the preclerkship phase of the curriculum, with 55% of M1 respondents reporting dissatisfaction. In response, the school lengthened the pre-clerkship phase of the curriculum from 18 to 20 months, increased the number of scheduled days off, and decreased time in the patient-centered learning (PCL) component of the curriculum. Survey data showed satisfaction with the number of days off and time spent in PCL preparation, but there are no follow-up data on satisfaction with overall workload. Narrative C. now asks for us to describe the policies AND how they are disseminated. New text is required for this. We’ll want to provide an updated weekly schedule, ideally to include some IL events, and this section may need to be edited to address the concerns raised by the LCME survey visit team for element 6.3.

9.1 Preparation of Resident and Non-faculty Instructors, reviewed by Dr. Zelewski. This was not a cited element. The table 9.1-1 has now included assessment methods as well. Will have the courses MedED and Advanced Anatomy include this information in the student’s orientation

	<p>materials. No other changes needed with the exception of the table where Neurology has been added.</p> <p>Element 9.2 Faculty Appointments, reviewed by Dr. Ruit. Not a cited element. The past DCI narrative address the new/reworded DCI questions. The new DCI questions ask the same question; the wording structure of the question is slightly different. No tables and no other concerns.</p>	
Next Meeting	<p>April 19, 2023 Elements for Review 7.3 BG, 9.3 JP, 9.4 KB, 9.5 RVE, 9.6 KR</p>	

Submitted by Sheila Bosh, Accreditation Manager

Approved by Dr. Ken Ruit, EASRC Chair