

**UND SMHS Educational Accreditation Standards Review Committee (EASRC) Meeting
Wednesday June 15, 2022, 4:30 – 6:00 pm via Zoom**

Attending: Steve Tinguely, Sheila Bosh, Pat Carr, Mark Koponen, Ken Ruit, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski, Jim Porter, Erika Johnson, Bryon Grove
Kurt Borg

Absent: Dinesh Bande, Bryan Delage

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
Call meeting to order	Meeting was called to order by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, Committee Chair.	
Review of Minutes	May 18, 2022 minutes were distributed electronically to EASRC members prior to the meeting and are also available on Blackboard.	Minutes approved.
Committee Membership	At a previous meeting we discussed recruiting a medical student and another faculty member. Dr. Tinguely reached out to KC Braaten to invite him to join the committee. He did not receive a response. He will email him again. KC is at the Bismarck campus. It is noted that Dr. Koponen will be retiring in July. We thank him for his contributions over the years. Welcome to Dr. Kurt Borg who has joined the committee.	Dr. Tinguely will email KC Braaten.
ISA 2 Updates	Dr. Tinguely has been in communication with Anja Selland (MS4). The ISA 2 committee is meeting, though progress has been slow. OMA will be meeting with Anja next Monday via zoom. She will attend the next DQIP meeting and provide additional updates at that time.	
OMPAQA and Committees Document	In follow up to a previous discussion, Dr. Tinguely created a draft document. The document includes the purpose, duties, reporting, membership, terms, and conditions of each of the subcommittees who report to OMA. Noted that we should Remove #7. In the duties list of OMPAQA as the Chief of Staff is no longer a committee member. Dr. Grove suggested that the length of term be capped at 3-4 years to allow faculty to gracefully bow out should they so choose and to allow for new membership. If faculty wish to continue, they may do so. Dr. Van Eck suggested that we use the same language as other committees who have similar term limits. Motion made and seconded.	

	<p>Dr. Van Eck suggested that we have some type of onboarding for new members. Specifically, regarding the writing and reviewing of the DCI. It was concluded that some type of onboarding may be beneficial. Further consideration for this to be discussed by OMA. Regarding the DCI and element review, it was decided that we will use the schedule that was created by OMA. If this does not provide the quality review that we anticipate, further discussion will occur at a future meeting.</p>	
<p>Element Review Proposal</p>	<p>EASRC Element Review for AY2022-23 was reviewed and discussed. Each element will be reviewed annually. We will review 3-4 elements each meeting. Review will begin in July and commence in May. Assignments will be emailed out in advance.</p>	
<p>Review of Elements from Exit Report (8.5, 8.8,9.7, 9.8, 9.9, and 11.1)</p>	<p>8.5 Medical Student Feedback (U?) Finding: The ISA data demonstrated low satisfaction with responsiveness to medical student feedback among M3 (55%) respondents. In response to the data, the school took several steps to understand and address the students’ concerns. The school has recently implemented several measures to address this issue. A follow up survey by the school revealed improved satisfaction among the M3 respondents, but decreased satisfaction among M4 respondents.</p> <p>Noted the M4’s that they’re referring to have graduated. Dr. Ruit also noted that this is double jeopardy as the preliminary report indicates that we may be cited for 2.4 as well. Both pertain to student feedback. The dean to advise as to how to address this with the LCME. Sheila has been working on associating student comments with the findings. This will be shared during our formal review.</p> <p>8.8 Monitoring Student Time (SM?) Finding: ISA data demonstrated respondent dissatisfaction with workload in the pre-clerkship 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 work load.</p> <p>Dr. Ruit noted that 6.3 and 8.8 is another double jeopardy. Dr. Zelewksi commented that this didn’t make it on ISA 2 because we started monitoring with real-time data on end of unit reports. She pulled the reports during the meeting and reported that when asked if they thought the overall workload was appropriate only 9 out of 68 responded that it wasn’t Question asked, “The overall workload was appropriate”, Unit 5 most recently completed 2 strongly disagree and 7 disagree N=68.</p> <p>9.7 Formative Assessment and Feedback (U?)</p>	

Finding: The school has a system in place to provide student formative feedback at the midpoint and end of pre-clerkship courses using the iSPIRAL tool, but ISA data demonstrated M1 respondents were dissatisfied with both the amount (31%) and quality (28%) of formative feedback.

Dr. Carr commented that students are saying it's not lack of feedback. It's too much feedback and "I'm not perfect." Students want only "glowing feedback" in their dean's letter. If it's neutral, they aren't happy. Dr. Porter commented that there may be a maturity that occurs where a student wants to receive insightful/constructive feedback to learn and grow; this maturity may not occur until 4th year. He noted that faculty development training on i-Spiral led to a consensus on what to expect – they have a good grasp on i-Spiral now.

Element 9.8 Fair and Timely Summative Assessment (SM?)

Finding: Data provided by the school demonstrated that during the 2020-21 academic year several clerkship sites did not provide final grades within six weeks of clerkship completion. Data provided for the 2021-22 academic year, to date, demonstrate that all clerkships at all sites have provided final grades with six weeks of completion of the clerkships

Challenge: we supplied one year's data of total compliance. See DCI plus supplemental documents. 2020-21 showed it was not consistent per KR – he thinks it showed it's prone to slippage. SZ is now in charge and noted "there will be no slippage."

Element 9.9 Student Advancement and Appeal Process (U?)

Finding: The school's Function of the Medical Student Academic Performance Committee (MSAPC) document gives authority to the MSAPC chair to place a student on suspension without involvement of the MSAPC, and without affording due process to the affected student prior to the adverse action being taken. If a hearing is held, the document also describes that the dean may attend the hearing and question the student, creating a potential conflict in any subsequent appeals process, as the dean's review and decision is the final step in the appeals process.

Noted that the MSAPC Policy needs to be revised so that a committee hearing occurs prior to suspension and remove wording that indicates dean has a role in MSAPC hearing.

Dr. Ruit suggested discussing this with the UND Dean of Students – reviewing the language of the Code of Student Life. Dr. Porter commented that he has spoken with Alex (Dean of Students) about this in the past. It was concluded that further discussion is needed before this policy can be revised.

Next Meeting	July 20, 2022	

Submitted by Sheila Bosh, Accreditation Manager

Approved by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, EASRC Chair