

Undergraduate Medical Education Committee Meeting Minutes

SMHS

Wednesday, June 28, 2023 - 4:30 PM, via Zoom

In attendance: Pat Carr, Jane Dunlevy, Kara Eickman, Bryon Grove, Jeremy Holloway, King, Susan Roe, Chernet Tessema, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski, Kurt Borg, Megan Denis, Eric Johnson, Andy McLean, Michelle Montgomery, Jim Porter, Ken Ruit, Dinesh Bande, Minnie Kalyanasundaram, David Schmitz, Lisa Schock, Andrea Guthridge, Janet Anderson, Eric Heitkamp

Minutes Submitted by: Dawne Barwin

Minutes Reviewed by: Pat Carr

Minutes Approved by: Chris DeCock and Susan Roe

MSC: Motion, Second, Carried

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome/call to order	UMEC Chair, Pat Carr, called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm via Zoom. If no objections, he proposed the time of adjournment to be 6:00pm.	Informational
2. Approval of Minutes	6.14.23	MSC to approve the 6.14.23 minutes by Susan Roe / Susan Zelewsjki // carried.
3. Student Check-in	King did not have anything to share from the students.	
4. Committee Reports and consent agenda items (Annual and Unit reports and policies not eligible for the consent agenda)	Committee Reports Committees P2P3C—SZ i. Verbal Report: ii. Consent agenda: Electives: o 5.9.23 Minutes o Bismarck Sanford Pathology AI o Change Intro to Emergency Medicine o Dermatology Trinity Health o Family Med AI Perham new section o INMED9210 Revised o Med 9604 edits o New Wilderness Medicine Elective	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 4.3 Clinical Duty Hours for Medical Students ○ 4.7 Policy on Specialty Electives for Medical Students in Phase 3 ○ 4.11 Policy on Medical Student Immunization Medical Examination and Health Insurance ○ 4.13 Phase 2 Elective Days <p>DEIC-MM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Verbal Report: proposal to change composition of DEI Committee (see below) ii. Consent agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DEIC 5.2.23 Minutes <p>DQIP / Office of Medical Accreditation: EASRc/SASRc/FASRc – KR</p> <p><i>Ad hoc</i> committees: none</p>	
<p>5. Special Orders</p>	<p>Telehealth Badge Proposal V2: The proposal, and two accompanying documents (AAMC 2021 Telehealth Competencies and the SMHS AAMC Telehealth Competencies Matrix) are available on Blackboard.</p> <p>Rick Van Eck gave a Power Point presentation of the Telehealth Badge Proposal and updates. The changes to the proposal were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Susan Zelewski asked why not make August the deadline, at end of Phase 2 to have badge completed? It would be a total of 14 months and they should be able to complete it in that time frame. ● Susan Zelewski asked if we have a badge curricular requirements list? As a student career advisor, it would be useful to give to a student. ● Rick Van Eck said the badge itself lists the requirements, it gives the list and is spelled out in the badge itself. Can we have a better LCME perspective and list required curriculum on our website? ● Pat Carr agrees that is needed. Most students get their information from upper class men and that that resource is not here since it is just starting this AY with the Class of 2027. ● Pat Carr and Susan Zelewski stated that students will have questions. They would like to use this Power Point presentation for questions from the students. ● Rick Van Eck stated that this information will be sent out to students to support them. The IPC Badge has to be supported online with its curriculum requirements. Maybe we 	<p>MSC to accept the Telehealth Badge Proposal V2 with the changes as discussed (make the deadline for completion be the end of Phase 2, place a badging requirements list and information on the Medical School website. Jane Dunlevy / Bryon Grove // carried.</p>

	<p>can carve out a space on website specifically for badging and all the information a student needs in relation to it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eric Johnson: With the scheduled emails that went out to students last year, it seemed to work well. The students knew what was expected and there were no issues with this process. • Susan Zelewski stated now that we are building badges it is important to have one place to look at and get the information that is needed. • Rick Van Eck said that once a student logs into Milestone for badging they will see all the badges that are available, they live in this online world and it will be easy for them. 	
<p>6. Special order item not on agenda—arose from DEI verbal report</p>	<p>DEIC Proposal of composition of membership: Michelle Montgomery talked about the DEI Next Steps Proposal that would restructure the committee for voting purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current voting ratio of Faculty to Students is 11:4. The proposal is to have 8 voting students per meeting with a minimum of 1 more faculty member than students for a vote at each meeting. DEI would like 8 students to attend meetings, 2 per class, and then have one per class vote. The increase to 8 students but have a maximum of 4 students vote at any one meeting. Giving the students more votes would encourage their attendance and participation in the meetings. This would change the voting ratio of Faculty to Students from 11:4 to 11:8. • Pat Carr comments the request will help to get at least 1 student from each class would be present at the meetings. Our medical school is faculty governed. Everything that comes from DEIC to UMEC is a recommendation, there cannot be a committee not run by faculty. • Bryon Grove asked if this is for the MD program specifically? With a ratio of 8 students to 11 faculty, won't this make a large committee and slow things down? • Michelle Montgomery said this proposal is for the Medical Program and she does not think it will slow things down. We are looking Student Equity and Diversity and we want student voices and in regards to feedback that is what is being asked for. • Pat Carr said that it will depend on how the minimum number and quorum is described, were we set up as 4 students voting and one of the two per class will vote. This would not change function of committee at all. • Rick Van Eck said he agrees with all Pat said. Quorum is not needed on this committee and all 8 students could vote although this would probably would not happen very often. • Susan Zelewski is agreement with Rick and would like to see the increase of students to 8. They are the ones that really know what is going on cross the country via peers. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • King agrees with having 8 students voting on DEIC, the more student representatives the better. • Dave Schmitz stated that the model used at the AMA where there are 8 student voices and 4 get to vote, this structure would then become familiar to them. • Rick Van Eck said he feels Dave Schmitz’s idea is persuasive. He would like to know what students feel about this? King, what do you think the student body would like to see? • King said that Michelle had brought this to my attention. Having 8 students and 4 votes, one per class, they can share the responsibilities. Who makes sure one of the 2 students is present? Do we give that responsibility to committee or to the delegates? Who decides that? • Pat Car and Rick Van Eck both stated they would like to leave that up to the students and how they want to decide who and when the voting student from each class will attend committee meetings. • Jane Dunlevy agreed the students are an important part of committee, this may encourage all 8 students to come to meeting and participate but 4 students vote. • King asked why 4 voting students? Why not 8 student votes? • Jane Dunlevy said she would be in favor of increase student availability to 8, we want to have more student voices and by increasing to 8 will do that • Michelle Montgomery was in agreement • Pat Carr said the voting membership in any one meeting must be one more faculty member than student members. • Rick Van Eck likes the idea of having the 8 students vote, then they all feel heard and got to vote. • Ken Ruit stated on a committee there must be a majority of faculty when a vote takes place. Faculty and students work collaboratively on any governance. We have heard here that the student voices in DEIC are important and need to be heard and incorporated into motions coming to UMEC. DEIC only makes recommendations to UMEC so all is in line with my thinking. 	<p>MSC DEI Committee Membership to be changed to include 2 student representatives from each of the 4 classes where all 8 will have voting privileges in any one meeting and the number of faculty voting has to exceed number of students voting by a minimum of 1 faculty member: Jane Dunlevy / Bryon Grove // Carried.</p>
<p>7. New Business</p>	<p>Education Resources Curriculum Retreat (10.26.23): Topics to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pat Carr said we have 3 topics that are all very interesting and very timely. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Telehealth ○ Badging ○ DEI • Rick Van Eck said he would like to see all three topics for the Retreat. We can always 	<p>Information</p>

	<p>back off if there is a time crunch. I think DEI would be ideally placed to identify the specific aspects that would be worth sharing along with notes and updates. There is an ask to help with the work of DEI in the curriculum. I would also like to have a talk and brainstorm about Telehealth and how we can increase telehealth experiences in Phase 2 and 3. It can be a way to get clinical faculty involved in talking about it. The Telehealth Planning Group would be a great resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Porter said he learned a new term in relation to DEI, Decolonization of Medicine. • Pat Carr will ask DEIC what topics they would like to see and what discussions would be advantageous? We could have a discussion or activity on Decolonization in Medicine. • The plan is to incorporate all three topics into the curriculum retreat 	
8. Other Business	<p>Quantitative Report by Cohort V4 – All comments for committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pat stated that it has been posted to Blackboard and the four curriculum committees (UMEC, P1C, P2P3 and CEMC) will review in the future. 	Information
9. Adjournment	<p>Meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm</p> <p>Next Meeting July 12, 2023 at 4:30 pm via Zoom</p>	Information