

UND SMHS Educational Accreditation Standards Review Committee (EASRC) Meeting Minutes
Wednesday November 17, 2021, 4:30 – 6:00 pm via Zoom

Attending: Steve Tinguely, Sheila Bosh, Pat Carr, Mark Koponen, Ken Ruit, Susan Zelewski, Erika Johnson, Bryon Grove, Bryan Delage, Jim Porter

Absent: Dinesh Bande, Rick Van Eck

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
Call meeting to order	Meeting was called to order by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, Committee Chair.	
Review of Minutes	October 20, 2021, minutes were distributed electronically to EASRC members prior to the meeting and are also available on Blackboard.	Minutes approved.
Curriculum Retreat, Phase Reports and Curriculum as a Whole Update	Dr. Van Eck was not in attendance. He provided this written update prior to the meeting. “Phase reports are being written this year based on the presentations given at the curriculum retreat. Susan Zelewski has written and presented Phase 2 and Phase 3 Report and presented it to P2P3C. It will be on an upcoming UMEC agenda. Jane Dunvley has not yet written the P1 Report but is working on it. It will be presented at an upcoming P1C meeting and forwarded to UMEC when ready.” Dr. Zelewski noted that the new format of reports (template) will not be done prior to the LCME site visit.	Add to December Agenda.
Curriculum System White Paper Tabletop Exercise Planning Update	Dr. Van Eck was not in attendance. He provided this written update prior to the meeting. “Still need to revise and update it to reflect the changes as through last week. Should be done the week after Thanksgiving. Tabletop exercise with UMEC can occur after that, but UMEC may not be meeting in -person in November so December would be soonest and will depend on agenda, which has been jam packed every meeting.”	Add to December Agenda.
Bloodborne Pathogen Follow Up	Dr. Zelewski provided an update. Many of the affiliates have agreed to cover immediate care only. We are waiting on a written agreement from Altru. Dr. Delage commented that ROME sites may agree to provide acute care. Some are concerned about ongoing costs. Still waiting for final agreements. Dr. Basson is overseeing this.	Add to December Agenda.
Standard 9 Review	9.0, Table 9.0-1 should add descriptor to be consistent per Ken Ruit. Pat Carr and Susan Zelewski pointed out that this table should be adjusted as we use unified sessions for some and blocks for	Send 9.0 to Pat Carr for revision.

	<p>others because of the snapshot year. Pat Carr was asked to assist Dr. Tinguely with this revision. He commented that we might be able to use information from 6.0 first column to complete this. Noted that we need to confirm if internal exams should be x'd in IPHC.</p> <p>9.1-1 Changed column two responses to "teaching not supervision". Residents as Teachers policy is being updated. Will need to add to appendix once approved.</p> <p>9.2 narrative c. Include "lectures are recorded and available for review by the course instructor. We monitor student feedback". Pat Carr noted that we receive weekly feedback from students and at the end of every unified session. Dr. Zelewski commented that any concerns raised are followed up on. Dr. Ruit was asked to assist with this revision.</p> <p>9.3 narrative a. Dr. Zelewski asked if we are quoting the old policy. <i>Additionally, students may only be supervised by providers who are employed by University of North Dakota (UND) School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) faculty or have UND SMHS clinical faculty appointments.</i> Steve Tinguely will look at current policy and revise this paragraph. Narrative d. the Dean commented this response seems not as solid as he'd expect. Susan Zelewski commented that this is true for electives as well as required clerkships. We could also state that students are aware of the policy requirements as they sign off on this in Phase 2 and Phase 3. It was concluded that Dr. Tinguely will clarify how the Dean wants to answer this.</p> <p>9.4 First paragraph in narrative a. removed this sentence. <i>Students participate in a mandatory three-week clinical skills boot camp as preparation for the clerkship curriculum at the end of the pre-clerkship curriculum.</i> Currently the bootcamp is integrated within the last preclinical course. Dr. Zelewski noted that we are currently redesigning the Clinical Skills Performance Review (CSPR) to be more realistic for 15-minute visits. Piloting with class of 2023 this year. Dr. Zelewski inquired whether we should include COVID in this element. She noted that there isn't any data for class of 2022 as they didn't have a CSPR due to COVID. Dr. Tinguely commented that he will review the element and decide if we should provide an explanation for that. Discussed the satisfaction with clinical skills instruction in the first and second years. Dr. Zelewski asked if a question should be added to the ISA 2. Ken Ruit commented that he doesn't think this is necessary as the level of satisfaction was acceptable. <i>ISA data demonstrate combined satisfied and very satisfied responses ranging from 88% for M3 students to 100% for M2 students. Regarding clinical skills assessment in the third and fourth years, 80% of M4 student were satisfied or very satisfied and 13 % were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Satisfaction rates for M3 students were 34% and dissatisfaction rates were 4% with 62% NA responses</i></p> <p>9.5 Discussed whether our response in narrative c. is sufficient. <i>Students do not receive written narrative description of performance in the Interprofessional Healthcare Course (IPHC). The many various students and faculty (medicine, nursing, physical therapy, etc.) participating in IPHC make a single standardized written feedback form impractical to use across all disciplines. However, medical students do receive verbal narrative feedback from their IPHC small group leader.</i></p>	<p>Send 9.2 to Ken Ruit for addition to narrative c.</p> <p>Dr. Tinguely will discuss 9.3 with the Dean.</p> <p>Dr. Tinguely will review element and determine if COVID impacts should be incorporated.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Ken Ruit and Susan Zelewski commented that the response may not be sufficient although as written it is a true statement. Pat Carr proposed that the creation of a standardized written assessment instrument. This will need to be brought to UMEC. He suggested that Rick Van Eck and Andrienne Salentiny be asked to help with this if UMEC approves the creation.</p> <p>Deferred 9.6 – 9.9</p>	<p>Pat Carr will add 9.5 to UMEC agenda.</p> <p>Add 9.6 – 9.9 to December Agenda.</p>
<p>Next Meeting</p>	<p>December 15, 2021</p>	

Submitted by Sheila Bosh, Accreditation Manager
Approved by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, EASRC Chair