

UND SMHS Educational Accreditation Standards Review Committee (EASRC) Meeting Minutes
Monday December 14, 2020 4:30 – 6:00 pm via Zoom

Attending: Steve Tinguely, Sheila Bosh, Pat Carr, Bryon Grove, Mark Koponen, Ken Ruit, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski, Bryan Delage
Absent: Dinesh Bande, Jim Porter, Erika Johnson

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
Call meeting to order	Meeting was called to order by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, Committee Chair.	
Review of Minutes/Follow up Action Report	October 21, 2020 minutes were distributed electronically to EASRC members prior to the meeting and are also available on Blackboard. EASRC did not meet in November.	Minutes approved
Action Table	<p>7.2 Completed by Dr. Carr. No further action at this time.</p> <p>9.2 Dr. Ruit shared that work on faculty appointments continues. The process needs to be written out and included in school guidelines, including promotion of clinical faculty. His office also plans to complete work on a standardized letter for clinical faculty appointments.</p> <p>7.6 Dr. Carr is the content expert for this element. Dr. Ruit mentioned that he has been interacting with Dr. Casey Osaki, Associate Professor, Education, Health & Behavior on the topic of cultural competence. Dr. Ruit is considering extending an invitation to the School of Nursing as well as to colleagues at the SMHS. He is in the process of determining who the relevant people are for inclusion in the conversation. He also commented that it will take some work to determine the best way to incorporate cultural competence into student learning and PCL. Dr. Van Eck suggested inviting Dr. Tom Mohr, Associate Dean Health Sciences to the conversation.</p>	<p>Dr. Ruit will provide an update at the next meeting</p> <p>Dr. Ruit will provide an update at the next meeting</p>
Element 6.2	Dr. Zelewski is the content expert for this element. The narrative was reviewed at length at a previous meeting. Today Dr. Zelewski commented that the narrative is complete, however, she believes that we're at the whim of whoever reads the DCI. If the survey team doesn't read the footnote or doesn't observe the table, it may not meet the LCME expectations. After discussion, Dr. Zelewski reiterated that she believes that we are good, however the way the table is formatted might not allow us to convey that.	

Element 7.9	The narrative was reviewed in great detail. There was discussion about the various ways in which the table could be written to provide further clarity. Dr. Ruit recommended clarifying the duration of the experience and the type of setting in which the assessment takes place. Also noted that simulation should be changed or removed as simulation is not a form of assessment. It was concluded that the element should be returned to Dr. Carr for revision.	
9.3	Dr. Zelewski commented that narrative d. will need editing after policy 4.2.1 Clinical Supervision is completed. The narrative asks <i>What practices are used during required clinical experiences and other school-sponsored clinical experiences (i.e., electives) to ensure that the level of responsibility delegated to a medical student is appropriate to the student's level of training and experience? Are these practices based in formal policies/guidelines?</i> Dr. Zelewski asked the committee to comment on the level of detail needed and the level of supervision required. In his review of this DCI element, Dr. Basson suggested we include the specific procedures students are allowed to complete, when they allowed to do them and how we know they are ready. He has suggested a higher level of detail for this narrative response. He would like to bring this to FASRC for further discussion.	Add to January FASRC agenda
9.5	Reviewed narrative a. <i>Summarize the policy/guidelines describing the circumstances in which narrative descriptions of a medical student's performance will be provided (e.g., length of teacher-student interaction, group size).</i> Noted there is not an institutional policy per se, rather a process that occurs. Discussed developing a formalized policy vs a procedure. Dr. Carr suggested adding the purpose of the tool and the importance of it to the procedure. In conclusion, Dr. Ruit recommended that this becomes a policy rather than a procedure. Dr. Zelewski commented that the process of using i-spiral 2.0 as narrative assessment will require additional faculty development. It was noted that i-spiral 2.0 is the updated version of the original i-spiral and it would be beneficial to make that distinction and include when the transition occurred. Dr. Van Eck commented that an i-spiral final narrative box needs to be mandatory as it's a milestone-based competency. It's also important to note that the narrative comments are also required for the dean's letter. It was concluded that Dr. Van Eck will send language and context to Dr. Charles Hosford in Education Resources. This element will return to Dr. Zelewski for revision.	
Deferred	9.7, 9.9 (Review MSAPC responsibilities)	
Announcements/Next Meeting	Next meeting January 20, 2021	

--	--	--

Submitted by Sheila Bosh, Accreditation Manager

Approved by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, EASRC Chair