

UND SMHS Educational Accreditation Standards Review Committee (EASRC) Meeting Minutes
Wednesday August 18, 2021, 4:30 – 6:00 pm via Zoom

Attending: Steve Tinguely, Sheila Bosh, Pat Carr, Mark Koponen, Ken Ruit, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski, Bryan Delage, Bryon Grove
Absent: Dinesh Bande, 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	July 21, 2021, minutes were distributed electronically to EASRC members prior to the meeting and are also available on Blackboard.	Minutes approved.
Element 8.5 Medical Student Feedback	This element and the Dean’s comments were discussed extensively in the LCME meeting prior to EASRC today. No further review required of EASRC.	
Element 7.6 Cultural Competency Update	Dr. Carr commented that Jane Dunlevy provided feedback at a UMEC meeting. He was not in attendance. He noted that 7.6 will have modifications in the very near future which he will forward to OMA.	
Element 8.8 Monitoring Student Time	Dr. Van Eck made the requested changes as were noted in the previous meeting minutes. He commented that he modified the response without including “study time”.	
Element 8.4 Evaluation of Educational Program Outcomes	Dr. Van Eck commented that he simplified the tables to include the percent of students who are passing (table 8.4-7 & 8.4-9). Dr. Van Eck asked for the element to be returned to him for review and revision if needed in response to the Dean’s comments.	Dr. Tinguely will send this element back to Dr. Van Eck for revision.

Element 8.3 Curricular Design, Review, Revision/Content Monitoring	Dr. Van Eck revised this element following the Dean’s initial review and comments. Dr. Tinguely noted that it hasn’t been sent back to the dean following this last revision. This will occur after all elements have been sent to the consultants.	
Element 8.7 Comparability of Education/Assessment	<p>Reviewed the Dean’s comments on this element. In table 8.7-1. Dr. Zelewski commented that It’s again noted that MILE and ROME aren’t parallel curricula. Dr. Zelewski suggested that we may want to eliminate MILE and ROME from the table as these aren’t courses or clerkships, and the table specifically asks for us to <i>Provide the requested information for each course or clerkship offered at more than one instructional site, including regional campuses</i>. Dr. Van Eck suggested adding a footnote that these are longitudinal.</p> <p>In section c. Dr. Wynne asked if there is evidence to show that things are better in the area of preceptor assessments. The question asks us to <i>Provide examples of the mechanisms employed and the groups/individuals involved in addressing inconsistencies across instructional sites in such areas as student satisfaction and student grades</i>. Dr. Zelewski agreed that it would be appropriate to add an example. The element will be returned to Dr. Zelewski for revision.</p>	Dr. Tinguely will return the element to Dr. Zelewski for revision.
6.0 Table	<p>Dr. Wynne reviewed this element and commented on our supporting document 6-00 curriculum schematic, and whether it should be in the element or in the appendix. In response to the comment, Dr. Tinguely emailed the LCME. He was informed that it is acceptable to add the document to the appendix.</p> <p>Dr. Tinguely noted that the 2021-22 DCI includes an additional sentence to asking us to include what we did in Phase 1 during COVID. Dr. Tinguely emailed Dr. Carr for his assistance in writing this response.</p>	
8.0 Table	Dr. Tinguely pointed out that student satisfaction with the quality of the medical education program has dropped again since 2019. He commented that this may be due to the seniors not having the Step 1 prep. Dr. Zelewski commented that the data from AI’s was not on the table. She suggested that we include this information which she will email to Dr. Tinguely.	
Program Evaluation Worksheet Update	This topic was deferred as there has not been any discussion among faculty at this point.	

Std 8 BS and CL Strengths, Improvement from 2021 GQ	Dr. Carr sent an email to OMA in which he requested review of the 2021 GQ Basic Science and Clinical Science Strengths and Improvements. He asked the EASRC members to share their ideas and recommendations with UMEC. Dr. Carr commented that the severity and frequency of the comments are important. He also commented that it would be beneficial to convene a group of core educators who make adjustments according to the feedback.	
Announcements/Next Meeting	Next meeting September 15, 2021	

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