

**UND SMHS Educational Accreditation Standards Review Committee (EASRC) Meeting Minutes**  
**Wednesday September 15, 2021, 4:30 – 6:00 pm via Zoom**

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

**Absent:** Dinesh Bande, Bryan Delage

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
<b>Call meeting to order</b>	Meeting was called to order by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, Committee Chair.	
<b>Announcements</b>	External SSTF work underway: Standards 3,6,7 and 8 will be discussed Oct 6 External Consultant (Dr Nora) DCI review findings: Monday Sept 20	
<b>Review of Minutes/Follow up Action Report</b>	August 18, 2021, minutes were distributed electronically to EASRC members prior to the meeting and are also available on Blackboard.	Minutes approved.
<b>Element 7.6 Cultural Competency Update</b>	A revision for 7.6 was submitted by Dr. Carr and this element has been forwarded to the LCME Consultants for review. Dr. Carr commented that the Student CQI Committee continues to work on their recommendations for improving cultural competency.	
<b>Curriculum Retreat, Phase Reports and Curriculum as a Whole</b>	Dr. Van Eck commented that CEMC discussed the date of the retreat. Noted that we will be in process for a couple years in which we won't have complete reports to refer to. This is relevant especially this year when we won't have a complete report that we can refer to in our narrative of 8.3. Noted our Snapshot year (2021-21) is our transitional year. UMEC hasn't approved curriculum as a whole report or phase reports yet. They hope to have this complete prior to submitting our DCI and Appendix in January.	
<b>Element 8.7 Comparability of Education/Assessment</b>	Reviewed 8.7 narrative c. in which we are asked 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. Van Eck is the writer for this element. Discussed how best to answer this and which examples	

	to include. It was concluded that additional information regarding the FM grades and how the process improvement originated should be obtained from Dr. Delage. The revised narrative will be completed by Dr. Tinguely and Dr. Van Eck.	Dr. Tinguely will obtain information from Dr. Delage.
<b>Curriculum System White Paper Table Top Exercise Planning</b>	Dr. Van Eck is working on the draft and in the process of obtaining feedback. Tabletop exercise will occur after that's complete.	Add to October Agenda.
<b>I-spiral</b>	OMA noted that there were several different versions of i-Spiral assessment forms. Dr. Van Eck explained that 2.0 is mapping of competencies to domains. This form isn't an assessment sheet. 6.0 and 7.0 are the same content in different forms. Dr. Van Eck recommended that we submit version 7.0 for our DCI appendix.	
<b>Program Evaluation Worksheet Update</b>	This topic was deferred as there has not been any discussion among faculty at this point.	
<b>Std 8 BS and CL Strengths, Improvement from 2021 GQ</b>	<p>Continued review of Basic Science and Clinical Science strengths and areas for improvement comments, looking for serious or recurrent themes.</p> <p>Noted a recurring theme in the area of Diversity. Multiple comments that education on diversity is lacking. Dr. Van Eck commented that there are opportunities to improve in this area; there is experience, lecture, coaching, and didactic means that could be explored.</p> <p>Bloodborne pathogen policy comment was discussed. Student commented that the school should provide financial support. This has been previously commented on by students.</p> <p><i>The reason students repeatedly complain about the blood borne pathogen policy isn't because we don't understand it, it's because we think that needle sticks are an occupational hazard and the school should provide some financial support towards covering the cost of treatments. Other medical schools without a university hospital accomplish this by adding a fee (~\$50) to tuition and creating a pool of money that students who do have a needlestick can then apply for if needed to cover the cost of care. Yes, I realize this passes the cost on to students, but it also distributes the cost (and makes it eligible for financial aid, an ER bill is not eligible for financial aid). This would also incentivize students to follow the current policy and accurately report occurrences, I know 3 classmates who did not report or seek care for needlesticks because of concerns about cost.</i></p>	

	It was concluded that Dr. Porter will talk with the insurance navigator to see if policies exist that would cover needle sticks. His findings will be discussed at the next meeting and then forwarded to the appropriate people.	Add to October Agenda
<b>Next Meeting</b>	October 20, 2021	

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