

Education Accreditation Standards Review Subcommittee (EASRS) Meeting Minutes  
SMHS

Monday, March 18, 2019 – 4:30 pm in room E493 and via phone/video

**In attendance:** Dinesh Bande, Pat Carr, Joy Dorscher, Bryon Grove, Mark Koponen, Leigh Moyer, Steve Tinguely, Ken Ruit, and Susan Zelewski.

**Not in attendance:**

**Minutes Submitted by:** Alissa Hancock

MSC = motion made, seconded, carried

**Minutes Reviewed by:** Steve Tinguely

**Minutes Approved by:** Bryon Grove and Mark Koponen

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
<b>1. Welcome/call to order (Tinguely)</b>	Dr. Tinguely called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m. via WebEx in room E493.	Informational
<b>2. Review and approve meeting minutes February 2019</b>	<p><b>a. February meeting minutes</b></p> <p><b>b. Action Table Review and Updates</b> 7.5 &amp; 7.8 went to MCC and were adopted by the committee. The remainder of the standard 7 report will be discussed at a future meeting. We can mark these as complete.</p> <p>The societal problems were adopted. Dr. Warne is the chair of the longitudinal thread focus group, which, has started to discuss how to incorporate these throughout the curriculum, in hopes that they will be less likely to get lost within the curriculum. They will also start thinking about the objectives for this also.</p>	MSC – approve February minutes. Bryon Grove / Pat Carr // carried.
<b>3. Old Business</b>		
<b>4. New Business</b>	<p><b>a. 8.3 Curriculum Design/Review/Revision/Monitoring (Continued) (Tinguely)</b> Continuing with review of section D. (How and how often curriculum content is monitored). Discussed that we will need to be ready to provide additional documents for a focus area that is specified in that year’ DCI. This 2019-20 DCI asks schools to search the following 2 topics: mitochondria and health care quality improvement. It was concluded that our current software system would be able to search the curriculum content topic area related to “health care quality” and achieve meaningful results. Searching the curriculum content topic of “mitochondria” on the other hand might not produce meaningful analysis.</p> <p>Dr. Carr (Assistant Dean for Medical Education) points out that currently we are able to provide curriculum data base searches per request. Curriculum Committee’s</p>	Informational

	<p>(such as CEMS) also have a regular scheduled reviews of different sections of the curriculum. Funding has recently been approved to allow the purchase of LCMS+. In the near future the LCMS+ software system will be utilized along with E*Value while we fully transition to LCMS+.</p> <p>With regard to years three and four, the required course objectives have now been mapped and the departments are currently reviewing them for redundancies. In the future, CEMS may be able to help review objectives on regular basis.</p> <p>It was concluded that 1. It is more advantageous to focus efforts addressing the identified gaps in the curriculum more so than the redundancies; and 2. All the objectives should be mapped to a domain and/or competency, which should be driving our curriculum focus.</p>	
	<p><b>b. 8.7 Comparability of Education/Assessment (Bande)</b></p> <p>This element currently focuses on the clerkships only but it is noted that AI's may be required in the future and therefore may become a component of this Element review.</p> <p>Dr. Bande's assessment is that the school is doing well overall with regard to comparability of educational experiences across locations and campuses.</p> <p>Even though clerkships are meeting the intent of this Element generally, there is a room for improvement in clarifying the roles and communication responsibilities between the clerkship directors, campus clerkship site directors and the preceptors. The communication methods and frequency also needs to be clarified for the MILE and ROME programs.</p> <p>Regarding how often a department communicates with its faculty and the methods of communication needs to be described so that a group of faculty, if asked, will be able to provide an accurate and consistent answer. Even though there may be different methods of communication among various departments, it will be important for us as the SOM to be able to explain how each department communicates to its faculty. It is equally important that faculty can explain how they receive communication from their individual clerkship leadership.</p>	<p>Action Plan: The final DCI report be written with clear explanations of the various but effective processes used by departments and clerkship leaders to communicate with its faculty and to evaluate its students, faculty and education across sites and campuses.</p>

	<p>We need to be clear in our explanations of the various methods in which evaluations of our students, preceptors and instructional sites occur for each clerkships and that it is consistent across campuses. Clerkship annual reports contain inter-campus student outcome data including preceptor scores, shelf exam scores and honors grading.</p> <p>Clerkship directors are responsible for evaluating and reporting any identified inconsistencies across instructional sites to CSCS. CSCS/ MCC, with the assistance of the Campus Deans, are responsible for correcting any identified inconsistencies.</p> <p>The Committee concludes that the intent of this Element is being met and that proper processes are in place to ensure comparability of education and assessment across locations and campuses.</p>	
	<b>c. Standard 8 Report Review</b>	Tabled
<b>5. Other Business</b>		
	<p><b><u>Future Meeting Assignments:</u></b>  April  Standard 8 Report Review and Standard 9 Element Assignments (Tinguely)</p>	Informational
<b>6. Adjournment/Next EASRS Meeting</b>	Dr. Tinguely adjourned the meeting at 4:44 pm.	Next meeting is Wednesday, April 17, 2019 in Room E493.