

UND SMHS Faculty Accreditation Standards Review Committee (FASRC) Meeting Minutes
Wednesday January 13, 2021 3:00-4:30 pm Zoom Meeting

In Attendance: Stephen Tinguely, Sheila Bosh, Ken Ruit, Laura Block, Marc Basson, Dr. Susan Zelewski (Guest)

Absent: Judy Solberg

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
Call meeting to order	Meeting was called to order by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, Committee Chair	
Review of Minutes	Minutes from December 16, 2020 were distributed electronically to FASRC members prior to the meeting and are also available on Blackboard.	Minutes approved.
Action Item Table	<p>Element 4.4</p> <p>Follow up discussion on the possibility of creating systems of central oversight/monitoring of volunteer faculty utilizing the new management software. Dr. Ruit noted that by June clinical departments will have a mechanism by which feedback will be provided to clinical faculty. Dr. Basson commented that there is no mandate for standardization. Dr. Ruit noted that they will still need to check on clinical faculty's ability to access student evaluations via Leo. As this is being addressed Dr. Tinguely stated that this can be removed from the table.</p>	
Element 5.5 Resources for Clinical Instruction	In follow up to a previous meeting, Dr. Tinguely emailed the LCME seeking clarification as to whether we should include the ROME sites and critical access hospitals on Table 5.5-2, when the learning objectives of family medicine clerkship do not require that type of experience. The LCME replied that this is not necessary.	
Element 5.11 Study/Lounge/Storage Space/Call Rooms & Photo Album	Jeanette Gratton has been asked to assist with the collection of photos. She is currently working with campus admins to complete this. She has informed OMA that she believes she should be able to collect the necessary information. Dr. Ruit commented that this becomes more relevant now after reviewing the current ISA data.	OMA will contact the campus deans for further clarification on specific campus issues.
Policy 4.21 and Element 9.3 Supervision of Medical Students	Dr. Susan Zelewski was asked to attend today to participate in the discussion regarding Policy 4.21 and Element 9.3 Supervision of Medical Students. She commented that we need to determine how we want to move forward	

	<p>as a school; also commenting that there have been varying opinions from faculty on how to address this. Some would like a clearly defined list of appropriate skills for each phase, and others would like this to be more open to individual interpretation. Dr. Basson commented that he believes the best approach is to provide a list of appropriate procedures that students may complete with supervision during each phase. He commented that there could be a distinction between what a student may be required to do and what they may have an opportunity to do. The student and preceptor should both be comfortable with the decision.</p> <p>Dr. Tinguely pointed out that the wording in the ISA table and the DCI table don't match. The ISA table addresses availability of supervision, and the DCI table addresses adequacy of supervision. Dr. Tinguely contacted the LCME to inform them of the discrepancy. The LCME replied that it is acceptable for us to change the DCI table wording and denote that with an asterisk.</p> <p>Dr. Zelewski shared that we track student concerns regarding appropriate supervision on clinical evaluation forms. A report of this is shared with CSCC & UMEC annually. Dr. Tinguely asked if we should add supervision monitoring to the existing policy. While this is the process, it hasn't been incorporated into the policy. Dr. Zelewski noted that this could easily be added.</p> <p>It was concluded that Dr. Zelewski and Dr. Basson will continue to work on a list of appropriate procedures. This proposed list will be brought to CSCC. Dr. Basson reiterated that It's our responsibility to ensure that faculty and students know that the policy exists.</p>	<p>Dr. Basson will provide an update at the next meeting.</p>
<p>DCI Element 1.1</p>	<p>Discussed strategic plan examples and whether these were the best examples to include in the DCI. Noted that it's important for us to find out why students indicated in the ISA that they are dissatisfied with Step 1 despite an improvement in Step 1 scores. Dr. Basson commented that it's vital that we find out why students are dissatisfied; and find out soon, rather than waiting for the focus groups.</p> <p>Discussed the CQI examples that are included in the DCI. The two examples are Career Counseling and Academic Counseling. Dr. Basson and Dr. Ruit commented that these examples are fine, and work should continue on these. For SP example 2, it was noted that it would be beneficial to include details from the white paper.</p>	<p>OMA will continue to work on the narrative.</p>

OMA, LCME, DQIP, CQI Website	OMA met with Brian Schill to discuss the content and layout of the proposed webpage. Documents from previous survey visit were shared. This is a work in progress.	OMA will provide updates at next meeting.
5.12 Notification to the LCME	At a previous meeting, Dr. Ruit commented that the curriculum revision paperwork would be submitted in early 2021 and be reviewed by the LCME in February or June. Today he asked that this remains an agenda item until complete.	Add to next FASRC agenda.
Next Meeting/Announcements	Next meeting February 17, 2021	

Submitted by Sheila Bosh, Accreditation Manager

Approved by Dr. Stephen Tinguely, FASRC Committee Chair