

Stony Brook School of Medicine  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
October 25th, 2005

Dr. Cedric Priebe (Presiding)  
Dr. Scott Johnson (Recording)

Attendance: Please see attendance roster. Excused: Drs. H.Cohen, S.McCrary, V.Tivakaran and H.Sussman

Dr. Priebe called the meeting to order at 5:05 pm.

**I. Review of Minutes of Meeting of June 14<sup>th</sup> 2005:** **Dr. Johnson**

- Minutes of the June 26th meeting were accepted as written. Dr. Priebe asked that if anyone had any questions or concerns regarding the previous minutes to address them with him or S.Johnson.

**II. Approval of Faculty Senate Membership** **Dr.Priebe**

- Dr. Priebe welcomed the faculty to the Senate meeting and reported that the new Faculty Senate membership was comprised of 93 members.
- Faculty Senate membership, including committee memberships, can be found on the website: [http://www.hsc.stonybrook.edu/som/faculty\\_senate/membership.cfm](http://www.hsc.stonybrook.edu/som/faculty_senate/membership.cfm)

**III. Executive Committee** **Dr. Priebe**

- Dr. Priebe reported that the Executive committee of the Faculty Senate has met on a monthly basis during the summer and will continue to meet on a monthly basis for the entire year.
- Dr. Priebe reported on the membership of the Executive Committee:
  - Members: Drs. C.Priebe(Chair), S.Johnson(Secr)  
W.Backus, W.Benjamin, R.Bronson, H.Cohen,  
A.Hurewitz (Winthrop), L.Kallus, A.Katz, S.Katz  
(NUMC), M.Parker, S.Simon

**IV. Welcome to our new Dean** **Dr. Fine**

- Dr. Priebe welcomed and introduced Dr. Richard Fine, the newly appointed Dean of the School of Medicine.
- Dr. Fine introduced himself and paraphrased Lyndon B. Johnson by stating, “I did not seek, but I did accept...” the nomination as Dean.
- Dr. Fine then stated that he will work to” improve the atmosphere and confidence that has been impacted by the prolonged search for a Dean of the School of Medicine”
- Dr. Fine then gave a presentation on his strategic initiatives for education, research and clinical endeavors, which is outlined below:
  - **Education**
    - 1) Evaluate increasing class enrollment to 125 students
    - 2) Evaluate any outstanding physical plant needs and initiate a strategic plan for improvement
    - 3) Evaluate current curriculum
      - A) Consider revising the 4<sup>th</sup> year curriculum
      - B) Assess reasons for lack of student attendance at lectures
      - C) Engage the students in the process
    - 4) Continue to focus on diversity in the medical school admissions policy

5) Establish standards to enhance our ability to optimize recruitment of candidates to the residency/fellowship programs

○ **Research**

1) Establish a Council of Translational Research which will facilitate communication and liaison between the Clinical Departments and Basic Science Departments including those on West Campus

2) Mandate increased GCRC participation of Clinical Departments

3) Establish a vigorous clinical research (trials) initiative

4) Annual recruitment of at least one established basic science/clinical researcher

5) Annual retreats of basic science and clinical investigators to initiate and sustain collaboration

6) Initiate methodology to expedite IRB approval of grants/contracts

○ **Clinical**

1) Establish the locus of control for the clinical enterprise of the Medical Center in the Dean's Office

2) Appointment of Vice-Dean for Clinical Affairs

3) Fast track the development of a medical office building on campus

4) Programmatic review of all Clinical Departments

○ **Relationship with the hospital**

1) Permanent Hospital CEO to report to the Dean

2) Develop synergy between the hospital and medical school in the strategic planning process

3) Collaborate with the hospital in expanding the alliance with CSH to other institutions

4) Attempt to develop co-terminus contracting for managed care contracting between the faculty and hospital

- Dr. Fine stated that he has a lot to learn and Dr. Edelman will assist him during the transition. Dr. Fine will keep an open door to all faculty who wish to communicate with him.
- Dr. Benjamin inquired whether Dr. Fine was appointed an acting or permanent Dean.
  - Dr. Fine is the permanent Dean.
- Dr. Henry congratulated Dr. Fine for his negotiations in changing the relationship between the hospital and the SOM. Dr. Henry stated that this change is very positive and the SOM will be stronger for it.

**V. Address by the Vice President of the HSC**

**Dr. Edelman**

- Dr. Edelman stated that it is now a time of great optimism.
- He stated that Dr. Fine is clearly someone of vision, very knowledgeable of the institution, and has proven early on to be a good negotiator.
- Dr. Edelman described the times during which he came to Stony Brook as Dean. Shortly after he arrived at Stony Brook, NYS made hospitals responsible for employee fringe benefits, which resulted in a large deficit. In 2001 this was overturned by NYS resulting in a \$30 million subsidy, which CEO Bruce Schroffel was able to invest in hospital and faculty recruitment.
- Now we are improving upon our clinical programs such as the Heart Center and Cancer Center.
- Dr. Edelman congratulated the SOM for finding a fine new Dean in Dr. Fine.

**VI. Curriculum Committee**

**Dr. Williams**

- Dr. Priebe distributed the full membership list of the Curriculum committee and each member's email address.
- Newly elected members are:
  - H.Fleit(Path), P.Halperin(Psych), W.Rosenfeld(Winthrop-Peds), S.Simon(Biochem),H.Sussman(Fam Med), A.P.Viccellio (Emerg Med)
- Dr. Williams, the Chair of the Curriculum Committee, has organized the committee into 6 individual task forces, which were developed at the Faculty Retreat in April 2005. Each of these groups has its own charge for improving education. All 6 of these groups have already met at least twice, and their specific charges are described in the SOM website.
- The committee meets on the 1<sup>st</sup> Monday of each month at 8:00am, and all faculty are invited to participate.
- Dr. Williams then briefly described the task forces:
  - i. **Curriculum Content**-focus is on what core content we should be teaching, and what we should cut from the existing core content. Dr. Peter Halperin chairs this committee.
  - ii. **Curriculum Delivery**-focus in on methods of teaching; they are evaluating methods of independent study and web-based study, as well as how to reduce the amount of passive learning we utilize. Dr.Marilyn London chairs this committee.
  - iii. **Curriculum Integration**-focus is on integrating the separate components of core content. We will start using integrated case learning for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year students. Dr. Fine earlier had alluded to revising the 4<sup>th</sup> year curriculum, which this task force has actively been working on. Dr. Howard Fleit chairs this committee.
  - iv. **Communication and Culture**-focus is on problems with communication within the institution. The goal is to develop collegiality and an "esprit de corps" amongst the faculty. This committee is chaired by Dr. Peter Williams.
  - v. **Faculty Development** - This committee is trying to start a fellowship in education program. They have just sent out a questionnaire to the faculty, the data from which is presently being reviewed and analyzed. Dr. Elza Mylona chairs this committee.
  - vi. **Evaluation of Students**- all courses have some form of simulated evaluation. For example, history and physical exams performed on actors are videotaped.
- Dr. Williams stated that there would be another Faculty Retreat on Education, scheduled for December 10<sup>th</sup> at Sunwood. Each task force will present a report on their recommendations at this time. Hopefully the committee will come up with interesting and engaging concepts for change. There is now great opportunity with the new Dean and the task forces to make substantial changes.
- Dr. Priebe applauded Dr. Williams' work on the SOM Curriculum.

## VII. APT committee

**Dr. Priebe**

- Dr. Nachman, Chair of the APT Committee, was unable to attend the meeting due to religious observance.
- Dr. Priebe presented proposed additions to Policies of the APT Committee regarding a method of promotion without Chairperson's letter, the optional Personal Statement, and the requirement of 4 letters for non-tenured Research Faculty. These proposed additions were distributed to the Senate for their review.
  - **Promotion packet without Chair's letter (IIA)**
    - Discussion ensued regarding a statement to be added to address the issue of how one would apply for promotion if one's chairperson were not willing to write the requisite letter and obtain the necessary documentation to complete the promotion packet.

- The addition would be “ If the Chairperson declines writing such a letter, the candidate may request the Office of the Dean to assemble the necessary documentation for presentation to the Committee.”
  - One suggestion was to consider removing the words “...*declines*...” and simply state: “The candidate may request the Office of the Dean to assemble the necessary documentation for presentation to the Committee.”
  - Dr. Benjamin questioned how a Chairperson could refuse to write a letter for the candidate, as each department has a tenure committee responsible for evaluating the candidate’s credentials for promotion. The Dean could also insist the Chair write a letter.
  - Dr. Priebe added that the Chair can write a letter of disapproval.
  - Dr. Robert Parker, former APT Chair, helped to clarify this issue. It was initially discussed 5 years ago, when there was concern about how long some promotion packets were being held in a Chair’s office before being given to the Dean and to the APT Committee. A non-supportive Chair might not give due diligence to performing and expediting the process. He thought this new process might make it easier for a faculty member to circumvent an uncooperative Chair by going directly to the Dean’s office.
  - Concerns were raised that this process might allow a potentially unqualified candidate to supercede his/hers department’s disapproving recommendation. As a Departmental Executive Committee vote, referee letters and an APT Committee peer evaluation would still be necessary, this would be unlikely.
  - Dr. Priebe reiterated that the Dean’s office would just take the responsibility of ensuring that the APT Committee process was followed, not that the candidate could circumvent it. The APT Committee is advisory to the Dean, who makes the final SOM decision and recommendation to the President. The final approval comes from the the State Office in Albany.
  - Departments vary on procedures and process for peer review and how and when letters of recommendation are solicited. Some departments do an internal review after the letters are returned. This can cause delay.
  - Although the departmental review process might be negative, the faculty candidate could still ask the Dean’s office to continue the process.
  - Someone inquired what is the academic justification for this process that allows a faculty member to seek promotion despite the fact that his or her department reviews the candidate negatively.
  - Dr. Fochtman questioned whether the Chairs answer to the Dean, and if so, why couldn’t the Dean expedite the process simply by pressuring the Chairs to fulfill the process. She also found it difficult to believe that the Dean’s office could do a better job than an individual department in soliciting letters of recommendation
  - It was stated that a faculty member might have a personality clash with his or her Chairperson precluding promotion even though the faculty member is qualified for promotion.
  - Dr. Priebe indicated that final wording of this addition to the Policies of the APT Committee would be further discussed with the APT and Executive Committees.
- ***Personal Statement (II B)***
    - Requirements and guidelines pertaining to the optional Personal Statement were discussed.

- This optional (not compulsory) Personal Statement has already been passed by the Senate, but has not yet been added to the website.
  - The Senate had no new comments on this addition.
- ***Non-Tenured Research Faculty Requirements (II C)***
  - A minimum of 4 letters from persons of at least equivalent rank to that proposed for the candidate will be required, 2 of whom are outside Stony Brook or its affiliates and have had no direct association with the candidate as a substantive collaborator or mentor.
  - Checklist additions have been added to ensure the required information is submitted properly.
- ***Educator Scholar tenured track***
  - The Educator Portfolio required for the Educator Scholar track is still being developed, and will be presented to the Faculty Senate when completed.
  - Dr. Luft commented that this track has already been approved and many qualified faculty already are invested into the track. He was concerned that changing requirements for promotion at this time may affect the faculty's existing expectations for promotion through this track. He also expressed concern that the development of new criteria and requirements may unfortunately result in a lengthy process. He suggested we ask the people initially involved with developing this track to express their original intent.
  - Dr. Priebe answered that it is necessary for the APT committee to have strict, well-defined criteria for promotion through this track. A compromise was reached 4-5 years ago when this track was initially developed, but it is evident now that well-defined criteria for this track are needed.
- ***Transition to paperless system***
  - There will be a transition to a paperless system for the APT committee members to review packets electronically and confidentially.
  - Past attempts have been unsuccessful.

**VIII. Nominations for HSC Academic Advisory Committee, the HSC Advisory Committee on Faculty Appointments, and University Council on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.**

**Dr. Priebe**

- Dr. Priebe asked the Senate whether there were any Senators willing to volunteer some new University committees.
- Dr. Edelman is organizing a HSC Advisory committee, on which he would like 7 members; one representative from each of the HSC's five schools with an additional 2 representatives from the SOM.
- This committee will advise on policy and work on improving all of the programs of the HSC.
- Dr. Lindquist, University Provost, is organizing a University council on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.
- This committee will develop a set of minimum standards and rules for all University faculty, to which they must adhere.
- Any faculty interested in serving on these committees was asked to contact either Dr. Priebe or Dr. Johnson.

**IX. Next meeting 11/22/05 at HSC or Wang Center**

- Most Senators felt that the HSC was more convenient for the Senate meeting, rather than attempting to have the meeting at the Wang center.

**X. New Business**

- Dr. Benjamin questioned the process by which the new Dean was chosen
  - Dr. Priebe answered that the Dean's Search committee recommended several internal candidates for consideration to President Kenny. President Kenny then made her decision two weeks later.
  - None of the Dean candidates were interested in an interim position, so President Kenny felt it was prudent to hire the most qualified candidate as the permanent Dean.
  - Dr. Fine understands the pertinent issues of the SOM deanship well.
  - Someone commented that although Dr. Fine is well-qualified and will likely perform well as Dean, the long 3-year process of searching for our new Dean could be perceived as a failure.
- 
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be on **Tuesday November 22nd at 5pm.**
  - The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 pm.