

**State University of New York
School of Medicine
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting
March 23, 2004**

**Dr. Cedric Priebe - Presiding
Dr. Lester Kallus - Recording**

The meeting commenced at 5:05 pm.

I. CARE Report ----- Michael L. McClain

CARE was formed about two and a half years ago to "Create A Respectful Environment". As plans were made to expand and renovate the physical plant, the hospital administration saw this as an opportunity also to create a new culture to complement the new physical plant.

Initial questions were:

1. What do we want this place to be?
2. What can we do to make this the kind of place we can be proud of?

A number of barriers were identified:

1. Cynicism, disagreements and distrust
2. Disagreement
3. Inter-departmental difficulties
4. Mismatched communication systems
5. "Things don't work right"
6. Staff feelings that their needs aren't met

The initial focus was to:

1. Address the disrespect some staff have for others
2. Upgrade the skills of the leadership in the hospital
3. Employee recognition programs incorporated into the CARE program

These foci could not be achieved without the cooperation of the medical staff. Dr. Arnold Katz has been the liaison with the Senate Executive Committee and worked to pass the Code of Ethics.

The two phases for CARE are:

1. Work at the supervisory level (the current phase)
2. Work at the grass roots level (future phase)

CARE is currently looking for volunteers.

II. Senate Membership-----Dr. Priebe

Senate Bylaws stipulate a membership comprised of 70 Clinical and 30 Basic Science faculty. The current membership includes 59 Clinical & 23 Basic Science faculty. Efforts are continuing to fill the membership.

III. APT Committee -----Dr. Priebe

The Policies of the APT Committee concerning the letters of support for appointment and promotion on tenured and non-tenured tracts have been collected and updated as shown in the following attachment. They were approved by a recent E-mail vote of the Faculty Senate, 28 for and 3 opposed.

Policies of the Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure School of Medicine—SUNY at Stony Brook

Suggested revision to article II-B. on page 1 of this document (requirements for letters of recommendation solicited by the Department Chairman):

II-B. For tenured, or tenure-equivalent positions (i.e., Scholars tracks, see Note below), a minimum of **six (6)** letters from persons of rank and tenure status at least equivalent to those proposed for the candidate must accompany the Department Chairman's information packet for the APT Committee's consideration. A *summary list* of these referees shall also be submitted with the candidate's packet indicating the following requirements.

1. These referees shall be chosen by the Departmental Chairman from those submitted to him/her by the candidate, and from additional referees of the Chairman's own choosing.

The Chairman will identify those referees chosen by the candidate with an **asterisk (*)** on the *summary list* of referees submitted to the APT Committee.

2. For promotion of candidates at SUNY Stony Brook or its affiliates, **four (4)** of these referees must be persons from outside SUNY Stony Brook and its affiliates.
3. At least **three (3)** of the outside letters must be from referees not chosen by the candidate and who have had no direct association with the candidate as substantive collaborators or mentors.
4. For appointment of candidates coming from institutions other than SUNY Stony Brook or its affiliates, at least **four (4)** of these referees must be from outside the institution at which the candidate has been working.

For Clinical Educator (non-tenured track, full time faculty) positions for appointment or promotion, the number of letters required will be decreased to 4 (at least 3 requested by the Department Chair), and at least 2 letters must be from individuals from outside of the candidate's department in the Stony Brook SOM or their previous institution. Letters may come from individuals who have worked with the candidate as a mentor or colleague, and may be from individuals at Stony Brook or any of its affiliates. They must come from individuals who hold a faculty appointment at the proposed faculty rank or higher.

For Voluntary Faculty (non-tenured track), 4 letters, at least 3 requested by the Department Chair, will be required. These letters may come from any source (inside or outside of the

institution) but must be from individuals who hold a faculty appointment at the proposed faculty rank or higher. There will be no requirement for outside letters.

Letters for all tracks shall clarify the writer's current knowledge of the candidate's character, scholarship quality and productivity, teaching capacity, clinical ability (See II, G, below), national stature, and service to his/her University. It is important that the writer of each letter state that he/she supports the appointment or promotion to the specific rank or tenure status proposed for the candidate.

Note:

Tenure-equivalent indicates an individual working at an affiliate institution not supported by New York State who has met the same qualifications as a tenured State employee.

The roles of Voluntary Faculty have also been reviewed. The following guidelines were approved by a close vote of 16 for and 15 opposed on the recent E-mail ballot for Senators.

Clinical Associate Professor: This title would be awarded to volunteer faculty who show evidence of providing significant and outstanding clinical service on a regular basis. Such service might include provision of specialized programs, teaching medical students or residents, providing lectures, participating in tutorials, direct clinical service or collaboration with full-time faculty. Letters of support would provide the primary documentation. There should be evidence of continued growth of reputation and maturation of teaching skills which should be evident over a five to ten year period.

Clinical Professor: To be awarded this rank, an individual would be expected to provide evidence of continued outstanding and regular clinical service as outlined above over an additional five to ten year period. Letters should provide evidence of a continued teaching commitment and general recognition of the significance of the clinical service.

The Voluntary Faculty Promotion Applications submitted to the Dean's office would not be reviewed by the APT Committee unless the APT Committee was specifically requested to review the application.

IV. RAPP Committee -----Dr. Priebe

The previous members of the RAPP Committee were asked if they wanted to continue serving on the committee. There remains an opening for 6 members. Some faculty have already expressed an interest. Dr. Priebe asked the senators for any other volunteers.

V. Search for the Dean Candidate-----Dr. Priebe & P. Williams

The Executive Committee was asked to help interview the most recent candidates. Members of the EC met with her on March 17, 2004. The two candidates interviewed by the EC to date have proved to be competent individuals skilled and experienced at dealing with problems. Both have made it clear that they required resources beyond what's currently offered to the Dean's Office.

Dr. Peter Williams stated there were at least four issues commonly discussed regarding assets available to the dean.

1. The dean has attenuated influence on the allocation of indirect cost (IDC) research distributions to departments and some believe the proportion available to the dean is low.
2. The dean has attenuated influence on the allocation of Part A money which, atypical for medical centers with hospitals, goes directly from the hospital to the departments. Even if the actual allocations to departments were unchanged, having the money go through the dean's office would increase the dean's influence.
3. The dean's tax on practice plan income is low by national standards and some of it, though earmarked for School of Medicine activities and projects, is no longer under the control of the Vice President but managed by the Office of the President. Again this raises an issue of influence; not concerns about actual distribution.
4. The dean's flexibility with state salary dollars is limited because an extraordinarily high percentage of them are tied up in tenured faculty lines and staff with permanent appointments. Almost all clinicians are paid by a combination of state dollars (often not very many) and a part of the clinical income they produce. Most basic scientists are virtually fully on state money and the significant salary offset money they produce from grants stays in the investigator's department. Most institutions comparable to ours use salary offset money to lower the percentage of state support and permit the dean and chair to use the freed state dollars to meet other needs.

Dr. Williams noted that each of these items involves important and legitimate interests of groups vying for control of these resources, and that dean candidates understandably seek to increase their control.

VI. Curriculum Committee -----Dr. Priebe

Dr. Barrocco's position on the Curriculum Committee has become vacant. Dr. Joseph Sorrento was approved as a replacement without dissension.

VII. Pornography on the Internet -----Dr. Priebe

Stony Brook has purchased software to block pornography on institutional computers. Some Senators pointed out that this software occasionally has blocked legitimate non-pornographic websites. Furthermore, it was pointed out that with this software in place faculty would be precluded from doing research on pornography. Dr. Priebe was asked and agreed to be on a committee with representatives from all the HSC schools to evaluate any refusals of requested access by Dennis Proul, CIO of SBUH and Security Officer.

Dr. Kallus agreed to discuss the issues with the Informatics Department and will report back to the Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.