

**Stony Brook School of Medicine  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
October 21, 2003**

**Dr. C. Priebe – Presiding  
Dr. J. Weisberg – Recording**

Faculty Senators present (see sign-in sheets)  
Meeting Commenced: 5:10 pm.

I. JCAHO Site Visit

Dr. William Green

- Reviewed highlights regarding upcoming (December) JCAHO visit
- Beginning 2006 all visits (every three years) will be unannounced
- Must always be prepared (See attached handout)
- Discussed potential consequences of less than full accreditation.
- Emphasized importance of medical staff participation
- JCAHO looks for quality of care by proper documentation

Areas of emphasis:

- Leadership
- Patient safety
- Sentinel events

Root Cause Analysis (RCA) – a cause analysis done before the event might occur to prevent the (negative) event from occurring

(For example, since instituting “Code H” in the past week and a half, three patients have been sent to the Cardiac Catheterization lab within 90 minutes of arrival in the Emergency Department)

- National patient safety goals (everyone must know)  
7 goals (on handout)
  1. Improve accuracy of patient identification
  2. Improve effectiveness of communication among caregivers
  3. Improve safety of using high-alert medications
  4. Eliminate wrong site, wrong patient, and wrong procedure surgery
  5. Improve safety of using infusion pumps

6. Improve the effectiveness of clinical alarm systems

7. Reduce risk of health care-acquired infections

II. Dean's Report

Dr. Edelman

1. LCME – While there were many strengths, the main criticism was management of curriculum, including the following:

- Not centralized enough
  - No satisfactory review of curriculum content
  - Should be a school function, not departmental function
- Recently, the two Secretaries of the LCME provided a consultation which was very helpful. We need to act relatively quickly to:
- Accept our institutional objectives
  - Review each course with the goal of determining which of the institutional goals the course should address.
  - Review course to see if it meets objectives, if not, institute changes by Curriculum Committee rapidly.
- Personnel
- New position to provide counseling services to students
  - Educational specialist.

Dr. P. Williams announced the Faculty Retreat November 15<sup>th</sup>. Information can be found at:

[academics/facultylinks.html/objectivesproject](http://academics/facultylinks.html/objectivesproject)

- An opportunity for you to provide your input/feedback

Dr. S. Simon stated that LCME is recommending a “bottom-up process.

Faculty that instruct students have active role (as opposed to Directors)

2. Functioning of AP & T

- 85% of packets are handled expeditiously  
However, those that are not affect morale tremendously

- Some are problems of the Dean's office slowing up process.
- Others are problems of AP & T subcommittee
- Very rarely is dept. vote overturned by AP & T because department sends down only those promotions that are "deserving."
- Question that has recently been raised in AP&T: Should subcommittee chair review packet alone and take to the subcommittee his/her recommendation regarding yes or no vote? In cases in which Subcommittee Chair is unsure then review within subcommittee...

### III. Dean's Search-Reinitiated

Dr. C. Leske

- The committee has reviewed available candidates
  - Identified two people who came for interviews
  - One invited for second visit, now contemplating third visit
- Prepared a new letter sent to leaders in academic medicine
  - Received approximately 3 dozen applications
  - Reviewed process of each committee member
  - Identified six people to bring for initial screening.
  - Seen four people – two more in early November.
  - Then final candidates will come back for 2-day interview with President Kenny and leadership of SOM

#### *Discussion & Questions raised by Senators*

Dr. Priebe raised the repeated request for the EC to have contact with candidates.

Dr. Leske reassured the Faculty Senate that this would when and if appropriate in the candidate's interview process.

Dr. Weisberg questioned why there are ongoing interview if there is a candidate already in the third phase of the interview process

Dr. Leske responded that fresh candidates are always being evaluated

Dr. Fochtman asked if the President was going ahead with the audit of CPMP and if the President was first meeting the candidates prior to them undergoing the interview process.

Dr. Leske indicated she was unsure about the status of the CPMP audit but that the President is not meeting the candidates first and is agreeable to meeting with them in accordance with the Search Committee's schedule and plan...

Dr. Ed Feldman asked if the committee same or different as the prior search committee

Dr. Leske answered that it is exactly the same as it was when Dr. Glass was Chair.

IV. Minutes of June 24, 2003 Dr. Weisberg

Minutes were accepted as is without changes or modifications.

V. Policies and Procedures of the AP&T: Dr. Priebe  
Discrepancies with Faculty Senate Bylaws

Dr. S. Baumgart: There are inconsistencies between Faculty Senate bylaws and AP&T policies and the "task" is to try to "streamline" them and make them consistent

A) Issue of Departmental voting on Promotions/tenure (Section II c)

Vote to change departmental vote (Section II c)

All in Favor of change (yes) – All Senators present  
All against change (No) - None  
Abstain – 1 Senator

B) Issue of outside reviewers (Section IIIA (4))

Dr. Priebe suggested discussion the discussion be tabled until the following Faculty Senate meeting due to time limitations.

Dr. Weisberg suggested that we discuss the issue at the present meeting due to the urgency of the issue and interest it raised

Drs. Fochtman and W. Benjamin agreed with Dr. Weisberg's suggestion

Dr. Priebe agreed to enter discussion, at which point a lengthy and “spirited” discussion ensued. Some of the key points included:

- It was mentioned that outside reviews on non-tenured promotions have not occurred in a few years
- Dr. W. Benjamin mentioned that there is no requirement for outside review for voluntary. Faculty or faculty with modified title (needed letter from outside institutions- not calls, etc.).
- It was suggested that the AP&T Committee construct a table (i.e. Excel) that shows what has been done and what needs to be done for each candidate for tracking purposes.
- Dr. Fochtman asked for a breakdown of the number of individuals being put up for tenure versus those being put-up for promotion without tenure  
She also suggested finding out about all sources of delay before considering changing the review process.
- Dr. Priebe indicated that the AP&T committee is able to deal with the process adequately and that many of the delays arise from the Dean’s office and the Departments.
- Dr. E. Smouha reiterated what Dean’s said and asked about the process to change the By-laws
  - Dr. Weisberg described the process of changing the Faculty Senate Bylaws.
- Dr. M. Parker stated that we need information from the AP&T Committee about what the delays entail
- Dr. Priebe will ask Dr. Baumgart to gather more information regarding the various factors influencing outside reviews, reasons delays occur, the frequency of such delays, how often such delays are due to outside reviewers and anything else that might provide additional data so that the Senators are able to discuss and vote on the issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30

