

**Stony Brook School of Medicine**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**January 27, 2004**

Dr. Cedric Priebe (Presiding)  
Dr. James Weisberg (Recording)  
Attendance: Please see attached attendance roster

Dr. Priebe called the meeting to order at 5:15.

**I. Review of Minutes: Dr. Priebe**

- The minutes of the November 2003 were distributed to all in attendance.
- The minutes were accepted without modification.
- Dr. Priebe thanked Dr. S. Baumgart, who took minutes for Dr. Weisberg in his absence.

**II. Dean's Search Committee Dr. Leske**

- Reviewed the process the committee has been adhering to in searching for a new Dean
- Presently, there are two candidates
- There will likely be an additional candidate in February
  - In response to Dr. Priebe's question, the Faculty Senate was informed that three (3) candidates have returned for second interviews and that one (1) candidate has been for a third interview and has met with some of those present (including the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate)
  - In response to a question from a Faculty Senator, Dr. Leske addressed CPMP issues as a primary reason past candidates did not work out; specifically, issues related to the resources and structure of CPMP
  - In response to a question from a Faculty Senator, it was revealed that there is possibly an ongoing dialogue between the candidates and President Kenny. The Search Committee has not provided input to President Kenny regarding a recommendation, so no recruitment has occurred.

**III. LCME Dr. Williams**

LCME Criticisms

- The medical school lacks an integrated system of curricular management
- School educational goals are not framed as measurable and therefore are not adequately measured
  
- The pre-clinical curriculum was reviewed. Some of the results of the review included better coordination of exam schedules, decrease number of exams, integrations of courses and clinical correlates etc.
  
- Evaluation of courses should be related to the medical school's objectives as well as each other
  
- Teaching/learning strategies-Faculty Development Workshops
  - To improve teaching

- Using new educational technology
- Innovative Groups
  - First year curricular rearrangement
    - ICM
    - Cells, Anatomy, Physiology
    - MCS
- Objectives Project
- **Clinical Course Director's Committee?**
  - Standardized student evaluation
  - 3<sup>rd</sup>. year elective
- Curriculum Committee needs new members
  - One (1) Interim replacement-Clinical
  - Five (5) members needed for three-year terms beginning this June
    - Two (2) basic sciences
    - Three (3) clinical

**IV. AP & T Policy Changes**  
**see attached slides**

**Dr. Priebe**  
**(for Dr. Baumgart)**

- Overall goal is to look for agreement from the Faculty Senate that the proposals being put forth are reasonable

(The proposals were reviewed as shown on the attached slides)

The following questions/issues were raised by Senators:

- What is the time frame for how long one can't have a mentorship/collaborative relationship with a reference?
  - There was some discussion on whether this should be a specified time length (5, 10, 15 years) or defined in a different manner. It was decided to first vote on the proposals, then return to this issue.
- There needs to be a statement defining the term "tenure-eligible"
- Dr. Fochtmann suggested that the change in the number of required reference letters from six (6) to four(4) needs to be described clearly as a change in policy, rather than just a clarification
- There was considerable discussion about the number of letters, number of outside reviewers for clinical educators and the length of time one should have no mentorship or collaborative relationship with a tenure applicant.
  - As previously indicated, it was determined by the President of the Faculty Senate that clarification, update and a consensus about the overall document was in order at present, rather than focusing on the specifics
  - The Faculty Senate proposed a vote on changing the policies of the AP&T Committee to read as shown on the document generated by Dr. Baumgart (dated 1.22.2004)
  - There was concern among Senators that sufficient confusion remained and needed to be clarified before voting
  - The following changes were made:
    - Switch II-B 2 and II-B 3
    - Addition of the words "tenure" and "tenure-equivalent" in II-B 1, 2,3,4

- Define “tenure-eligible” as an *assistant professor eligible for tenure*
    - Define “tenure-equivalent” as a *person working at an institution not supported by the state*
  - Questions regarding delays in the promotion and tenure process were raised and the following were provided as possible reasons
    - Clinical chairs take long periods of time to complete packets
    - The Dean’s office takes a long time to review packets
    - Individuals on the AP&T committee take a long time to complete the review process
- Research Educator Track
  - The question of adding a basic science educator track, similar to the clinical educator track was raised
  - There was no resolution, but general agreement that there should be such a track

**V. University Faculty Senate**

**Dr. Priebe**

- Need to replace representative to University Faculty Senate
- ? Add basic science faculty member to replace Martha Furie

**VI. RAAP Committee**

**Dr. Priebe**

- Produced a report in 2001
  - Some recommendations were carried out, others were not followed
  - Would like to reactivate the RAAP Committee
  - If interested, please inform Dr. Priebe

**VII. New Business**

- It was requested that someone from the Research Foundation come talk to the Faculty Senate

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15pm