School of Medicine Faculty Council  
Joseph Sullivan, MD, Chair

MINUTES  
Thursday, November 8, 2012

PRESENT:  Joe Sullivan (Chair) Ellen Weber (Vice Chair), Robert Baron, Judith Ford, Harry Hollander, Celia Kaplan, Alma Martinez, Robert Nissenson

ABSENT: Marcelle Ceders, Cynthia Curry, Teresa De Marco, Elena Fuentes-Afflick, Ruth Goldstein Sam Hawgood, Catherine Lucey, Heather Nye, Phil Rosenthal, Lydia Zablotska

GUEST: Claire Brindis, member of the Operation Excellence Faculty Oversight Committee

Chair Joe Sullivan called the Faculty Council meeting to order at 3:39 p.m. in room S-118. A quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes from October 11, 2012 (Attachment 1)  
Chair Sullivan motioned for approval of the minutes. Council members approved.

Chair’s Report  
Chair Sullivan reported on the following issues:

- Space Planning Report  
Chair Sullivan had a brief conversation with Bruce Wintroub regarding the new Space Planning report. Bruce provided details about the report and expressed interested in giving a presentation to the Faculty Council. Council members agreed that it would be good to have Dr. Wintroub attend the next meeting. A detail they would like to hear more on from Bruce is what will happen to “release” space left over by departments moving to Mission Bay.

- SOM Chairs and Directors Meeting  
Chair Sullivan reported on the Marcelle Cedars recent attendance of the SOM Chairs and Directors group. This group gives reports on accomplishments and challenges of each of the departments. Issues covered at the meeting included:
  - Radiation Oncology and Anatomy – Information Technology has been a problem for this group. A lot of updates are needed.
  - Anatomy reported that the basic sciences are having financial issues. This problem is attributed to declines in state funding.
  - There was a presentation on the proposed Physician-Scientist Scholars program: As part of this program, scholars would receive salary and research support which will be split between the department and dean’s office for up to five years.

- Operational Excellence (OE)
An OE survey meeting is scheduled for November 28. All of the Faculty Council Chairs will meet with administration to discuss how to shape the survey in way that will be constructive in helping to improve OE. Claire Brindis, the Councils guest for the day, will also be in attendance to aid in the process.

**Vice Chair’s Report**
None

**Bylaw Revisions**
Council member Robert Nissenson gave an overview of the recent work to review and potentially revise the standing committee’s bylaws. Last year, the Faculty Council formed a task force to review the standing committee bylaws to address concerns about a lack of Faculty Council oversight. After review, the task force requested more information on polices and procedures of the committees from the vice deans responsible for each standing committees. Information requested included rosters, member terms, policies, procedures and relevant documentation. Member Nissenson noted that this month, he had finally received most of the needed information. With documentation now in hand, the question is what should the Faculty Council do next?

A case in point is the handling of the Student Welfare committee? This committee hasn’t meet in a couple of years and it has no clear membership. Council discussed the issue and agreed that more information is needed before any action could be taken. Member Nissenson motioned that the Council should ask Vice Dean Papadakis to attend a Council meeting to report on the business of the committee. Council members agreed.

Chair Sullivan then motioned that all vice deans should attend the Council meetings throughout the year to report on each standing committee. Deans can discuss the composition of the committee and give an update on business. Council members concurred and added that the vice deans should be asked when the most appropriate time should be for a report. Finally, Council members suggested that the standing committees should review their bylaws and recommend revisions. Over the course of the year the Faculty Council will compile all agreed upon revisions to the standing committee bylaws and submit the package for approval.

Member Nissenson then updated the Council that Vice Dean Maxine Papadakis has recommend changes to process for student disqualification. Currently, cases for student dismissal are first reviewed by Screening and Promotions Committee and then reviewed by Academic Standards Committee which may agree or disagree with the Screening committees recommendation. Faculty Council was informed that this process might be revised in the future.

**Discussion on the Proposed Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy Bylaw Revisions**
The rationale for the proposed the bylaw revisions are to expand the scope of responsibility of the committee to now include the continuum between undergraduate and graduate education. This is because medical education is shifting to a competency based methods. A goal is to have the committee work on establishing better transition points.

Council members were a little confused about some of the language CCEP revisions Section 2 Subsection b. and c. Council members would like to have this cleared up.

When Catherine Lucey attends to give her report, the Faculty Council will move to have the revisions approved. Until then, they will hold off on making a formal approval. Council members agreed.

**Update and Discussion on the Operational Excellence (OE) Evaluation Efforts in the SOM**
Claire Brindis, member of the OE Faculty Oversight Committee, gave an overview of the SOM and campus-wide efforts to evaluate OE.
When the OE program was first implemented at SOM, it was realized that evaluation metrics needed to be established to ensure that OE actually delivered upon its goals of reducing costs and maintaining or increasing efficiencies. To do this, faculty and administration looked to create a common tool that could evaluate the program on an ongoing basis. The result was a survey created by Dr. Brindis and several other faculty members from the Schools of Nursing and Pharmacy. This survey tool includes two parts: 1) A baseline survey that went out to faculty before OE changes were implemented and 2) a longitudinal survey titled, “How’s my Driving.” The survey is submitted to faculty after each time they have submitted a grant. The information that is provided through these surveys is collected by the OE administration and used to improve the program.

Dr. Brindis also added that while the survey is being used for evaluation, it was never meant to be the only method of evaluating the program. Other methods considered are personal oral interviews and other targeted measures. The oral interviews, for instance, could be done with faculty members that have had a positive experience with OE and faculty members that have had a negative experience. A concern about these evaluation methods is ensuring that faculty will not be overburdened.

Claire asked the Faculty Council members if they had any concerns with the survey or the evaluation process. Faculty Council member questions and comments included:

Q: Some faculty never received the “How’s my Driving” survey. Did the survey only go out to PIs, or are Co-PIs supposed to receive the survey, too.
A: All faculty who have submitted a grant should have received the survey. Dr. Brindis will contact Marge O’Halloran to ask for more details.

Q: Who is collecting and analyzing the data? Data and analysis should be made available to the faculty.
A: The OE team has analyst who do a great job at producing high quality analysis. Reports are posted to the OE website for faculty to access.

Q: It would best if an independent group gathered the data and provided an analysis.
A: Dr. Brindis noted that this is understandable concern and she agreed that an independent source would lend credibility.

Q: Faculty have concerns about the process of OE, but not with the OE staff member that helps them. Can the survey be revised to allow faculty members to comment about the process of OE?
A: Dr. Brindis will ask Marge if this change can be made to the survey.

Q: The email that comes out asking faculty to fill out the “How’s my Driving” survey should be more specific to which survey is associated with which grant. Right now the email is fairly vague.
A: Dr. Brindis acknowledged the concern and will forward the message on to OE administration.

Claire also presented her thoughts on the benefits of a qualitative survey. She noted that there still are a considerable amount of concerns. For example, how to reduce selection bias? Council expressed interest in a qualitative survey and members recommended that evaluators should interview faculty members that submitted grants in different areas.

Chair Sullivan then motioned that the Council should not engage in implementing the SON survey. Instead, Council members will work with Claire and the OE administration to edit the current survey and process.

**Old Business**

None
New Business
None

Chair Sullivan adjourned the committee at 4:58pm.
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