Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
April 12, 2011

I. Welcome: Meeting called to order at 4:35 PM

II. Minutes of March 8, 2011 meeting were approved.

III. Dean’s Comments:
   a. Dean Richard Krugman was not in attendance at the meeting.
   b. No updates provided.

IV. Discussion and Approval Items
   
   A. Professionalism First Presentation: by Stephen Wolf, MD, Assistant Dean, Advanced studies, Phase IV.

   Additional details of presentation are available on the website: [www.ucdenver.edu/professionalismfirst](http://www.ucdenver.edu/professionalismfirst)

   Dr Wolff is charged with the educational campaign to launch this new process and to heighten awareness of the importance of professionalism across the Anschutz Medical Campus as it relates to medical education.

   Brief history was provided:
   In 2004 recommendation was made to set up a committee to enhance faculty professionalism due to concerns about faculty professional lapses.

   2009-2010 Anonymous system for 3rd party reporting system was developed/approved.

   Currently – Faculty Professionalism Committee has been established, designed to receive reports from students and residents. Goal is to prioritize the feedback and to complement the existing other reporting mechanisms such as faculty evaluations. The new reporting mechanism will be using a 3rd party that specializes in anonymity, EthicsPoint. Actions from this feedback would depend on the extent of the lapses, categorized as major and minor, see details on website above. Planned Go-Live date: April 18, 2011.

   ** Discussion and Questions Summary:**

   ** Is the information / feedback discoverable? Answer – In general: University does not own the data, EthicsPoint does. However, the issue is not completely resolved. Concern was that data can be entered anonymously by anyone and possibly non-founded reports may be used against a faculty member. Explanation of the procedure was provided. Persons reporting serious, major lapses would have to be eventually identified before the information would go
outside of the Professionalism Committee. Purely anonymous reports will have no consequence other than that the Professionalism Committee would read it.

** Reminder that this process was started due to an LCME violation (CU SOM reports of lapses 27%, much higher than national average of 15%) and that it is not unique; it is a companion to the existing reporting system.

** Will the information feed into Board of Medical Examiners database and affect license renewals? Answer – usually only hospital discoverable items will affect this.

B. VOICE Committee Report – presented by Dr. Celia Kaye, Sr. Associate Dean for Education.

Additional details of the presentation are available on the handout attached to these minutes.

Background – This Vision, Oversight, Innovation, Competence, and Evaluation committee was established 2 years ago to oversee undergraduate medical education along with the Faculty Senate.

This is the annual report to the Faculty Senate. The following Committee’s and Task Forces reported to the VOICE committee over the past year: Curriculum Steering Committee, Office of Diversity, Mental Health and Wellness Center, Volunteer Faculty, Scholarship Committee and Student Oversight Task Force.

Several accomplishments are outlined in the handout; of note are:

  ** Diversity Committee has worked hard to improve campus wide diversity as the SOM had received a citation about this in the past. Efforts were successful in large part also due to funds allocated for this by the Office of President Benson.

  ** Remediation task force has been developed to help struggling students earlier than before so they can get help before getting into serious trouble.

C. Discussion and Vote on Resolution Regarding Speakers’ Bureaus: Presented by President Chesney Thompson.

Background and details of these recommendations are available on the handout attached to these minutes and please also refer to minutes of previous Faculty Senate meetings for details of previous discussions.

There was a lot of feedback from the faculty to the faculty Senators since the last meeting. Despite the amount of negative feedback, there was agreement that there was no place for marketing presentations by faculty members for pharmaceutical companies. At the same time, there was concern about prohibiting talks where there is a need for service and education. The University does not want to lose these opportunities, so the faculty officers worked on the
wording of the resolution to clarify further what is considered marketing and a mechanism by which talks could be approved even though they were sponsored by pharmaceutical companies. There were 3 changes made in the resolution that was presented at the last Faculty Senate Meeting (see new resolution attached).

**Discussion and Questions Summary:**

** Use of the term “Clearinghouse” in context of the non-profits was discussed. There was a perception that the resolution meant that any talk to a nonprofit would have to be “cleared” through a new committee; this was not the intent – “clearinghouse” needs to be changed to a new word, so it is clear the “center” was meant to enable fundraising from industry, nonprofits and others.

** Discussion regarding the use of the term “speaker’s bureaus” – it needs to be clear that regardless of the name of the activity, the limiting factor with respect to the activity being acceptable are that:
- There is no specific emphasis on a particular product
- There is no use of pharmaceutical company slides.
- Pharmaceutical company has no say regarding content of the presentation.

** Discussion about the committee, several present expressed that the wording regarding this committee should be less tentative: “initiate” instead of “explore”.

** Discussion about educating faculty on parameters of acceptable interactions with pharma, suggestion that this be done at the departmental and/or divisional level, with emphasis on defining the answer to the bigger question of what the relationship between physicians and pharma should look like.

** Specific suggestions as to improvement of the policy:
- Have a clearly defined process by which the drug company contracts can be approved.
- Consider requirements such as that these activities can only be performed during non clinic or vacation time.
- Not to limit the restriction to pharma and devices but also nutritional supplements.
- Limits of amounts allowed to be earned to be left up to the departments

** Specific suggestions as to “approval committee”:
- Have a clearly defined committee name, function and rules.
- Guarantee 72 hr turnaround time to approve or deny application.
- Include an educational mandate.

** Discussion regarding whether to take a vote or not was lively. Sentiment was that the above suggestions for improvement should be implemented and then a vote taken at a future meeting. It was decided to take a straw vote on an “amended proposal” that would have changed wording as noted above without
dramatic change in meaning, and to clearly define the rules of the committee. The straw vote was 26 for and 6 against.

** Faculty officers will meet to amend the proposal and present it for a vote at the next Faculty Senate meeting on May 10, 2011.

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Debra A. Bislip, M.D., FAAFP
Faculty Senate Secretary