Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
February 8, 2011

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

II. Minutes of January 12, 2011 meeting were approved.

III. Dean’s Comments - Dean Richard Krugman

A) Status of Searches:

i) Surgery Chair search committee has started working and is coordinating with Denver Health Surgery Chair search that has also started since their chair has also resigned. Searches are being coordinated to avoid confusion with candidates and institutions. Dr. D’Ambrosia is heading the UCH search and Dr. Phil Mehler is heading Denver Health search, DH is looking for primarily for a trauma surgeon.

ii) Emergency Medicine Chair Search is in progress. Three persons have visited. Two more airport interviews are scheduled for 2/22/2011. Expectation is that a preferred candidate will be selected soon.

B) Affiliation Agreements:

i) Denver Health: has passed legal review, will be presented to Executive Committee next week.

ii) National Jewish Hospital: work ongoing.

iii) VA Hospital: conversations ongoing.

C) Other:

i) Promotion and Tenure Task Force was charged last week. Harley Rotbart, MD, and Nancy Zahniser, PhD will co-lead this group and the task force will come to Faculty Senate in the next 2-3 months to present ways to improve the rules and process of promotion and tenure.

IV. Discussion Items

A. University Accreditation Update: Presented by Terry Potter, PhD, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Effectiveness.

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

The institutional accreditation is important in order to maintain the accreditation that UC Denver has had since 1913 and is on a 10 year cycle. The next site visit
is April 4-6, 2011. Reaffirming the accreditation is required for access to student loans and for quality assurance to the public, students and potential students.

Congress is raising the bar on accreditation because of large amounts of money defaulted on and UC Denver’s goal is to get a clean slate and not have any ongoing lingering accreditation issues. A Review Team has been formed to prepare for the site visit. A schedule is being made for the site visit and the plan is to have an open forum at the end of the 2nd day when the Accreditation Team will be visiting the AMC. The Review Team is preparing a self study in preparation of the visit and will also prepare a briefing document that will outline how the institution meets and exceeds the criteria of excellence.

More information on the Accreditation Process and steps involved in preparing for this is available at: www.ucdenver.edu/accreditation. Once the schedule is finalized it will also be posted on this website.

The Review team would like feedback from the Faculty Senate regarding how large a group may be expected to participate in such an open forum.

B. Faculty Disclosures Resolution: Presented by Anand Reddi, Medical Student II.

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

Background – long before recent Pro Publica article, the medical students started this project to correlate faculty disclosures with those made when presenting to peers in lectures and at conferences. The students had a perception similar to the public, which is of uncertainty if certain faculty affiliations would influence material presented in lectures.

The students met with Dr. Lowenstein, Dr. Michaels, Dr. Ronald Gibbs and Dr. Robert Eckel and now have a proposed new policy. This policy is not meant to add anything new, just expand on the existing policy. The policy is meant to be voluntary, not intended to be enforced and would entail that there would be a general disclosure prior to each lecture in phases 1 and 2, to indicate whether there are financial ties that are disclosed to the University or that there are no financial ties.

There was a discussion amongst the senators that addressed whether the students felt a lack of trust or that they were being “sold”. This is not the case, they would just like disclosure. Also addressed was whether the disclosure should be specific to the lecture at hand in the opinion of the lecturer, instead of a general disclosure and whether it should be voluntary or required. The students feel that making it required would give the impression of distrust and they would prefer a broad disclosure that they can then research themselves so that it is not subjective to if the lecturer thinks it is related to the specific lecture or not.
Dean Krugman’s feedback is that the proposal as presented is too timid because it is voluntary and too unfocused because of the broad character of the disclosure. The recommendation is to go back to all affiliates and return to this body at a future time for further discussion.

C. Recommendation Regarding Speakers’ Bureaus: Presented by President Chesney Thompson.

Background and details of these recommendations are available on the handout attached to these minutes. The recommendations are presented to start a discussion, in the broadest sense to get to a new definition of acceptable collaboration with pharmaceutical and other medical supplier companies in a way that does not interfere with the CU COI or UPI practice agreements.

In brief, the recommendations are:
1. Participation in Speakers’ Bureaus to be prohibited for all faculty members.
2A. All other speaking and consulting arrangements to go through UPI for contract review and billing.
2B. Re-define and clarify SOM Exempt Honoraria, these would not require review by UPI. All other arrangements then must go through UPI.
3. SOM to develop enforcement and monitoring policies.
4. SOM to establish "Clearinghouse" center for industry to provide support for research and education to help separate individual faculty members from payer sources.

Discussion and Questions Summary:

** Rationale for UPI – follow precedent of medical-legal income. This task would be very large for option 2A. For option 2B, the list of exemption would need to be very specific and then anything outside of that list would need to go through a review.

** UPI Agreement already states that all income except for exempt honoraria and one time engagements need to be assigned.

** “One time” needs to really be so, thus – separate invitation each time, not part of ongoing involvement.

** Possible penalties – current discussion is taking place in Executive Committee whether schools and departments should request re-payment by those who violated agreement and if so, what should be re-paid.

** What about faculty employed by VA, DH and NJH? DH and VA do not permit consulting unless totally in faculty’s own time.

** Clinical (volunteer) faculty are not subject to these limitations.
** School rules need to clearly state that participating in marketing is not what we should be doing and new ways to do education without marketing will need to be developed.

** There has been interest on part of pharmaceutical companies to support a center for education and CME. There is acknowledgement that maintaining a good relationship with the pharmaceutical companies is critical.

** Acknowledgement that junior faculty may not be willing to try and sort out whether giving a certain talk falls within the accepted parameters or not and at the same time that talks are important promotion criteria.

** As much as having a good definition of Speakers' Bureaus is important as is the development of a separate education clearinghouse, there may still be a public perception that “pharma money” is funding medical education and other activities. Public perception includes the regents who may get the impression that medicine is being adequately funded by pharmaceutical companies.

** Dean Krugman encourages all to consider that it is important for SOM and the faculty senate to decide how we want to govern ourselves and not just because of public perception.

** General mood during the meeting was one that a list of exemptions should be worked on. Proposal was made by President Thompson to create and define new rules and refine the recommendations presented today. Officers will work on this and bring refined recommendations out at midmonth so the senators will have a chance to discuss with their constituents before continued discussion at the March or April Faculty Senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 6:05 PM

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