



**Mount
Sinai**

ICAHN SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AT MOUNT SINAI



SELF-STUDY DESIGN

March 2013

Updated February, 2014

Prepared for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education

ICAHN SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AT MOUNT SINAI SELF-STUDY DESIGN

I. INTRODUCTION

Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai (ISMMS) is seeking reaccreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Initial accreditation was conferred in 2010 and this Self-Study Design represents the first step in the reaccreditation process.

ISSMS was established in 1963 through a charter from the New York State Department of Education. Conceived as an academic partner to the venerable Mount Sinai Hospital (MSH) and renowned for educational, scientific and clinical expertise and academic achievement, ISMMS and MSH together comprise The Mount Sinai Medical Center (MSMC). Sharing a multifaceted mission of excellence in education, research, patient care and service, the School and Hospital are known both nationally and internationally as biomedical leaders.

ISMMS offers degree-granting programs at the doctoral and masters levels. Full-time enrollment for academic year 2012-13 includes 567 students in the Doctor of Medicine (M.D.) program, 272 doctoral students and 225 master's students. The School also offers postgraduate research and clinical training opportunities, and continuing medical education courses. Our programs are highly competitive and attract outstanding students.

ISSMS has been a free-standing medical school since 2010, when it disaffiliated from New York University after a ten-year relationship. That affiliation, which was developed in parallel with a clinical alliance between MSH and New York University Hospital Center, had little practical impact on our School. ISMMS functioned autonomously, set its own educational agenda, developed its own curricula, evaluated its own programs and recruited, appointed and promoted faculty in accordance with the standards and policies of our own institution. ISMMS finances and infrastructure were totally separate from NYU's, as was the Board of Trustees. In 2007 the Board resolved to dissolve the academic affiliation relationship with NYU, and to establish ISMMS as an independent degree-granting institution without a university affiliation.

In 2012, upon receipt of a gift of \$200M from Carl Icahn – one of the largest donations ever to a medical school – Mount Sinai changed the name of the School from Mount Sinai School of Medicine to Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai. A charter amendment approving the name change was granted in December 2012.

As a Candidate for its first reaccreditation, ISMMS is required to use MSCHE's Comprehensive Self-Study Model. As was the case in our initial accreditation by MSCHE, we will undertake an in-depth analysis of our programs, processes, people and infrastructure in order to confirm that we meet or exceed all MSCHE standards. The Self-Study also affords an opportunity for us to assess our progress in resolving challenges identified in the original Self-Study in 2010, and to determine whether there are additional challenges to address.

Voluminous information will be available to the Self-Study Steering Committee and work groups for review. The Self-Study document that we prepared for our initial MSCHE accreditation provides an excellent foundation for beginning this second Self-Study. Indeed, the challenges identified in that initial review will comprise an important focus in our current efforts. We will also draw on our experience having undertaken self-studies for program accreditation by a variety of external agencies. For example, in 2012, our self-analysis and subsequent review by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education resulted in maximal accreditation of the M.D. program. Similarly, program accreditation activities through the Council on Education for Public Health and the American Board of Genetic Counseling (which accredit our M.P.H. and M.S. in Genetics Counseling programs, respectively) will prove valuable as we undertake this MSCHE Self-Study. Also of value will be quantitative and qualitative reports that Mount Sinai periodically submits to external agencies.

II. INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY

The Self-Study for our initial accreditation had enormous value to our school. It prompted introspection about our policies and processes, stimulated dialogue about a wide range of issues, and helped us to identify and address problems or potential problems. During the current Self-Study, we are once again committed to using the MSCHE Self-Study as an opportunity for growth. Faculty, students and administrators will collaborate in critiquing our performance within the context of the School's mission.

Specific goals that for the reaccreditation Self-Study include:

- Creating broad awareness of our mission and of the importance as a community of working together to achieve excellence in our academic programs
- Using the MSCHE standards as a framework for identifying institutional strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement and growth
- Assessing institutional success in interweaving our mission with our planning and evaluation processes to ensure optimal institutional effectiveness
- Demonstrating to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education that Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai meets or exceeds all standards and is deserving of reaccreditation.

III. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE SELF-STUDY

A. Steering Committee

Dean Dennis Charney, M.D. has appointed and charged a Self-Study Steering Committee to oversee the process. The Steering Committee reflects broad representation from the M.D. program, the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, central administration and our governing board and includes academic leaders, faculty, administrators and trustees. Following correspondence describing the overall Self-Study process and extending invitations of membership, the Dean convened an initial meeting of the Steering Committee. He welcomed members, emphasized the importance of the Self-Study and outlined expectations. Consistent with MSCHE requirements, Dr. Charney explained that consideration of the ISMMS mission must be a driving force for deliberations of both the Steering Committee and the work groups. He further explained

that as an institution seeking initial reaccreditation from MSCHE, we must follow MSCHE's Comprehensive design model and broadly address all MSCHE standards.

Dr. Charney charged the Steering Committee with:

- Identifying key issues to examine in the Self-Study
- Developing a structure for the Self-Study design, including:
 - Establishing work groups organized around specific issues/concerns and/or MSCHE standards
 - Ensuring that all MSCHE standards will be addressed by the work groups
 - Developing research questions for each work group to address
 - Creating an administrative structure to provide each work group with adequate support to conduct their research/analysis and write their reports
 - Creating a timetable for the Self-Study
- Monitoring work group progress
- Advising, assisting and supporting work groups as needed
- Reviewing preliminary work group reports to confirm that the research questions outlined for the Self-Study are addressed
- Facilitating communication within ISMMS about the process and products of the Self-Study (See Appendix A)
- Coordinating work group reports to create a single, cohesive, meaningful Self-Study document
- Arranging the institution-wide review of the Self-Study
- Overseeing completion of the final Self-Study report

- Overseeing the site visit by the MSCHE review team
- Responding to site visit report

Appendix B is a list of Steering Committee members and their titles. To ensure that a comprehensive review is undertaken, the Steering Committee Co-Chairs are the Dean for Medical Education and the Dean for the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, who together have broad oversight for all of our academic programs. The Steering Committee will meet periodically throughout the Self-Study.

B. Work Groups

Five work groups organized around the MSCHE standards have been created by the Steering Committee. Work group Chairs are all faculty members selected for their roles and functions within ISMMS and their knowledge of the areas of focus; a number of the work group Chairs are Chairs of academic departments. Each Chair is paired with a Co-Chair with administrative expertise relevant to the work group. In the case of the Assessment Work Group, two faculty co-chairs plus an administrative co-chair have been assigned in order to ensure sufficient input from all programs.

Work group Chairs will convene and lead meetings, facilitate communication among members, and oversee preparation of interim and final reports of their groups. Below is a matrix summarizing the MSCHE standards assigned to each Work Group. The membership list for each group is provided in Appendix C.

Work Group	Standard Addressed (Standard #)
Mission and Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission and Goals (#1) • Leadership and Governance (#4) • Administration (#5) • Integrity (#6)
Planning and Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal (#2) • Institutional Resources (#3) • Institutional Assessment (#7)
Faculty Effectiveness and Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty (#10)
Student Education and Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Admissions and Retention (#8) • Student Support Services (#9) • Educational Offerings (#11)
Assessment of Student Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Student Learning (#14) • Institutional Assessment (#7)

Each work group will be required to provide evidence that ISMMS has met the relevant MSCHE standards. In the event that weaknesses are identified, concerns will be articulated and recommendations will be proposed. The focus of each work group will be to evaluate ISMMS within the context of its relevant standards and assigned Research Questions provided by the Steering Committee; however, as appropriate, the groups will have the latitude to consider other pertinent areas and propose alternative Research Questions.

In assembling the work groups, careful consideration was given to ensuring that all School constituencies are represented and have a voice in the process. We have learned through experience that a wide range of interests and perspectives is crucial to a productive Self-Study, and the membership is intended to reflect the rich diversity within the School.

Work groups are encouraged to invite faculty, administrators and students to attend specific meetings as “consultants.” This affords flexibility to add special perspectives or expertise to deliberations as necessary.

Department Chairs have been notified of which of their faculty have been appointed to the Steering Committee or work groups. Having this information is important so that Chairs can grant their faculty sufficient time to devote to the Self-Study process, and can also support them in their efforts. In light of the emphasis that the Dean and sub-Deans place on conducting a thorough Self Study, participation in the process is considered an essential service to the School.

C. Administrative Support for the Self-Study

The Office of the Dean is committed to ensuring that an appropriate administrative structure is available to support the Steering Committee and the work groups so that they can conduct their deliberations and prepare their reports within the necessary timeframe.

Administrative support for the Self-Study will be coordinated by Senior Associate Deans Phyllis Schnepf and Leslie Schneier and Senior Director of Enrollment Services Kevin Cavanagh; all three will serve on the Steering Committee and will also Co-Chair the work groups, so that they will have intimate and ongoing insight to the evolving needs of the Self-Study process. Analytical and secretarial assistance will be arranged as needed. The administrative team will facilitate communication between the Steering

Committee and the work groups, coordinate meetings, assemble and disseminate data and documents, and serve as an overall resource to the Self-Study. A flexible staffing model will be used so that additional personnel can be tapped as needs arise.

IV. CHARGES TO WORK GROUPS

As is required by the Comprehensive Self-Study Model, the work groups will examine specific research questions developed around the MSCHE standards. The Steering Committee will charge each work group Chair with the responsibility of leading his/her group in identifying issues, validating strengths, raising concerns and reaching consensus; under the Chairs' guidance, each work group must produce a cohesive and relevant set of recommendations that are encapsulated in a group report.

The Steering Committee, impressed by the successful organization of the work groups assembled for the original accreditation Self-Study, has adopted a similar approach for the reaccreditation Self-Study. Using a similar structure will facilitate assessment of progress and roadblocks in targeted areas since the initial effort was undertaken. Thus, five work groups will be formed, although the precise focus of the work groups and the research questions that they address will differ from the original Self-Study in order to capture issues of current relevance.

Below is a description of the focus of each group, the MSCHE standards that will provide the context for each group's deliberations, and the key research questions that each group will address.

A. Mission and Governance Work Group

Charge:

The Mission and Governance Work Group will examine the ISMMS governance and administrative structures in order to determine whether they support the School's mission and provide a framework for meeting our goals in an effective and efficient manner, while at the same time providing an ethically sound environment.

MSCHE Standards to be Addressed:

Standard 1: Mission and Goals. The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance. The institution's system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

Standard 5: Administration. The institution's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance.

Standard 6: Integrity. In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.

Research Questions for the Mission and Governance Work Group:

1. **Mission:** Which elements of our mission are most important to the furtherance of our educational goals? Are we successful in ensuring that the mission supports those goals? Has alignment of our mission and goals changed with the disaffiliation from NYU and/or the creation of the Mount Sinai Health System?
2. **Governance:** What impact, if any, have our status and structure as a free-standing medical school within a Health System had on our ability to carry out our multi-faceted mission? If any negative impact is detected, what might we do to reduce or eliminate that impact?
3. **Integrity:** How have our expanded conflicts of interest rules contributed to the integrity of our educational, research and clinical programs? Are there other changes that similarly affect the integrity of our programs?

B. Planning and Resources Work Group

Charge:

The Planning and Resources Work Group will assess the inter-relationship among institutional planning, decision-making and resource allocation to identify possible positive or negative effects on the School's ability to meet its strategic goals.

MSCHE Standards to be Addressed:

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal. An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources. The human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment. The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Research Questions for the Planning and Resources Work Group:

1. **Planning:** Does the ISMMS Strategic Plan continue to have a primary influence on the direction of the School's programs and processes? How and why are changes to the Plan introduced over time? Are our planning processes effective in allowing ISMMS to fulfill its mission and meet its goals?
2. **Resource Allocation:** How are resource allocation decisions made at the institutional and departmental levels? What impact do resource allocation decision-making processes have on the ability to conduct our business and meet our goals?
3. **Institutional Assessment:** Are the key mechanisms for evaluating ISMMS similar to those used before we were a free-standing school? What is the relationship between the School's fiscal performance and its mission achievement in all arenas?

C. Faculty Effectiveness and Support Work Group

Charge:

The Faculty Effectiveness and Support Work Group will examine whether and how the composition and size of the ISMMS faculty is appropriate for carrying out the School's mission and providing positive and fulfilling educational experiences for our students. The work group will also consider whether institutional resources and programs for recruiting and assessing faculty and supporting their professional growth are satisfactory and contribute to the School's goal achievement.

MSCHE Standard to be Addressed:

Standard 10: Faculty. The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

Research Questions for the Faculty Effectiveness and Support Work Group:

1. **Faculty Development:** Has the recently implemented faculty mentoring program enhanced the professional experience of our faculty and supported their needs? Have other faculty development initiatives have been introduced and if so who do they serve and what are their goals?
2. **Appointments and Promotions Process:** What changes to the faculty promotion criteria and processes have been introduced since the initial accreditation? What is the motivation for the changes and what impact have they had on our faculty?

D. Student Education and Services Work Group

Charge:

The School's success is predicated upon its ability to attract, retain, and graduate exceptional students. To that end, the Student Education and Services Work Group will review ISMMS's recruiting, admissions, orientation, student services, financial aid, information technology, and other relevant educational policies to ensure they appropriately meet the needs of our students, and are consistent with Sinai's mission.

MSCHE Standards to be Addressed:

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention. The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students' educational goals.

Standard 9: Student Support Services. The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings. The institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Research Questions for the Student Education and Services Work Group:

1. **Student Admission and Retention:** How effective are Sinai's recruiting and admissions strategies in attracting a qualified and diverse student body prepared for the rigor of Sinai's curricula? How does Sinai review and make changes to its plan for recruitment, admissions, and marketing?
2. **Educational Offerings:** How well does Sinai ensure that its academic offerings are consistent with its core mission and its commitment to excellence in education and research? What are Sinai's criteria for determining whether it is meeting its

mission to provide education that is both comprehensive and of the highest quality?

3. **Educational Offerings:** Are the information technology support services available to Sinai's students effective at meeting students' needs? How does Sinai determine the resources necessary for its libraries and educational support services?
4. **Student Support Services:** What changes in provision of student support services have been implemented since the last Self-Study, and what benefits have they brought to the educational experience at Mount Sinai? How does Sinai assess the effectiveness of its student support services and how does it determine which services to introduce, improve, or eliminate?
5. **Student Support Services:** How effective is Sinai's orientation programming in informing students of available academic, enrollment, and support services, especially given the students' unique transition into medical education or research intensive environment?
6. **Student Support Services:** Is ISMMS successful in providing financial assistance to students? Does Sinai communicate effectively to students regarding the financial aid programs/debt reduction programs available to them?

E. Assessment of Student Learning Work Group

Charge:

The Assessment of Student Learning Work Group will address how Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai assesses both its specific student learning goals and its broader institutional effectiveness. This work group will review assessment processes, evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment processes and determine whether outcomes are in line with our institutional mission, goals and objectives.

MSCHE Standards to Be Addressed:

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment. The institution has developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in: achieving its mission and goals, implementing planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes; using institutional resources efficiently; providing leadership and governance; providing administrative structures and services, demonstrating institutional integrity and assuring that institutional processes and resources support appropriate learning and other outcomes for its students and graduates.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning. Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution's students have the knowledge, skills and competencies consistent with institutional goals and that students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals.

Research Questions for the Assessment of Student Learning Work Group:

1. **Program Assessment:** Are assessments of student learning of adequate quality? Do they yield direct evidence that is clear, tangible, convincing, and purposefully relates to the program's key learning outcomes? Do they have results that are sufficiently accurate and truthful that they can be used with confidence to make decisions?
2. **Program Assessment:** How do our educational programs prepare students to apply their knowledge and skills to transition successfully into the workforce (residency, post-doctoral position or job)? How do we assure our graduates are effectively transitioning?
3. **Program Assessment:** Do our programs continue to align with our mission and do they foster scholastic rigor, analytic thinking and the ability to analyze complex systems or problems? Have we prepared our students to seek, analyze and apply new scientific discoveries into their practices and research and use this information to educate patients, colleagues, staff, and future scientists?
4. **Program Assessment:** Are our graduates able to partner across disciplines and work effectively as team members?
5. **Program Assessment:** How have new programmatic offerings been integrated into existing assessment systems?

F. Guidelines for Work Group Research and Reporting

Each group will be expected to produce a report that includes:

- A description of the work group charge and its research questions.

- A description of the discussion and analytic approach adopted by the group. If subgroups are formed to address specific tasks, these should be articulated. Key resources used by the group should be noted.
- A discussion of strengths and weaknesses, particularly as they relate to the MSCHE standards. Document-based evidence and associated analyses supporting these assessments should be included.
- Confirmation that the relevant MSCHE standards are being met.
- Recommendations for addressing weaknesses, real or perceived, and ensuring continued or expanded strengths.

Each work group Chair will receive a template to guide in the preparation of the individual reports. The Chairs must submit a work group progress report to the Steering Committee; this report, due midway between initiation of the Self-Study and submission of the work group report (an exact date will be provided to them) will summarize:

- How the work group approached its research questions
- Key data sources
- Plan for completion of final report

Additionally, at each Steering Committee meeting the work group Co-Chairs will provide an oral progress report on the five work groups.

Work groups will be expected to submit their final reports by July 15, 2014.

V. INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

A significant amount of quantitative and qualitative information will be made available to Self-Study work groups. A preliminary inventory of major documents is provided as Appendix C. The document list is likely to expand as the work groups delve into their research questions and seek additional information.

VI. ORGANIZATION OF SELF-STUDY REPORT

The Self-Study report will be structured as follows to adhere to MSCHE requirements and to present a logical and coherent document:

Executive Summary

- Brief description of our findings and subsequent recommendations
- Eligibility Certification Statement

Introduction

- Brief overview of ISMMS
- Description of Self-Study process

Discussion by Standard:

- Outline of the topics studied and the supporting documents and resources used, including materials that were also relevant to multiple standards
- Analysis of how the evidence was used to identify strengths and challenges and to confirm compliance with each standard
- Presentation of recommendations for improvement based on the analysis

Conclusion

- Summary of major conclusions and recommendations

List of Supporting Documents

- List of documents that will be available to the visiting team

Appendices

VII. EDITORIAL SYTLE AND FORMAT FOR REPORTS

All work group reports and the institutional Self-Study report will be completed on standard 8 ½” x 11” paper, with upper and lower margins of 1” and side margins of 1.25”. Times New Roman, 12 font, with double spacing and indenting at beginning of each paragraph will be used. Degrees will be presented with periods, e.g., M.D. rather than MD.

The template provided for the work group reports (as mentioned in Section IV-F) will facilitate uniformity of submissions. Work group Co-Chairs will serve as lead editors because of their familiarity with the template, and will be responsible for adhering to the established guidelines.

VIII. TIMETABLE

The following timeline has been developed for the Self-Study process:

February 2013	- Steering Committee Chairs appointed
March 2013	- Steering Committee appointed
	- Steering Committee develops Self-Study Design
	- Work groups appointed
April 2013	- Self-Study design submitted to Middle States

- Preliminary visit by Dr. McKitrick
- February 15, 2014 - Work group deliberations commence
- May 15, 2014- Work groups submit interim reports to Steering Committee
- July 15, 2014 - Work groups submit final reports to Steering Committee
- September 2014 - Self-Study Report draft completed
- October 2014 - Community input solicited
- November 2014 - ISMMS BOT reviews the Draft Self Study Report
- Draft Self-Study Report submitted to Team Chair
- January 2015 - Chair site visit
- November 2014 – March 2015 - Self-Study Report finalized
- March 2015 - Final report submitted to Middle States
- May 2015 - Middle States Site Team Visit

IX. PROFILE OF VISITING EVALUATION TEAM

ISMMS is one of only a small number of free-standing U.S. medical schools, i.e., we are not part of or affiliated with a university. Accordingly, there is a relatively limited pool of similar institutions from which to draw for purposes of assembling a peer group for the Self-Study site visit. In Mount Sinai’s initial accreditation by MSCHE, it was acknowledged that we share many attributes with university-affiliated medical schools and a review team that included representatives from universities was considered to be appropriate. We feel that a similar approach would be applicable for the reaccreditation

site team, i.e., that a certain set of attributes will be important in site visitors regardless of whether or not they hail from an independent school:

- Site team members should have experience with in the education and practice of medicine and/or biological sciences.
- Site team members should have experience with institutions of higher education that place a strong emphasis on academic research.
- At least one site team member should have a strong financial background/perspective.

APPENDIX A COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

The Steering Committee will be responsible for facilitating communication within ISMMS about the process and products of the Self-Study and will use the Self-Study Design document as a reference guide. A range of communication modalities will be tapped to ensure broad awareness of and input to the Self-Study from beginning to end.

Some key avenues of communication will be:

- Updates to ISMMS Dean – The Dean will be apprised of the progress of the Self-Study on a regular basis through:
 - Regularly scheduled 1:1 meetings that Dr. Charney conducts with Deans Muller and Morrison and Senior Associate Deans Schneier and Schnepf
 - Bi-weekly reports from Senior Associate Deans Schneier and Schnepf at the Dean’s Operations Committee meetings
 - Ad hoc updates as necessary or as requested
- ISMMS Leadership – The ISMMS Dean holds group meetings with Department Chairs and Institute Directors on a regular basis. At those meetings, he updates attendees on School news, programs and events. Self-Study progress reports will be incorporated into those updates.
- Faculty and Administrators - Department Chairs and Center directors will relay to their faculty and staff information that they learn about the Self –Study from their meetings with the Dean. Chairs who serve on the Steering Committee or in work groups will be able to provide their faculty and administrative staff with a particularly

intimate perspective on the Self-Study progress. The Faculty Council will receive periodic updates of the Self-Study process.

- Students – As Deans of the M.D. program and the Graduate School respectively, Drs. Muller and Morrison will update students on the Self-Study. Students will also be appointed to work groups and can share their experiences with their peers; they can also formally apprise students of the Self-Study through the Student Council.
- Trustees – The Medical Education and Graduate School Subcommittees of the Board will receive periodic updates on the Self-Study. Because we also have Trustee representation on the Self-Study Steering Committee, the lines of communication with the Board will be strong.
- Entire ISMMS Community - The mssm.edu website will be a key ongoing resource for disseminating information about the Self-Study; it will provide information on both the process and our progress. The Self-Study Design will be posted on the web, as will draft reports to encourage review and solicit comment. The availability of the draft Self-Study Report, representing the compilation of all of the work group reports into a single document, will be especially critical for purposes of public awareness and comment.

Additionally, the Dean will periodically send blast e-mail updates to the faculty, staff, students and trainees updating them on the Self-Study process and progress both for informational purposes and to solicit their input.

APPENDIX B
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

John Morrison, Ph.D. (Co-Chair)
Dean, Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences
Dean, Basic Sciences
Professor of Neuroscience and of Geriatrics and Palliative Medicine

David Muller, M.D. (Co-Chair)
Dean Medical Education
Professor and Chair, Medical Education

Kevin Cavanagh, M.B.A.
Senior Director, Enrollment Services and Student Information

Robert Friedman, M.B.A.
Trustee
Member, Graduate School Subcommittee of the Board
Member, Medical Education Subcommittee of the Board

Donald Gogel, J.D.
Trustee
Chair, Medical Education Subcommittee of the Board

Basil Hanss, Ph.D.
Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences
Associate Professor, Medicine

Stephen Harvey, C.P.A., M.B.A.
Senior Vice President for Finance

Yasmin Hurd, Ph.D.
Director, M.D./Ph.D. Program
Professor, Neuroscience and Psychiatry

Reena Karani, M.D.
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education and Curricular Affairs
Associate Director, Mount Sinai Global Health Center
Director, Institute for Medical Education
Associate Professor, Medical Education, Geriatrics and Medicine

Robert Krauss, Ph.D.
Professor, Development and Regenerative Biology

Paul Lawrence, M.F.A.
Vice President, Academic Informatics and Technology

Leslie Schneier, M.B.A., M.P.H.
Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Administration

Phyllis Schnepf, M.S.
Senior Associate Dean for Education and Research Operations

Albert Siu, M.D.
Professor and Chair, Geriatrics and Palliative Medicine

APPENDIX C
WORK GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Mission and Governance Work Group

Burton Drayer, M.D. (Chair)
Professor and Chair, Radiology

Leslie Schneier, M.B.A., M.P.H. (Co-Chair)
Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Administration

Wayne Goodman, M.D.
Professor and Chair, Psychiatry

Elizabeth Herries, J.D.
Senior Associate General Counsel

Andrew Leibowitz, M.D.
Chair, Faculty Council Committee
Professor, Anesthesiology

Rhoda Sperling, M.D.
Chair, Conflicts of Interests in Research Committee
Professor, Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Science

Ming-Ming Zhou, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair, Structural and Chemical Biology

Student
TBD

Planning and Resources Work Group

Kristjan Ragnarsson, M.D. (Chair)
Professor and Chair, Rehabilitation Medicine

Leslie Schneier, M.B.A., M.P.H. (Co-Chair)
Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Administration

John Davey, M.A.
Director, Digital Editorial Services

Stephen Harvey, C.P.A., M.B.A.
Senior Vice President for Finance

Rama Iyengar, M.B.A.
Senior Associate Dean for Planning and Resource Management

Alan Krissoff, M.A.
Director, The Levy Library

Reginald Miller, D.V.M.
Associate Professor and Director, Center for Comparative Medicine and Surgery
Associate Dean for Research Resources

Michael Schaffer, M.P.A.
Chief Operating Officer, Faculty Practice Associates

Faculty Effectiveness and Support Work Group

Phillip Landrigan, M.D., M.Sc. (Chair)
Dean for Global Health
Professor and Chair, Preventive Medicine

Phyllis Schnepf, M.S. (Co-Chair)
Senior Associate Dean for Education and Research Operations

Gary Butts, M.D.
Senior Associate Dean for Diversity Programs, Policy and Community Affairs
Professor, Medical Education

Lakshmi Devi, Ph.D.
Associate Dean for Academic Enhancement and Mentoring
Professor, Pharmacology and Systems Therapeutics

Jenny Lin, M.D.
Associate Professor, Medicine

Sandra Masur, Ph.D.
Professor, Ophthalmology
Director, Office for Women's Careers

Leslie Schneier, M.B.A., M.P.H.
Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Administration

Juan Wisnivesky, M.D., Dr.P.H.
Professor, Medicine

Student Education and Services Work Group

Ross Cagan, Ph.D. (Chair)
Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences
Professor, Developmental and Regenerative Biology

Peter Gliatto, M.D. (Chair)
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education and Student Affairs
Associate Professor, Medical Education

Kevin Cavanagh, M.B.A. (Co-Chair)
Senior Director, Enrollment Services and Student Information

Allison Gault, M.D.
Assistant Professor, Pediatrics

Marek Mlodzik, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair, Developmental and Regenerative Biology

Ann-Gel Palermo, M.P.H., Dr.P.H.
Associate Director for Operations, Center for Multicultural and Community Affairs
Assistant Professor, Pediatrics

Valerie Parkas, M.D.
Associate Dean for Medical School Admissions
Associate Professor, Medical Education

Lily Recanati, M.P.A.
Administrator, Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences

Michelle Sainte
Assistant Dean for Academic Administration

John Graves
Director, Instructional Technology

Students
TBD

Assessment of Student Learning Work Group

Basil Hanss, Ph.D. (Chair)
Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences
Associate Professor, Medicine

David Thomas, M.D. (Chair)
Professor, Medicine

Phyllis Schnepf, M.S. (Co-Chair)
Associate Dean for Education and Translational Research Operations

Janice Gabrilove, M.D.
Director, Clinical Research Program
Professor, Medicine

Nils Hennig, M.D., Ph.D., M.P.H.
Director, Public Health Program
Assistant Professor, Preventive Medicine

Reena Karani, M.D.
Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs and Undergraduate Medical Education
Director, Institute for Medical Education
Associate Professor, Medical Education, Geriatrics and Medicine

Brian Nickerson, Ph. D.
Administrative Director, MS Program in Health Care Delivery Leadership

Matthew O'Connell, Ph.D.
Professor, Oncological Sciences

Rainier Soriano, M.D.
Associate Professor, Geriatrics and Palliative Medicine

Christina Wyatt, M.D.
Assistant Professor, Medicine

Karen Zier, Ph.D.
Associate Dean for Medical Student Research
Professor, Medicine

Randi Zinberg, M.S.
Director, Master of Genetic Counseling Program
Assistant Professor, Genetics and Genomic Sciences

Student
TBD

APPENDIX D
PRELIMINARY INVENTORY OF RESOURCE DOCUMENTS

Mission, Governance, Administration, Planning

Mission Statement
Strategic Plan
Board of Trustees Charter and Bylaws
Faculty Council Bylaws
Student Council Constitution and Bylaws
Minutes, Leadership Meetings
Table of Organization
Student Services Organization Chart
Student Services Reports and Plans
Dean's Reports

Financial Information

Audited Financial Statements
Current and Prior Year Budgets
Revenue and Expense Projections
Annual Scholarship Reports
Development and Fundraising Plans
CARTS Budgeting Process and Policy Information

Institutional Infrastructure

Facilities Master Plans
Renovation and Construction Project Summaries
Information Technology Inventory
Academic Informatics Plans
"Reconceiving the Levy Library" Report
Department Review Protocol and Data Requirements

Policies for Faculty, Students and Staff:

Student Handbooks
Faculty Handbook
Human Resources Policy Manual
Conflict of Interest Policies
Leadership Role and Responsibilities of the ISMMS Course Director
Student Orientation Materials
New Beginnings Handbook for Staff
Research Policies, e.g., Program for Protection of Human Subjects
Clinical Research Curriculum Guide
Medical Staff Bylaws

Institutional and Programmatic Accreditation

2010 Middle States Self-Study Report
2011 LCME Self Study Reports
Genetic Counseling Accreditation Documents
MPH Accreditation Documents

Internal Assessment Resources

Admissions Statistics
Alumni Surveys
Current and Projected Enrollment by Program
Faculty Publication Data and Competitive Analyses
Graduate School PhD and M.D./Ph.D. Tracking Information
IPEDS Data
MSCHE Annual Data Submission
Medical Scientist Training Program (MSTP) Progress Report Summary
Medical Student Performance Evaluation (MSPE) Data
United States Medical Licensure Examination Data
National Resident Match Program Report
PhD Retention/Progress Data
PhD Thesis-related Publication Data
Student Surveys
Training Grant Progress Reports
Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Database Reports
Faculty Development Seminars and Workshops