

Approved Minutes
College of Medicine Faculty Council
Meeting Friday, October 27, 2017
12 noon – 1 pm
Downing Hall 2315

1. Call to Order by President Dr. David Kennedy at 12:07 p.m.

Faculty Present:

Shobah Ratnam, Joseph Margiotta, Rande Worth, Robert Mrak, Chris Cooper, David Weaver, Andrea Kalinoski, Kandace Williams, William Maltese, John M. Wryobeck, Deepa Mukundan, Diya Raman, Wafaa Hanna, Kam Yeung, James Judkins, Bill Gunning, George Moukarbel, Cathy VanHook, Andrew Hsu, Melissa Gregory, Steven Haller, Stan Stepkowski, Travis Taylor, David Weldy, Kate Eisenmann, Alexei Fedorov, Sadik Khuder, Gretchen Tietjen, Jeffrey Hammersley, David Giovannucci, Kristi Williams, Beata Lecka-Czernik, Jennifer Hill, Lance Talmage, Nagalaksami Nadiminity, Amira Gohara, Jyl Matson, Viviana Ferreira, Juan Jaume, Thomas Papadimos, Michael Rees, Patrick Frank, Steven Haller, Jason Huntly, Champa Jayasuriya, James Judkins, Saurabh Chattopadhyay, Edward Kakish, Ruili Xie, Haitham Elsamaloty, Mehmood Rashid, James Van Hook, Jerzy Jankun, Jiayong Ciu, Vithal Shendge, Rajesh Gupta, Lucy Goodenday, Cynthia Smas, Jiang Tian, David Kennedy, Shirly Bodi, Stan Stepkowski.

A motion for the approval of the June, 2017, COM minutes was approved.

A motion for the approval of the August, 2017, COM minutes was approved.

3. Report of the Executive Committee: David Kennedy, PhD

The most important information by the report of the Executive Committee is the fact that College of Medicine is represented by 14 Faculty Senators: Mark Bonnell (year 3), Ruili Xie (year 3), Bill Frank (year 3), Jason Schroeder (year 3), David Weldy (year 3), Joan Duggan (year 2), Juan Jaume (year 2), Beata Lecka Czernik (year 2), Nikolai Modyanov (year 2), David Giovanucci (year 1), Saurabh Chattopadhyay (year 1), Jeffery Hammersley (year 1), and James Willey (year 1). The Executive Committee has welcomed new COM Council Representatives: Dave Weldy (Family Medicine), Jeremy Laukka (Medical Education), and Jorge Ortiz (Surgery) who just started their 3 year terms. All senators represent the interests of the College of Medicine at the University of Toledo Senate.

4. Update on Provost Hsu's requested changes for the APT procedures: Melissa Gregory, PhD

The proposed changes requested by Provost Andrew Hsu intend to unify the work of one APT Committee for the University of Toledo. These changes are intended to accomplish the following goals: 1) Common institutional practice for all colleges, as at other public universities; 2) Faculty written and provost approved procedures; 3) Serve as a model for every college and provide guidelines for departmental elaborations; 4)

Establish broad standards and expectations for the entire University of Toledo; 5) Define shared concepts and procedures; 6) Protect faculty interests with centralized procedures and requirements; 7) Stabilize university culture for the process of promotion and tenure; 8) Establish continuity across all different colleges and departments; 9) Enhance fairness of tenure/promotion process for all faculty members; and, 10) Improve recruitment and retention of the Faculty at the University of Toledo. Each of these points was briefly presented and discussed by Dr. Gregory.

The views of the Faculty Members about changes on APT procedures were subsequently presented and discussed:

What are the goals of the University-level Tenure and Promotion and Guidelines? The review of current COMLS APT policies at the College of Medicine was presented by Joseph Margiotta PhD (Chair, COMLS APT Committee), and Joan Duggan, M.D. (Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs). The details are presented at the existing website: http://www.utoledo.edu/depts/facaffairs/pdf/rules_regulations.pdf

The efforts by the University of Toledo were presented as a proposal to Faculty Senate Executive Committee to draft guidelines. The APT changes should represent the collaborative faculty effort to protect and represent each of the colleges. The Committee was then formed by Faculty Senate to include the following representatives: Melissa Gregory, Chair (Arts and Letters), Patricia Relue (Engineering), Linda Rouillard (Arts and Letters), Mark Templin (Education), James Willey (Medicine and Life Sciences). Between June and July 2017 this Faculty Senate Committee drafted the document which already was revised and presented in August 2017. The completed draft was finished in September and October 2017, which then was circulated for the feedback by Deans of all involved colleges, AAUP, as well as the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

The APT proposal provides detail guidelines for the College of Medicine and Life Science faculty who are applying for tenure and promotion. The intention is to assure that all candidates for promotion and tenure participate in the same process of internal faculty review as the Main Campus faculty. The scheme of the process would have the following flow of the review in 3 stages: [Stage 1] by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) → Department Chair → [Stage 2] by College → Committee on Academic Personnel (CCAP) → College Dean, and [Stage 3] University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) → Provost → President.

The proposed review process should provide: 1) Feedback to candidates about their development and progress in each of the 3 categories (teaching, research and administrative activities); 2) Mentoring regarding how best to advance both the candidate's goal of advancement in rank and tenure as well as the university's educational mission with respect to the candidate's academic assignment; and, 3) Information about documents and recommendations for tenure and promotion as stated in the current draft of the University-level Tenure and Promotion.

Guidelines to regular performance feedback and mentorship are central to: 1) Faculty success in promotion, academic and scientific activities; and 2) Faculty retention at the University. Mentored faculty members across ranks [in medical schools] reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction and more positive perceptions of their roles in the organization.” Specific, timely feedback measurably improves job performance among medical professionals. . . . Feedback provides faculty members with the information and tools they need to adapt their behavior and adjust more effectively to new situations”

Published work about Faculty Performants and Satisfaction related to The Process of Proposed Changes:

— “Does Formal Mentoring for Faculty Members Matter?” *Medical Education* 50 [2016]: 670.

—Shannon Fox, “Ideas in Practice: How to Provide Effective Performance Feedback,” AAMC publication, 2011. (from the AAMC’s Faculty Forward website, which makes recommendations about medical school practices based on their 2011-12 survey.)

Proposed internal review process: It should be well organized, stable, and timely. Everyone should be on the same timeline called “Academic Personnel Calendar”. It is important that candidates know when to expect the feedback. The main objective should be very clear to everyone and the review process must be unbiased. It is very important that the entire process is not dependent on just one person. The broad perspective need to be the highlight of the entire process. It also needs to be inclusive to allow multiple opinions heard at the review time. The organization should support the consensus among all involved parties and should be guided by the unified purpose. It is expected that collegial atmosphere is included. There is shared responsibility for the candidate’s progress: multiple colleagues should invest in the candidate’s advancement at the University. It is also important that different activities at the University are included in the dossier, such as teaching, professional activity, and service.

There are multiple examples of other medical schools that use DPC, Chair, CCAP, Dean in annual reviews of tenure/promotion candidates. University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP): Tenured Associate or full Professors only; one from each college with faculty under the jurisdiction of UCAP, namely: Arts and Letters; Business and Innovation; Education; Engineering; Health and Human Services; Law; Natural Sciences and Math; Nursing; Pharmacy; Library (1 rep); Comprehensive. Multiple individuals involved in assessment and evaluation. More pairs of eyes better than one. Objective and unbiased. No Chairs or Deans. Experienced. 3-year terms, with 1/3 of the members retiring each year. Familiar with process of evaluating faculty from wide range of disciplines (Musicians, Pharmacists, Lawyers, and Astronomers). Respectful of previous levels of review. Due consideration to recommendations and findings of preceding units.

5. Faculty Senate Report: Jeffrey Hammersley, MD and David Giovannucci, PhD

There are the following positives: One unified process for all faculties regardless of which college; Simplification of the process and adding objectivity and unbiased review. The APT committee should include members with experience; they are nominated for 3-year terms, with 1/3 of the members retiring each year. Members who are familiar with the process of evaluating faculty may represent a wide range of disciplines (Musicians, Pharmacists, Lawyers, Astronomers, etc). The process at different levels should be respectful of previous levels of the review.

There are Pros and Cons to modifying the COMLS APT process. These Pros and Cons should be discussed, made available at the public forum, and formally discussed with our faculty. The common position is that one process for all faculty regardless of which college the faculty member is the simplification of the APT process for faculty with joint appointments. At least for those with a joint appointment in, for example, the Department of Medicine and the Department of History. Single APT system is in place at a number of Universities (for example OSU).

Arguments for Cons: Dual APT system (separate APT structure for COM and Main Campus) is in place at a number of Universities. The present ATP process is substantially different than that of the main campus faculty (different requirements for promotion and tenure, different role for tenure in Medical School, different requirements for clinical faculty, different role of science faculty and teaching faculty). Each department established over years of experience the criteria for promotion and tenure and these criteria are not always comparable with those at the main campus. The APT procedures are twice a year in the Medical School and it is proposed to be once a year for the University. Twice a year review is beneficial for the Medical School and should stay in place. The main Cons are the following: 1) Different metrics for payment, work schedules, and responsibilities; 2) Different criteria for achievement; 3) Non-union employees have very different contracts and thus are evaluated by distinct criteria; 4) Teaching, professional activities, service are viewed differently; 5) Clinical work is difficult to categorize under the new system; and 6) Potentially a steep learning curve for the campus based faculty trying to adjudicate the contributions of medical school faculty and physicians.

6. Graduate Council Report: Andrea Kalinoski, PhD
7. Clinical Affairs Committee Report: Shobha Ratnam, MD
8. Old Business:
 - Update on Faculty Compensation Plan: Bryan Pyles
 - Update on New Medical School Curriculum: Shirley Bodi, M.D.
 - Update on Undergraduate Research Initiatives: Steven Haller, Ph.D., David Kennedy, Ph.D

Directed Research in Human Health Sciences: Personal integration of undergrads into human health science education and mission of UT's Health Science Campus; Laboratory embedding with Health Science Campus PI's; Students learn and execute the experimental techniques; focused mentorship with project: work with graduate students/postdocs on existing projects; individualized learning environment; mentoring

and long-term relationships; work-study option; approved by the Faculty Senate in Oct. 2016; course number: Interdisciplinary (INDI) 4000; Cross-listed with Biology (BIOL 4910 and Honors) and Chemistry/Biochemistry (CHEM 4910) on the main campus; COM faculty must receive permission from the department of Chemistry and Biochemistry to accept students from this department; Credit Hours: 1-12 (1 credit hour = 3 hours/week); terms offered: Fall/Spring/Summer; current sections: 12 Faculty mentors; students: 10 (3 students completing Honors Thesis); additionally: 19 Bioengineering placements over the past 5 years in the following COMLS labs: Dr. Joshua Parks, Dr. Jamie Teeple, Dr. Baptista, Dr. Wang, Dr. Marthe Howard, Dr. James Willey, Dr. Elsamaloty (Radiology), Dr. Hussein El-Gafy, Dr. Jianyong Liu, Dr. Julie Westerink, Dr. Joseph Margiotta, Dr. Guillermo Vazquez, Dr. A. Champa Jayasuriya.

Directed Research in Human Health Sciences. To register for a section each faculty member will need to provide: Maximum enrollment. Contact information/lab location. Office hours. Contact: -David Kennedy: david.kennedy@utoledo.edu; Steven Haller: steven.haller@utoledo.edu

Update as of October 27, 2017: every undergraduate student can get involved in research; there are 12 faculty mentors; 10 students completed under honors program; how information about these possibilities are transmitted to students?

9. New Business-none

10. Adjourn at 1 :11 PM