

Dean's Council (DC)

October 4, 2006

Minutes

Present: Dr. Arnold, Dr. Deckers, Dr. Ford, Dr. Garibaldi, Dr. Gould, Dr. Jacob,
Dr. Kenny, Dr. Lalande, Dr. Pappano, Dr. Simon, Dr. Strongwater

Excused: Mr. Gillon, Dr. Koeppen, Dr. Weber

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m. In Dr. Koeppen's absence, Dr. Garibaldi chaired the meeting.

1. The minutes of the July 5, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved.
2. Discussion began regarding allocation of General Funds to support a portion of all faculty salaries to reflect a level of commitment to the undergraduate teaching program. Some questions raised included whether this should occur at all; if the funds should be pro-rated according to tenure or non-tenure status; should it be a set dollar amount or a percent of individual salaries; should it depend on the faculty member's actual contributions; what would the cost be to the institution. Dr. Garibaldi also asked whether this is an issue the Dean's Council should undertake, whether it should be remanded to another Council, or whether an ad hoc committee should be appointed to address it. Dr. Deckers noted that there are some research faculty who are paid 100 percent by grants and who believe that they should devote 100 percent of their time to research and not contribute to the educational program because to do so would be in violation of the time and effort associated with the grant. Dr. Garibaldi noted that this is occurring on the clinical side as well. Faculty are so consumed with clinical responsibilities that they are unable to carry out their teaching responsibilities. However, Dr. Deckers believes that faculty appointments, whether clinical or basic science, carry with them the requirement to teach and that all faculty should contribute a minimum of five percent of their time to education. Dr. Strongwater noted that currently some new recruitments are allocated funds for educational activities and others are not. He feels there must be consistency when dealing with this issue. Dr. Deckers also cautioned that funds may not be available to support whatever is decided, and this might be another variable to consider in identifying the academic gap in the budget.

Dr. Deckers then put forth the following issues which he believes the DC should begin to address, or assign others to address, and which he feels may be more pressing.

- a. Faculty should seriously consider the organization of the Health Center at the leadership level, i.e. whether the current joint position of EVP/Dean is the best organizational structure going forward, and make their opinions known to President Austin and the Board of Directors.
- b. He explained that academic gap is the difference between annual academic revenues and academic expenses. A portion, but not all of the gap, is filled by General Funds. Some of the remaining gap is supported by the hospital, but Dr. Deckers feels this is a flawed economic model which cannot continue. He is trying to cause the legislature to recognize that the Health Center General Fund subsidy needs to keep pace with the legitimate academic expenses of the Health Center, but he needs input from faculty to be sure all academic expenses, including growth of new programs and research and development, are included.
- c. Dr. Deckers continues to believe there is a value to the School of Medicine in rehiring retired faculty to perform specific duties. Perhaps guidelines should be developed for the implementation of this. He will be bringing this issue to the Finance Subcommittee of the Board of Directors.
- d. He noted the need to decide the future of the Public Health Initiative and its relationship to the SOM.
- e. Faculty need to consider where the Medical School and medical education should be in 2015-2020 and whether a Committee of Scholars on Medical Education (COSME) should be created. This might be a group of faculty largely devoted to teaching, particularly in those areas where faculty are no longer classically trained (e.g. anatomy).
- f. He believes that as new research space is created, faculty must be involved in planning how the space will be redesigned and used. For example, it is not too soon to plan for Farmtech.
- g. He believes the DC is the appropriate body to vet suggestions that come out of department and center reviews and asked that it agree to advise him on the recommendations made in those reviews.

- h. He noted that matrix management is working better in some areas than others but continues to believe it is the right organizational structure.
- i. He noted the need for improvement in the area of philanthropy, and that faculty and alumni must realize that the institution cannot succeed without it.

Dr. Deckers excused himself from the meeting at 5:20, and discussion began on how to tackle these issues. It was agreed that each member, including Dr. Deckers, will provide their thoughts on each item and prioritize them by time sensitivity. The responses will be collated by Ms. Donatelli and brought back at the next meeting for further review and prioritization.

3. Liaison Reports

- a. Public Issues Council has touched on the Public Health Initiative, but it was noted that this Council needs guidance.
 - b. Clinical Council is discussing the role of chairs as it relates to clinical productivity and accountability.
 - c. Research Council is working on research compensation plans for both tenure track and in-residence faculty. They have also begun asking for research strategic plan proposals from faculty.
 - d. Education Council is still awaiting recommendations from the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee regarding interactions with pharmaceutical representatives. They have appointed an ad hoc committee to make recommendations regarding faculty teaching evaluations and how they can be done more uniformly and who would have access to them.
4. The following recommendation was made: That department and center review reports be provided to the Dean's Council, in addition to the Oversight Committee. The recommendation was unanimously approved. The Pharmacology Department review is complete, and Dr. Jacob will send a copy of the report to the members of the DC.
5. The following recommendation was made: That the chair of the department/center that has been reviewed provide a written response to the report which includes his/her support of the recommendations made or rebuttal. The recommendation was unanimously approved.

6. Dr. Jacob noted that she would like to identify specific questions for each department or center being reviewed. She indicated that she was going to ask for input from Dr. Deckers and the chair of the department/center, but would now like input from the DC as well.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 1, from 4:30-6:00 p.m. in the Medical Dean's Conference Room, AG-078.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Donatelli