

Dean's Council (DC)

February 7, 2007

Minutes

Present: Dr. Albertsen, Dr. Arnold, Dr. Ford, Dr. Garibaldi, Dr. Gould, Dr. Jacob, Dr. Kenny, Dr. Lalande, Dr. Nissen, Dr. Pappano, Dr. Simon

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

The meeting was called to order at 4:40 p.m.

1. The minutes of the January 15, 2007 meeting were unanimously approved.
2. The Education Council asked the Dean's Council to consider developing a Health Center policy regarding interactions with pharmaceutical representatives. The Dean's Council decided to create an ad hoc committee charged with development of the policy and discussed the process for appointing ad hoc committee members. There was some discussion as to whether the policy should encompass the entire Health Center or be restricted to the School of Medicine. It was agreed that the ad hoc committee would be charged with creating a policy for the School of Medicine which could then be shared with the Dental School for their input. Dr. Nissen noted that policies are being developed for graduate and undergraduate medical education. It was agreed the ad hoc committee should be instructed to collaborate with those efforts.

Following discussion, the DC unanimously agreed on the following process for appointing the ad hoc committee. The Clinical, Education, and Research Councils will be asked to identify two faculty members who represent their areas to serve on the ad hoc committee. These faculty do not need to be Council members. DC will retain the freedom to add additional faculty and to decide on the final composition of the committee, as well as name the chair. Dean's Council will review and approve the policy when drafted. The Councils will be asked to forward names within one month.

3. Dr. Garibaldi distributed the draft Policy on Faculty Consulting. The policy was created by a cross-campus group and applies to all faculty paid by the University of Connecticut, including Health Center faculty. He noted that the State Ethics Commission has a very rigid definition of conflict of interest which applies to all State employees and has a major impact on the Health Center's ability to carry out its educational, research, and clinical missions. The purpose of the draft policy is to describe how faculty may participate in consulting activities and still comply with the State Code of Ethics. It is hoped that the Board of Trustees will ratify the policy at an

upcoming meeting. DC members who represent other Councils were asked to bring the draft policy to their Councils for comment. Questions or concerns should be directed to either Dr. Nancy Adams or Dr. Scott Wetstone.

4. The Dean's Council unanimously approved the draft policy pertaining to storage in L Building corridors.
5. The Research Incentive Plan approved by the Research Council (RC) was forwarded to the DC for approval. There are three elements to the plan -- Part A, which applies to tenured and tenure track faculty; Part B, which applies to in-residence faculty; and Part C, a portion of the plan that allows for exceptional merit. Background information on the first Research Incentive Plan was provided. Although that plan embraced all faculty, it was designed to increase tenured/tenure track faculty salary support on grants. That occurred to a degree but has not continued. Increased salary support on grants should also be one goal of a new Research Incentive Plan, but some members of the DC felt Part A was a reinvention of the old plan. Part A was viewed by some as a reward system rather than an incentive plan because it advantages even those who are not supported much on their grants. Some felt the Research Incentive Plan should be a faculty retention tool to prevent loss of faculty who have all of their salary support on grants and bring significant resources to the Health Center. Others questioned why the Research Council did not use the Academic Merit Plan model as the tool to reward faculty for the quality of their research.

Because the DC had numerous concerns regarding Part A of the plan, they agreed to send the Research Incentive Plan back to Research Council with a request that they address the following:

- a. That RC consider a higher threshold and a higher payout for tenured/tenure track faculty in Part A;
- b. Explain how Part A will not disincentive those who were highly rewarded by the old Research Incentive Plan;
- c. Consider tying this Research Incentive Plan to the Academic Merit Plan in the way that faculty efforts on teaching are now incorporated in that plan (attached);
- d. Be more specific about the funds available for the Exceptional Merit component.

Dr. Garibaldi will circulate a draft statement summarizing these concerns for review by DC before sending it to the Research Council.

Dean's Council - Minutes
February 7, 2007
Page 3

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held on Monday, February 19, from 3:30-5 p.m. in the Building 20 Conference Room.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Donatelli

**Faculty Compensation
ACADEMIC MERIT PLAN**

Educational Merit Component

Unacceptable Performance (no increment)*

1. Refusal to accept a reasonable request to teach.
2. Unsatisfactory or poor performance as a teacher (determined by course directors, program directors or department chairs).

Marginal Performance (standard increment)

1. Reluctantly accepts teaching assignments, and devotes little effort to prepare for those assignments.
2. Weak performance as a teacher (determined by course directors, program directors, or department chairs).

Satisfactory Performance – Meets Expectations (standard increment)

1. Accepts reasonable teaching assignments and does a satisfactory job teaching.
2. Does a satisfactory job as a course director, section leader, program director, etc.

Superior Performance – Exceeds Expectations (merit increment)*

1. Is recognized by students/residents as an exceptional teacher (i.e., receives formal teaching award).
2. Is recognized by a course director (or residency program director) as having made an exceptional contribution to the course (or residency program).
3. Receives national recognition for teaching or other educational activities (requires more than service on national education committees, unless such service is in a leadership role).
4. Receives an education related grant.
5. Serves as principal author of an education-related article in a peer-reviewed journal or a textbook.
6. Serves as a contributing author on two or more education-related articles in a peer-reviewed journal or a text book.

*To elect to not participate in the education academic merit compensation plan, or obtaining a “does not meet expectations” in this plan voids increments and bonuses in all other incentive based compensation plans.

**Reviewed and approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs and Education.

7. Develops a new curriculum offering or course improvement (i.e., a significant reorganization of an existing course that improves student learning and performance.)
8. As a course director, section leader or residency program director significantly revises and improves the course/section or residency program (evidence for such change or improvement must be provided).
9. Volunteer to teach in a critical need area (e.g., gross anatomy, PCM).
10. Highly successful directorship of a Graduate program (evidence of success such as obtaining training grant must be provided).
11. Other: excels in education in unique ways as determined by department chair or center director.