

Dean's Council (DC)

April 4, 2007

**Minutes**

Present: Dr. Albertsen, Dr. Arnold, Dr. Deckers, Dr. Ford, Dr. Garibaldi, Mr. Gillon, Dr. Gould, Dr. Jacob, Dr. Kenney, Dr. Koeppen, Dr. Lalande, Dr. Nissen, Dr. Pappano, Dr. Simon

Guests: Mr. Kleinman, Dr. Klobutcher, Ms. Lyle, Dr. Tennen, Dr. Wolfson

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

1. The minutes of the March 19, 2007 meeting were unanimously approved.
2. Promotion of Dr. J. Robert Galvin to Clinical Professor of Family Medicine

Dr. Deckers presented the request to promote Dr. J. Robert Galvin to the rank of Clinical Professor of Family Medicine based on non-academic grounds. A letter from Dr. Cushman supporting the promotion was previously distributed to the DC. Both Drs. Deckers and Cushman felt Dr. Galvin was deserving of this promotion in recognition of his numerous contributions to the School of Medicine. These contributions include his regional and national stature in public health in his role as Commissioner of Public Health; his support of the development of a signature program in public health; his leadership role in the stem cell initiative; and his service as Chairman of the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Health Center's Board of Directors. Some expressed concern that this action could be viewed as a conflict of interest relative to Dr. Galvin's involvement with the stem cell initiative. However, it was explained that although he chaired the Stem Cell Advisory Committee, he did not set the priority scores of the applications. It was also noted that there is no financial attachment to this promotion.

Following discussion, the Dean's Council voted unanimously in favor of promoting Dr. Galvin to the rank of Clinical Professor of Family Medicine.

3. The Dean's Council unanimously approved the following motion: The Dean's Council delegates to Dr. Casey Jacob the responsibility for managing the process of School of Medicine elections to the Dean's Council, Oversight Committee, Education Council, Research Council, Clinical Council, Public Issues Council, Compensation Executive Committee, Compensation Appeals Committee, Faculty Review Board, and Health Center Appeals Committee.

4. The Dean's Council unanimously approved the Post-Approval Monitoring Plan. The plan, which was approved by the Research Council, was developed in response to several violations related to laboratory animal use.
5. Mr. Kleinman and Ms. Lyle met with the DC to address concerns regarding the proposed policy on Prohibition of Sexual Harassment. Most concerns revolved around the statement that, "Sexual relationships between students/trainees and their faculty, administrative, and/or staff supervisors, even when consensual, are not acceptable regardless of the degree of supervision in any given situation." Although all members recognized the need for a strong sexual harassment policy, some felt this language was unnecessary and too restrictive, particularly when applied to relationships between residents who are at different levels of training. Ms. Lyle stressed that this only pertains to relationships where one individual serves in a supervisory capacity over the other. She explained that the language used, while not legally necessary, was recommended by the AMA and was included to prevent creation of a hostile work environment which can occur due to favoritism resulting from these relationships. Having the appropriate policy in place also protects the institution from liability. She also noted that the School of Dental Medicine faculty were comfortable with the policy.

In light of the DC's continued concerns with this portion of the policy, Mr. Kleinman and Ms. Lyle agreed to revise the statement in a way that will be responsive to the concerns expressed by the Dean's Council but will still be protective of the institution.

6. Drs. Klobutcher and Tennen, who serve on the Oversight Committee, presented proposed revisions to the School of Medicine Bylaws. Dr. Jacob explained that each of the Councils will be asked to develop position papers on the revisions prior to the Faculty Forum scheduled in May. The revisions will then be voted on by the faculty. There was some discussion regarding change of professional category and track. The proposed revision states that such changes must be approved by the faculty member, department chair, and Dean. A question was asked regarding the appeals process if the department chair and Dean disagree. Dr. Jacob explained that such matters would be referred to the Faculty Review Board, but some thought this should be clearly stated in the Bylaws. There was also some discussion regarding the extended tenure probationary period. Some were concerned that faculty are allowed to be nominated for tenure more than once within the probationary period. Dr. Jacob explained that she investigated this issue and found that many schools, including the Storrs campus, allow faculty to come up more than once. However, department chairs will be encouraged not to nominate faculty until they are highly qualified and have a strong chance for a favorable outcome.

Following discussion, the Dean's Council unanimously approved the proposed Bylaws revisions.

7. Dr. Wolfson joined the meeting to discuss the Research Incentive Plan, which was revised by the Research Council at the Dean's Council's request. In reviewing the revised plan, the DC continued to be concerned about the low threshold (20 percent SSOG) required for inclusion of tenured/tenure track faculty in the plan. Some felt the primary goal of the plan should be to retain faculty who have a significant portion of their salary support on grants and that the threshold for inclusion in the plan should be higher. Dr. Wolfson explained that because the Research Council represents all researchers, they felt that allowing all PI's a "seat at the table," even for a small incentive payment, might motivate some to increase their salary support on grants. It was suggested that a way to possibly satisfy both goals would be to retain the current threshold for inclusion, but provide a higher payment to those who reach 50 percent SSOG (i.e. increase the incentive payment from 5 percent to 10 percent). Dr. Wolfson believes the Research Council would be comfortable with this suggestion. Another concern is that the percent effort for SSOG is calculated based on the individual's total FTE rather than the percent identified as "R". It was felt this had a negative impact on many clinical faculty who do have grant support. While Dr. Wolfson was sympathetic to this concern, which was discussed by the Research Council, he indicated that RC still felt the calculation should be based on total FTE. However, he agreed to bring both issues back to the Research Council for further discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 2, from 4:30-6 p.m. in the Medical Dean's Conference Room, AG-078.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Donatelli