

University Faculty Council

Meeting: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 - 4:00-5:30 PM

Location: **Room G-204** | <https://neomed.zoom.us/j/94931186352?pwd=ZVYxNmhCcm12UmFYs2Z6Nkkrcm4zdz09>

ZOOM Information: Connection time 3:55 PM

<https://neomed.zoom.us/j/94931186352?pwd=ZVYxNmhCcm12UmFYs2Z6Nkkrcm4zdz09>

Or Telephone: +1 301 715 8592 (US Toll); +1 312 626 6799 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 949 3118 6352 | Password: 705178

Members: Patrick Gallegos (chair), Natalie Bonfine (vice chair), Cathy Anthony, Mariquita Belen, Natalie Bowersox, Rachel Bracken, Yeong-Renn Chen, Angelo DeLucia, Sheila Fleming, Alex Galazyuk, Alex Hoffman, Yong Lu, Jeffrey Mellott, Erin Reed-Geaghan, Erica Stovsky, Liya Yin

Administrative Support: Deborah Loyet

Time		Agenda Item	Discussion/Next steps
4:00 p.m.	1	Welcome Action Item Review <i>Patrick Gallegos, PharmD Chair, University Faculty Council</i>	Dr. Gallegos welcomed members and explained the rationale for increasing the UFC schedule to monthly meetings, which is partly due to the volume of work UFC is involved in and partly due to trying to limit work during normal business hours, instead of outside business hours. He asked if members prefer the first or second Tuesdays of the additional months. Members preferred to keep all meetings on the first Tuesday. Dr. Gallegos reminded members that the Council has a responsibility to reach out to its colleagues to gather information on the Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation form and give that information to Fayeze Safadi.
	2	Approve previous UFC minutes (12/7/2021) (approved minutes located on NEOMED website)	Leave for February meeting.
		OLD ACTION ITEMS (from previous meetings)	
	4	Executive Management Team notes, Fall/Spring 2021-2022 sign-ups <i>EMT meetings are now in-person</i>	Please note that the schedule for the Executive Management Team (EMT) meetings has changed (visit link to left). When taking notes during an EMT meeting, please send them to Deborah, Patrick and Natalie to be posted.
	5	Ohio Faculty Council Update	Dr. Litman reported that most discussions have no application to NEOMED but some issues are interesting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population of Ohio is dropping and affecting projected enrollment in higher education. Bowling Green's Trustees approved a social democracy policy, which will impact the curriculum. However, faculty had no input nor were they consulted. BG is forming a committee to look at this. This

			issue generated a great deal of concern over violation of academic freedom.
6		Proposed Revisions to College of Medicine Non-tenure Track Faculty Bylaws	<p>The Council discussed the presentation from the College of Medicine and Dr. Jouriles. Since no formal proposal for input from the UFC was requested, they decided to table this item.</p> <p>Dr. Lu explained that the COM non-tenure track faculty appointments and promotions committee reviews dossiers separately for NEOMED-employed non-tenure track faculty. So, the review process is distinct from that for the clinical (voluntary) faculty.</p> <p>Dr. Litman said the committee already includes two basic scientists, so we have the ability to get immediate input.</p>
DISCUSSION ITEMS—NEW & FOLLOW-UP			
7		Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Plan (APE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UFC Task Force on Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation <i>Fayez Safadi, PhD, Task Force Chair</i>	<p>The UFC created its own task force to look at the APE form and provide feedback, in response to the vice president for academic affairs' request. The performance evaluation form metrics will apply to everyone. So it is important for us to provide feedback.</p> <p>Dr. Gallegos explained that in a discussion with the VPAA, he asked that APE and Compensation Plan align with each other and should not be separate entities. He said that Dr. Langell is also very interested in UFC's feedback. The VPAA advised that the information was given to chairs about a year ago and they provided their input. We did another request from them and they are providing further input now.</p> <p>UFC's next steps are to gather all input and make formal recommendations to the VPAA. This is a short timeframe. The new form will be implemented on March 1 for the new performance year timeline. The VPAA asked for feedback by the second or third week of February.</p> <p>The COM Faculty Forum will provide recommendations to UFC and the UFC will share those recommendation with the VPAA (de-identified). The UFC task force is representative of all colleges. If you have concerns or want to be involved – let us know. We want to be inclusive.</p> <p>Dr. Safadi said in his conversation with the VPAA that this will be reviewed every year to continue to refine it.</p> <p>Timeline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chairs giving feedback by this Friday - Faculty feedback – latest should be last week January - Report to UFC by last week January - Sent to VPAA by end of first week of February

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members said that they will want feedback/response from the VPAA so they can anticipate what will be applied from their recommendations. <p>Dr. Gallegos asked the Task Force to have their report by Feb. 1st. Meanwhile, he encouraged members to be sure to get information from their departmental faculty.</p>
8		<p>Faculty Compensation Plan and Research Incentive Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UFC Task Force on Faculty Compensation <p><i>Jeff Mellot, PhD, Task Force Chair</i></p>	<p>Dr. Mellott reported on the work of the UFC Task Force on Faculty Compensation. The TF is currently working with the President to get additional compensation into the plan to cover some elements of some service. The President seems open to taking on high workload components. Drs. Gallegos and Bonfine and Mellott met before Winter Break to look at standing committees for colleges as a general start. Dr. Mellott emailed the TF to ask what other committees may need to be added. From there, additions of up to 10 bonus points were written up into a list. Committee chairs were then identified as those who would get half those points and vice chairs would get a little less. Dr. Langell had recommended that members on university committees would get one point.</p> <p>Next steps are to get a meeting with Dr. Langell to finalize. He wants full professors to opt in or not by end of February.</p> <p>Human Resources is going to have to go back and forth like they did last year with the junior professors. There are other issues that have been brought up. One item I don't know how we'll tease out which is compensation for service roles that are very high workload, such as course directors. There are faculty that are adamant that these deserve compensation separately.</p> <p>If you look at the compensation calculators, they all have roles on it as "Dean's Lines". Our faculty aren't confident our deans will fend for this. Dr. Langell's strategy is that a lot of stuff we're asking for isn't compensated currently. So, he says faculty are still opting in so why add this?</p> <p>Dr. DeLucia commented that it is not a matter of whether you're compensated or not but if you feel it is part of your job. Once you start specifying then there is disincentive to help someone else. An example is the work of the chair for the Biosafety Committee. The skill set required to serve as chair is in and of itself a high-level requirement and part of what you're being paid for.</p> <p>Dr. Mellott said faculty have been concerned since the plans came out that service is missing. That's what happened in Year 1; then when COP and plan for full professors came around, the tune has changed. COM chairs are upset because to get their full professors to do service, why would they do service if there is no service as part of compensation? Chairs previously had clout to get faculty to do service.</p>

As a compensation task force, we went along with service not being compensated. But then the President opened door to identify high-level workload items. We are trying to take advantage by providing a narrow list – so you get points and can forego other requirements for the points. We're ready to go to Dr. Langell to see if he's open to this process. This doesn't change the overall plans.

Dr. Galazyuk said that only people who are exceeding expectations should be compensated. Meanwhile, everyone needs to do service, it is part of what we should be doing.

Dr. Mellott reminded that to be clear, we're talking about the incentive plan which is distinct from the compensation plan. This incentive plan is worth up to \$3,000 per year. Part of the issue is to continue to drive home that service work feels like it is being devalued; the other issue is to ensure faculty stay engaged in service work that doesn't fall within education or research. Ensures that very busy faculty don't let service fall to the back burner.

Dr. Safadi asked that if they are looking at the Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) as teaching, research, and service. The individual who opts into the Plan will have a clear description of teaching and research but not service? Dr. Mellott said it's an amendment, no one would get full comp for just service.

Dr. Safadi said that when he spoke with Drs. Langell and Kasmer, they want to be sure these two processes align. How are we going to do this when one form has service and one doesn't? What about service outside NEOMED, e.g., NIH? Incredible commitment reflects highly on NEOMED. This should also be considered – external service, not just internal. Is this going to be captured?

Dr. DeLucia said he understood that would be folded into your research component/number. Membership in the NIH committees is a high level of commitment.

Dr. German advised that if you start knit-picking with a table of what this and that are worth, there is no end. Someone will always feel they have been neglected. Very few rules are needed.

Dr. Galazyuk said this should be in the hands of the chairs. They make the compensation decision.

Dr. Mellott said there is the viewpoint to not "opt in". Faculty who have opted in to the plan make more money regardless of whether they are compensated for specific activities.

		<p>Dr. Yin expressed concern about giving all decision-making power to chair. I think we need a plan and metrics for evaluation for the plan.</p> <p>Dr. Raman said that compensation for research is heavily based on external funding. Don't see how any other activities count for research. If you have a grant, you will be compensated, if not, it doesn't count.</p> <p>Dr. Mellott said there are three responses: 1. Don't opt in; 2. Whether I like it or not, the president and vice president for finance are not shy to say they want faculty to apply for NIH dollars. 3. All but one faculty that falls into this category still opted in – they got more money opting in even with the issue of research that isn't NIH. We've discussed with Vice President Taylor that this is a culture shift to imply that there is little value on anything that isn't NIH.</p> <p>Dr. Gallegos said that he, Drs. Bonfine and Mellot would be meeting with Dr. Langell and Mary Taylor to propose pieces for the incentive component/list (to enhance rather than keeping it where it is).</p>
		DISCUSSION ITEMS—NEW & FOLLOW-UP
10	Open Forum & Adjourn	<p>Dr. Gallegos reported that he and Dr. Bonfine have been working with the President and Secretary of the Board of Trustees to get a faculty member on the Board. Terms may be similar to a student rep. The reason we're working on this now is this president is interested in faculty input. We have organized time to meet with trustees when they do meet. Dr. Bonfine and I will share a plan with you. I am proposing that the immediate past chair serve this role because they'll have four (4) years of insight.</p> <p>Dr. Bonfine said it is important for trustees to hear from us on what we're doing; what we care about, etc. A member asked if there are faculty on other university boards. Yes, there are two. And Ohio State University has faculty on committees within the Board of Trustees. U of Akron is putting a proposal together to send to the Governor.</p> <p>Dr. Gallegos announced that the UFC needs to identify a new vice chair. Dr. Bonfine will become chair at the end of academic year. We need someone to step up to this role. Dr. Bonfine said we are trying to create a structure to be responsive to requests to UFC. We are also trying to spread the workload out.</p> <p>Dr. Gallegos asked if there were any other items for discussion. He adjourned the meeting at 5:25 pm.</p>

Upcoming agenda items for February

- Leadership Report – Vice President for Research

- NEOMED Medical Journal
- Annual Performance Evaluation

Action Items

- Strategic Plan funding proposal ideas for UFC – email to Patrick and Natalie
- Note changes for Sign-up for Spring semester EMT meetings
- Collect Annual Performance Evaluation Materials Feedback