



## University Faculty Council

Meeting: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 - 4:00-5:30 PM

Location: **Room G-204** | <https://neomed.zoom.us/j/96052565876?pwd=UkJKMUIrVjVwREljaytBS2IRU1ZyZz09>

### ZOOM Information: Connection time 3:55 PM

<https://neomed.zoom.us/j/96052565876?pwd=UkJKMUIrVjVwREljaytBS2IRU1ZyZz09>;

Or Telephone: +1 312 626 6799 (US Toll); +1 646 876 9923 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 960 5256 5876 | Password: 572802

**Members (attendees bolded):** 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

**Invited Guests:** President Langell, Matthew Smith, Priya Raman

**Guests:** Rebecca German, Paul Hartung, Janel Koellner, Amy Lee, Christian Ritter, Maria Schimer, Bradley Winters

**Administrative Support:** Jordan Cinderich, Deborah Loyet

Time	Agenda Item	Discussion/Next steps
4:00 p.m.	1 Welcome Action Item Review  <i>Patrick Gallegos, Pharm.D. Chair, University Faculty Council</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Gallegos opened the meeting at 4:01 and stated the primary activity for today's meeting will be to endorse or not endorse the bylaws changes. He reviewed the agenda and advised the sequence of items may be adjusted.</li> </ul>
	2 Approve <a href="#">previous UFC minutes</a> (6/1/21) <i>(minutes located on <a href="#">NEOMED website</a>)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Call for motion: P. Gallegos</li> <li>• Motion to approve: A. DeLucia</li> <li>• Second: J. Mellott</li> <li>• Motions carries.</li> </ul>
4:05 p.m.	3 Departmental updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Gallegos said the College of Medicine LCME results are a positive outcome that is worth mentioning at today's meetings and thanked the many contributors to this effort.</li> </ul>
	<b>OLD ACTION ITEMS (from previous meetings)</b>	
4:10 p.m.	4 <a href="#">Executive Management Team notes, Summer &amp; Fall 2021 meeting sign-ups</a>  <i>EMT meetings are now in-person</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Gallegos explained that UFC members are expected to attend an EMT meeting at least twice per semester. Attending members are expected to attend the meeting, take notes, report important UFC announcements, and send minutes to Jordan shortly thereafter.</li> <li>• Dr. Lu questioned how many UFC members are reading the EMT notes. He attended a couple of weeks ago. Evaluation of staff by PIs was very difficult. It should be easy to evaluate the staff and using the new universal standards doesn't make sense. Dr. Gallegos asked that the issue be</li> </ul>

			<p>added to the agenda for the next meeting. Dr. Yin said there are concerns about who will pay the extra money for raises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Yin stated that it is difficult to take notes during EMT meetings because of lack of familiarity of faces in the room, use of abbreviations, and discussion of unfamiliar topics. Dr. Lu agrees. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mr. Cinderich offered to include headshots of EMT members in the notetaking template.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Dr. Gallegos responded that you should feel very comfortable to ask questions during those meetings.</li> <li>• Dr. DeLucia: Do we have directives from the EMT on what we should be doing to prepare for that meeting? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ P. Gallegos: UFC representative should be providing the faculty perspective on issues and be open to transparent, bi-directional communication. We should all be reading the EMT notes. Can we all agree to take 5-10 minutes to read these notes when they are distributed? Members should feel free to take notes during the EMT meeting and then edit afterward before distribution to Jordan and UFC members.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	5	<p>Ohio Faculty Council representative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nominations needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Gallegos identified the need for a representative to represent NEOMED at the OFC. Charles Thodeti last served in this role. I would like to identify someone for this role within this next month. Dr. Gallegos encouraged members to sign up if you enjoy working with the other universities. Email Natalie and Patrick if you have questions. Meetings in Columbus or via Zoom.</li> <li>• Visit this link for more information: <a href="https://www.ohiofacultycouncil.org/">https://www.ohiofacultycouncil.org/</a>.</li> </ul>
4:15 p.m.	6	<p><u><a href="#">Post-tenure Review &amp; Annual Performance Evaluation</a></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vote of endorsement/non-endorsement</li> </ul>	<p>PTR &amp; APE discussion was held after agenda item 7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Gallegos stated that the remainder of UFC concerns have been addressed by the administration in the last 24 hours concerning post-tenure review (PTR) bylaw revisions. All materials and updates have been provided to faculty and should have been reviewed.</li> <li>• UFC had recommended 3 out of 4 years instead of 2 out of 3 years to trigger a post-tenure review as well altering the number of years of materials that a PTR committee would be required to review from 3 years to 6.</li> <li>• Y. Lu: Most recent bylaws state that PTR is triggered by annual performance evaluation (APE) which has not be articulated well. PTR triggers should be developed at University level and not by departments which would create inequities. So far, we have spent a lot of time preparing these bylaw revisions and much less time on retaining faculty members at NEOMED. UFC has lost two very qualified members recently. I would like to know the stats on how many universities have PTR systems. PTR will bias faculty research, teaching, and service efforts in the future. Most tenured faculty contribute mostly to research and will focus there. Securing funding secures the position and without this, we'll be out of business. I am</li> </ul>

			<p>also concerned about recruitment of faculty of NEOMED with this process in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A. DeLucia: In the discussion within IMS, there was identified an issue if there is a potential conflict of interest with membership of PTR committee. Is there veto power for membership of that committee? My vote to endorse will depend on this amendment.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion was paused as Dr. Langell entered the meeting for his Leadership Report. Discussion on this agenda item resumed at 5:20pm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Gallegos called for a vote of endorsement and stated the voting options: endorse with recommendations or do not endorse.</li> <li>• Dr. Bonfine clarified that this vote is to provide the University Bylaws Committee (UBC) with our current opinion of the bylaw revisions.</li> <li>• A. DeLucia: Will the UFC see this again? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J. Wenstrup: It is UBC that will approve exact language recommendations.</li> <li>○ P. Gallegos: It is UFC's role to engage faculty in the overall conversation. Our vote is to endorse recommendations or not. I would say that faculty have had a very strong voice in this process and have made it friendlier for faculty. I think it is important that faculty vote on this today.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A. DeLucia raised concern about lack of IMS representative on UBC. All faculty should have a vote for a true democratic process. Dr. Lu agreed. Who has the authority to make this decision? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J. Wenstrup: It is the University Nominating &amp; Membership Committee who appoints members to university committees. Membership of UBC is done by college, not department. As a member of the UBC, I am here to represent you.</li> <li>○ A. DeLucia: I think it is much more important who approves the final language to the administration. This should be more democratic.</li> <li>○ J. Wenstrup: I think we need to follow the current bylaw amendment process for this procedure and discuss approval process at a later time.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Dr. Gallegos called for a vote. Dr. Bonfine sent Qualtrics link via email to all UFC members.</li> <li>• Dr. Bonfine announced results of the vote (out of 16 members minus Chair): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 12 votes to <b>endorse with recommendations</b> (2 vote in absentia)</li> <li>○ 1 vote not to endorse</li> <li>○ 2 absent members</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>DISCUSSION ITEMS—NEW &amp; FOLLOW-UP</b>			
4:30 p.m.	7	<p><a href="#"><u>Integrated Pharmaceutical Medicine (IPM) program update</u></a></p> <p><i>Priya Raman, M. Pharm., PhD, IPM Co-Director</i>  <i>Matthew Smith, M.S., PhD, IPM Co-Director</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drs. Smith and Raman are co-program directors for the Integrated Pharmaceutical Medicine (IPM) program.</li> <li>• M. Smith: There is an impending financial crisis for IPM. There are currently 9 students enrolled in IPM who are funded by University stipend plus fringe benefits. The program did not receive sufficient fundings from</li> </ul>

			<p>the FY22 zero-based budgeting process to continue to fund students after this year. For 2022-23 academic year, the program will be in the hole after draining carryover funds. Concern is that if we receive the same funding allocations next year, we will not be able to sustain the program. Our understanding is that 54% of the dollars that come from the State of Ohio to fund that program go to NEOMED to pay university bills and 46% come back to the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-directors met with Dr. Langell last Friday. Dr. Langell confirmed that the additional four students in which funding is needed will be funded by the university, but this is only a verbal commitment. We are proposing that UFC use its voice to propose a more formal resolution for continued funding for these students and the program.</li> <li>• M. Smith: We need to get creative on how to continue to fund this program with the resources we have at our disposal or come up with alternatives. We are asking UFC members to go back to their departments to ask for ideas.</li> <li>• L. Yin: What about new students who would be enrolled in the program next year? How will they be funded? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ P. Raman: With current promised funding, we could only ever have 4-5 students at a time. The remainder of the funding from the state, according to Dr. Langell, is going to fund administrative expenses and operational costs. Enrollment would essentially stagnate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A. Galazyuk: What about research dollars from advisors. Are those going to stay in the program? To whom do we need to advocate to help with this situation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ P. Raman: Dr. Langell?</li> <li>○ Y. Lu: Isn't there a record of where money goes once it is given to NEOMED?</li> <li>○ M. Smith: It is shocking that it seems like no one is able to tell us how that money is spent other than the general premise that we have bills to pay for the University.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Y. Lu: On behalf of faculty, we need to ask for more financial transparency so that faculty know where money is going</li> <li>• P. Gallegos: UFC can convene a group to discuss this issue further and come to a plan of action.</li> <li>• P. Raman: First request is for formal support to assure funding for current students.</li> </ul>
<b>LEADERSHIP REPORT</b>			<p><b><u>General Faculty Concerns</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J. Langell: Top ten concerns of faculty from survey done in May 2019, listed from highest level of disagreement to least: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1) 82% disagreement that NEOMED “provides an adequate number of faculty for teaching students.”</li> <li>○ 2) 73% disagreement that NEOMED financially compensates its faculty adequately</li> <li>○ 3) 70% disagreement that NEOMED leadership is responsive to faculty concerns.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4:45 p.m.	8	<p><b>John Langell, M.D., Ph.D., M.P.H., M.B.A.</b> <i>President</i></p>	

- 4) I receive adequate support from graduate students for my research. (New program planned for next August to help with this.)
- 5) NEOMED leadership involves me in decision making.
- 6) NEOMED provides adequate opportunities for professional development.
- 7) NEOMED has diverse faculty in positions of leadership. (Making significant progress on this item.)
- 8) Faculty development activities to improve my skills in teaching and student assessment are available to me.
- 9) NEOMED leadership responds to input from me.
- 10) NEOMED provides adequate opportunities for mentoring.
- Dr. Langell identified progress on some of these initiatives and the intent to continue to track progress on these issues.

**Faculty Development**

- J. Langell: Faculty Development was moved to Academic Affairs, and I tasked VPAA to work with faculty to design development opportunities that faculty want. Dr. Kasmer convened multiple groups on each faculty work area. New website is being developed and should be completed before October 1. Academic Impressions has been selected through an RFP process for faculty support, both synchronous and asynchronous opportunities. Dr. Langell listed additional points of the Faculty Development Plan that are planned for the future.
- New faculty development office will be called the Office of Enrichment & Engagement.
- Medical Education Research Certificate (MERC) workshop – seven lecture series

**Faculty Compensation**

- J. Langell: Human Resources reports no issues in the roll out of the new compensation plan.
  - Opt-in pilot plan launched in July 2021
  - Will begin development of expanded plan by September 2021
- 23 faculty eligible for FY22 pilot
- 14 opted in and 9 opted out + 3 new hires = 17 in the pilot plan
- Impact of plan relative to AAMC benchmark salary comparison:
  - Associate Professors
    - FY21 average salary at 27<sup>th</sup> AAMC percentile
    - FY22 average salary at 39<sup>th</sup> AAMC percentile
  - Assistant Professors
    - FY21 average salary at 27<sup>th</sup> AAMC percentile
      - Range 6<sup>th</sup> – 69<sup>th</sup> percentile
    - FY22 average salary at 44<sup>th</sup> AAMC percentile
      - Range 33<sup>rd</sup> – 69<sup>th</sup> percentile
- Y. Lu: When will the compensation plan for full professors be available?

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J. Langell: It will be available by the end of the calendar year and implemented next fiscal year (FY23).</li> <li>● A. DeLucia: What were the percentiles that you shared in the presentation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J. Langell: Public, U.S. medical institutions (AAMC)</li> <li>○ A. DeLucia: Can this be distributed?</li> <li>○ J. Langell: I would ask Darcie Flower for those numbers. I cannot distribute widely for copyright concerns because we pay for the AAMC reports.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Post-Tenure Review (PTR)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● J. Langell: Black boxes in the bylaws are not helpful for faculty. We recently had a tenured faculty member that was let go from the university that was very expensive. I come from a university in which PTR was abused when there were disagreements between faculty and administration. We need a process that faculty can point to when this situation arises. We need to be able to identify people earlier who may need support in their career. I think all of you love your current department chairs but that may not be the case with your next chair. A PTR requires Dean agreement and an evaluation of your peers. We need a process that is as unbiased as possible.</li> <li>● A. DeLucia: I think this was a communication issue and could have been diffused among the faculty earlier with appropriate communication. I think NEOMED has a strong tenure system, and we have greatly benefitted from that. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J. Langell: Communication is always key. In my opinion, I don't think our bylaws define tenure very well and do not offer many protections. I have lived in the tenure world and currently have tenure, so I understand its value and support it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● A. Galazyuk: I think communication with administration is always a struggle, but we are moving in the right direction.</li> </ul>
<b>DISCUSSION ITEMS—NEW &amp; FOLLOW-UP</b>			
5:15 p.m.	9	<p><b>Faculty morale</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● COM Faculty Forum has been investigating. Dr. Young will be attending upcoming meeting to discuss.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No discussion.</li> </ul>
<b>UPDATES &amp; EVENTS</b>			

	10	HLC Comprehensive Evaluation & Site Visit <i>Deborah Loyet, M.S., M.A., Exec. Director, Institutional Research</i> NEOMED 50 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Submit ideas to Patrick or Natalie</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No discussion.</li> </ul>
	11	Open Forum & Adjourn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No discussion.</li> </ul>

**Upcoming agenda items for October 5, 2021 meeting**

- Leadership report - Vice President for Academic Affairs
- PI staff evaluations

**Action Items**

- IPM program follow-up
- Sign-up for EMT meetings through Fall 2021