

School of Medicine Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, June 18th, 2013
AO1 Building, 7th Floor Boardroom

ATTACHMENT 1

Present

Members: John Cambier, Timothy Crombleholme, Eva Burger for Robert D'Ambrosia, Chip Dodd, Randall Holmes, Herman Jenkins, Mark Johnston, Richard Krugman, Bruce Landeck, Todd Larabee, Kevin Lillehei, Wendy Macklin, Naresh Mandava, Dennis Matthews, David Norris, Ches Thompson for Nanette Santoro, Richard Schulick, David Schwartz, Mark Kochevar for Dan Theodorescu, Ann Thor, Andrew Thorburn, Richard Zane

Participants: Mark Couch, Megan Dishop, Ben Honigman, Richard Johnston, Doug Jones, Celia Kaye, Steven Lowenstein, Thomas Meyer (VA), William Neff, Chris Nyquist, Marian Rewers, Carol Rumack, Jane Schumaker, Ron Sokol, Fred Suchy, Richard Traystman, Cheryl Welch, David West, Nan LaFrance

Guests: Dwight Klemm, Ashton Chase, Mollie Young, Marc Moss, Steve Anderson, Cheryl Kisling, Sharon Conry, Kim Benson, Vic Patel

I. Approval of the Minutes – The May 21st, 2013 SOM Executive Committee Meeting minutes were approved as written.

II. Dean's Update and Discussion Items

A. Discussion Items:

1. ***Symposium on the Future of Healthcare*** – the Dean would like to have a discussion at next month's SOM Executive Committee Meeting regarding Research Strategic Planning. The symposium on the Future of Healthcare he attended was taped and Bruce Schroffel (UCHealth) will be asked if it can be edited to make the key discussions available to those who were not in attendance. In the next several weeks, the Dean would like for the SOM Executive Committee members to review the tape of the symposium as there will be a more in-depth conversation at the next meeting regarding Research Task Force and how to proceed. The event was very enlightening.
2. ***FY 2014 General Fund Budget*** – this is the end of the fiscal year, the Dean recapped that consistently the SOM has worked off the previous year's increment. Jane Schumaker stated that the general fund dollars that are distributed to the departments were flat she stated that Terri Carrothers sent out a request for general fund line budgets to each DFA and the information is being returned to her. The extra dollars that the campus did approve did not turn out to be significant and were not distributed to the schools, the money was used to fund certain special initiatives. Dr. Krugman, Jane and Terri, along with all the other Deans and their Associate Deans met in extended sessions to discuss how to distribute the funds. The discussions began with central administration going through how all the areas are funded. They talked about reallocation that's happened between from UCD to AMC, specifically AHEC needed and was provided more funding, as was IPE, the Ethics program, autoclaves expenses, etc. Significant to all of this is that central administration is also funding almost \$400K to Office of Grants and Contracts which will give them for 4 or 5 new open positions. There are additional costs with student mental health due to the Aurora shooting and the aftermath to bring additional staff in and around mental health on the campus. The Dean stated that these additional funds are 'one-time' dollars and all AMC Schools shared in the costs of these needs, which we are absorbing in the Dean's office. Jane noted that the DFA's turned in their Table 1 information, but there were too many after the fact errors submitted in

general which people need to be more thoughtful about going forward as some individuals ended up not getting increases as a result of these submitted errors.

- B. CU Foundation Faculty and Staff Giving Program** – Dean Krugman discussed a possible campaign focused on faculty and staff to raise money recognizing that many already donate and have for years. In FY12, there were 230 people on the faculty and staff that gave approximately \$715K to the CU Foundation, much of that went to individual programs and many are contributing to their own work as well as contributing to student scholarships, SOM Endowment, etc. For FY13, 291 people gave close to \$580K. Dean Krugman believes we will be increasingly reliant on philanthropy; therefore it is time to focus on this and discuss how an initiative like this should be handled. Many who sit on not-for-profit boards and foundations note that 100% of their board members give to their foundations. The 291 that have given in FY13 makes up only about 15-20% of the faculty and staff. Ashton Chase from the CU Foundation was invited to speak to the SOM Executive Committee to describe the program.

Ashton Chase introduced himself and noted that he has already met with some members, but at that time the program had been placed on hold. The CU Foundation has started to roll out the program for each school. This roll-out is about participation, not about dollars given. The participation is where that individual employee would see where the dollars go. When the foundation met with department chairs, they were asked to look at three buckets where they would like to see these initiatives within their departments or for the employees to give to. Mr. Chase added that he will assume the role of the customer service agent, work with each department and do the work for the departments in order to make this easy. It will not be rolled out as a SOM roll out, but will be done departmentally. The School of Pharmacy has already started this initiative and it is going well. All the issues have been worked out and it now runs smoothly. By interviewing like institutions around the country and following best practices, they've learned that the giving comes from the top down as well as from the bottom up. He would like to meet with each of the department chairs again to figure out priorities, build the priorities out into the 'buckets' in which funds would be put into, build the giving opportunity whether it be on-line, payroll deduction, or others. An email campaign will be generated sharing the successes of how the program is going and why individuals have given and why new donors are giving now. Dr. Dodd asked if the giving can be done with pre-taxed dollars and informed that there are a variety of ways for deductions to be handled. Jane Schumaker suggested that it would be a good idea to have Ashton talk with the DFA's at the next Administrator's meeting.

At-Will Faculty Status Discussion –At-Will Faculty Status Discussion – Dean Krugman stated that there are four departments in the SOM that have all or at least 90% of their faculty as 'at-will' employees. This has created unease among the faculty and administration. In the mid-90's there was a discussion of promotion and tenure revisions and disconnecting tenure from promotion. This made it possible for faculty to become associate professors without tenure. At that time there was discussion of 'rolling contracts' that were 2, 3 or 4 years in length. Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, Steven Lowenstein, MD stated that there have been trends in the last few years; some departments have moved all of their faculty to at-will appointments and some newer faculty are being recruited and hired as at-will employees. Since January 1, 2013, out of 52 new assistant professors, 71% of them were hired to at-will appointments. Dr. Lowenstein feels that this puts our school at risk. Some issues he's observed are misinformation and confusion about these appointments. Faculty members and new recruits are often told that 'at-will' is required. This is not true; the fact is that almost all the SOM faculty and instructors and senior instructors are eligible for term appointments for 1, 2 or 3 year appointments. In 2012, Colorado legislature passed a new bill and the

University of Colorado implemented a new policy triggered by that bill that encourages more term contracts and fewer at-will appointments. For the first time in Colorado, 1, 2, or 3 year term contracts will be available to teaching instructors (those who teach more than 50% of their time in the classroom) who are masters trained and often the most junior faculty not engaged in research. The reason for this is recruitment and retention. The system-wide Vice President for Academic Affairs, Kathleen Bollard was quoted as saying ‘This is going to be great for helping us recruit high quality instructors.’ In the SOM rules, Instructors are normally hired to 1 year term contracts. Sometimes it is argued that this is a national trend. Faculty Affairs sent out a brief questionnaire to all the medical schools around the country to the offices of faculty affairs and out of the replies received, 0 out of the 10 received use ‘at-will’ appointments and the majority had not heard of it in an academic setting. One faculty affairs representative reported that, at their institution, at-will appointments are primarily used for only temporary workers. The most important argument in favor of returning to 1, 2, and 3 year appointments and eliminating the move to at-will, is that in the absence of tenure, we have to have a way to reward faculty, make a commitment to faculty who are willing to make a commitment to the school and who are succeeding in their work. Dr. Lowenstein is concerned about the lack of tenure. As far as budget requirements, the need for chairs to be financial stewards and to have financial flexibility means they must hold faculty to very high performance standards. Non-producing faculty should be given honest feedback, told where they are not meeting expectations, what is expected of them, should be put on notice that their performance must improve and if it does not, they can be put on notice that will not exceed one year. It has been brought to Dr. Lowenstein’s attention that faculty members hear from supervisors that they are ‘at-will’ and can be fired at any time. He also would like to state that there are many at-will faculty members who have been given notice and are treated respectfully and properly. In Dr. Lowenstein’s opinion, the risk of faculty disengagement, faculty cynicism, high turnover, and loss of productivity is what happens when faculty are treated as temporary workers. His final point is that he doesn’t feel that this should be implemented as a school-wide or department-wide policy at any time without faculty input. A faculty task force input, discussion and approval should be required to implement policies about appointments, promotions and tenure, etc. Since tenure has become marginalized and uncommon, the policy of offering 1, 2 and 3 year appointments, especially after they’ve met all expectations and been promoted, is a commitment that should be made to faculty who make a commitment to the school. At-will should remain an option, but one that should be used very judiciously.

C.

D. CCTSI LITeS Program - Dr. Ron Sokol updated the committee on where things stand with the Colorado Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute. Word was received word on May 1st that NCATs, the NIH Institute that funds CCTSI would be providing close-out/bridging funds through October of \$6.8M which will allow CCTSI to continue. CCTSI also scored 3rd out of 29 for the competing renewal that was submitted in January.

Marc Moss MD, a co-director at the CCTSA, overseeing the Education, Training and Career Development program and Dwight Klemm PhD, will give a brief summary on CCTSI LITeS program, Leadership Innovative Team Science Training Program that many have already been through and invite those who haven’t, to participate. The program includes students from high school to senior clinical translational investigators. The most senior course is the LITeS course which occurs on an annual basis involving 4 – 2 day sessions (total of 8 days). The goal is to enhance leadership skills and to build better teams and improve the conduct of team science

across the university system. Some courses offered are conflict management, how to give/receive feedback, how to build effective teams, leadership skills, how to deal with generational differences, etc. There have been over 100 people who participated and it has been very well received. Surveys indicate that 100% of those who participated feel they are better connected to the university and 30% have established new research collaboratives with other participants from the LITeS program. One of the things initiated when Dr. Judith Albino took over as director of the program, was to develop four different groups of participants that work on a group project together, with the goal of the participants learning how to work on team science and providing high level consulting from these teams. Dr. Klemm was a participant in the last LITeS training program and attests to the fact that the leadership management and team building training is truly first rate and very valuable. This year's course was designated to work in teams and find ways to facilitate team and multi-disciplinary science on our campus. Questions asked by scientists today are so complex that individual experts don't have the training and expertise background or resources to adequately address these questions. These multi-disciplinary teams bring together different resources, perspectives, experience and ideas to address the very complex questions. The payoff is high impact science. Team science can access non-traditional sources of funding. Many private and public funding agencies now are setting aside money to fund team science initiatives specifically because they do produce high level/impact science. In the biomedical sciences, team science tends to be translational, going from bench to bedside accessing basic research funding as well as clinical dollars. It offers opportunities for public and private partnerships and licensing of intellectual properties. Twenty-eight participants were divided into 4 teams to identify barriers and develop solutions to foster and facilitate team science on this campus and throughout the CU system. Faculty does recognize the positive benefits of working at this institution, there are areas for improvement; funding, education, physical environment and on-line resources. If anyone would like to find out more on these classes, please go to the CCTSI website, under the LITeS training page, there is a link circled in red and a copy of the white paper produced by their teams can be downloaded. <http://cctsi.ucdenver.edu/Lists/Announcements/DispForm.aspx?ID=88>

- E. **Faculty Senate Update** – Dr. Larabee stated that the Faculty Senate heard a report regarding the budget from the Chief Financial Officer, Todd Saliman from the University who presented the dismal projections for higher education funding in this state and talked about alternative funding mechanisms and laws that are changing. Jerry Johnson, a lobbyist from CU talked about legislation that went through the system this year that affects the SOM. Steven Lowenstein, MD, spoke to the Faculty Senate about the Professionalism Code that will be addressed in the first meeting of the Fall Senate. Dean Krugman thanked Dr. Larabee for this service as Faculty Senate President for the 2012-13 year.

III. **Action Item**

Request for OB-GYN to reorganize the Department into seven Divisions – the department feels that this move would move them into the forefront and they would be more of a robust destination in terms of identity and reputation. The OB-GYN department currently has 5 sections and the proposed reorganization is to have 7 divisions. The proposal was voted on and unanimously approved by the SOM Executive Committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

IV. **Approval Items**

- a. All Sr. Clinical Appointments and Promotions Committee Actions were unanimously approved.
- b. Faculty Promotions Committee Actions – all recommendations were unanimously approved.

- c. The approval for Emeritus Appointments for Drs. Wibur Franklin and Steven Kent Nordeen were unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45am