CU-SOM Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes (4/19/2022)
as noted by Amy Clevenger (Secretary 2021-2022)

March meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

The next Faculty Senate Meeting is on May 17, 2022, from 4:30 to 5:30 P.M.

Updates from Dean Reilly:

- Leadership recruitments on this campus:
  - Director of Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine: candidates coming through for third round interviews
  - 5 Department Chairs
    - Pharmacology: close to the finish
    - Physiology and Biophysics: close to the finish
    - Radiology: several second round interviews next week
    - Dermatology: similar to radiology
    - Otolaryngology - Head & Neck Surgery: just getting underway
  - President
    - Todd Saliman is the sole finalist. He has been acting in this role since July 2021
    - It is now in the public comment period for the Board of Regents to collect feedback
    - He will be on this campus April 21st for a series of meetings, including an open town hall. If interested, that would be the venue to ask your questions.
    - A vote will be completed on April 29th to decide if we will offer him a contract.
- Denver Health
  - Director of Service searches going on for Surgery, Medicine, and Family Medicine
  - CO search underway
  - Frank DeGruy, MD, MS, former chair of the CU SOM Department of Family Medicine, was confirmed 4/18 by the City Council to join the Denver Health Board of Directors. He will replace Dr. Reilly
- VA
  - Dr. Parmley and Dr. D'Arcy are both retiring. Searches are underway for their replacements.
  - Searches for Chief of Medicine and Chief of Anesthesiology in progress
- We have passed match day. Overall, the residency program and 4th year medical students thought this was a success. About 50 of our medical students are staying in Colorado, 31 in our residency program. 7-8 are in the Denver Health Emergency Medicine Residency Program.
- For those involved in research and who work with research technical staff: we underwent a major reorganization of our PRA work force and adjusted salaries as of April 1st to bring them closer to the market reimbursement rate, and to recognize their experience and expertise. This was an off cycle adjustment and does not replace the 3% merit raise pool that will occur on July 1st
- John Moore presented today to the department chairs to explain the new methology for allocating our state funding. Each of your departments will be getting your updated numbers for the upcoming fiscal year. The total amount of support remains unchanged or is slightly up this year, but there will be some variability and changes across the departments.
- Questions
  - If a young faculty researcher would like to inquire about the reallocation of physical research space, how should that person proceed? A - It depends on what they have a question about. If it is about the lab spring cleanout, they should contact Suzanne Ruedeman. If it is about space reallocation and undertulized space, they should contact Peter Buttrick. Of note, the laboratory cleanout is underway. To date, there have been 900 pieces of equipment that have been identified for removal / repurposing that are also too big for the dumpster. There will be an equipment swap set up by Suzanne and her colleauges so junior researchers can utilize this. We are filling a 20 yd^2 dumpster a day with items to be thrown out from the labs. Dr. Reilly anticipates this will significantly reduce clutter.

New Biomedical Informatics Department Approval (Steven R. Lowenstein, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs)

- This is a brief action item for the Faculty Senate to consider
- Last month a faculty committee met to review a proposal by Dr. Casey Greene and 27 other School of Medicine faculty members to create a new department, the Department of Biomedical Informatics
- If approved, this will be the first new School of Medicine department since the creation of the Department of Emergency Medicine in 2010. (There was also a merger in 2015 of two existing departments – Immunology and Microbiology).
- This new department was approved by the Executive Committee this morning
- If approved by the Faculty Senate, it would still need approval by the Chancellor and then forwarded to the Regents for approval
- The committee members agreed unanimously that the proposed new department met all criteria in the School of Medicine rules:
    - National precedent exists
    - Presence of established graduate degree program
    - Evidence that this new department will benefit the faculty and the school
- New department will integrate a range of disciplines to advance biomedical research and improve health care, including: biomedical and health informatics, AI, computer and information sciences, machine learning, cloud computing
- New department will provide a home for many principal investigators who are currently on our campus and also help us recruit and retain national leaders in diverse fields such as genomics, population genetics, epigenetics, pharmacogenomics, biomedical imaging, knowledge representation, public health informatics, etc.
- New department will be interdisciplinary with strong bridges and partnerships with other basic science and clinical departments as well as with affiliated hospitals and health systems.
- 45 faculty members are slated for probable primary appointments in this department. They have over $50 million dollars in current extramural funding and have published more than 300 peer reviewed articles in 2021 alone. They are also experienced educators.
- Highlights
    - Computational PhD program
    - Focus on graduate student training
    - Plan to create clinical informatics certificate programs and fellowships at multiple training levels
- Faculty leaders are aware of the costs involved in creating and sustaining a department. Their proposal includes concrete plans for financial stability and fundraising
- Strong committment to DEI as one of its core values
- Review committee voted 8-0 in favor of creation of this department and is recommending approval by the Faculty Senate
- Questions
    - How will a faculty member know if they are a candidate to move into this department? A - The primary faculty we expect to be drawn from units such as the following: 1) Department of Medicine – Division of Biomedical Informatics and Personalized Medicine. 2) Department of Pediatrics – Section of Informatics and Data Science. We do not want to draw all expertise on campus to this department such that it doesn't exist anywhere else. We are therefore being deliberate about primary appointments and also have a robust process for secondary appointments.
- Vote: 31 approved, none against

APP Request for Rules Change for Instructors and Sr. Instructors (Richele Koehler, Chair, Junior Faculty Promotion and Advancement for Advanced Practice Providers Committee)

- On behalf of the School of Medicine Junior Faculty Promotion and Advancement for Advanced Practice Providers Committee, we wanted to discuss the recent School of Medicine rule change that went into effect October 2021.
- This rule stated that the Faculty Senate members shall be elected exclusively from the rank of Assistant Professor and above.
- With this change, faculty with the rank of Instructor and Senior Instructor, which includes the overwhelming majority of APPs, are now excluded from the Faculty Senate.

- As of July 2021 in the School of Medicine, there were almost 2000 faculty at the rank of Instructor, which is almost 40% of the total faculty. Of that, 38% are advanced practice providers.
- The majority of APPs, almost 95%, have the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor
- We as a committee propose a rule change that allows Senate Faculty members to be drawn from the rank of Instructor and above. This will allow for APPs to have more of a voice in the School of Medicine governing body.
- Because this rule change would take time, we also request that 1-2 APPs be appointed to nonvoting positions in the Faculty Senate in order to allow APP representation.
- Questions
    - Is the PA school part of the School of Medicine? A – the PA program is within the School of Medicine. They are faculty, most often in Pediatrics, but in other departments as well. They are faculty in the School of Medicine.
    - Is there a precedent at other medical schools to have non-physicians as part of a Faculty Senate for a School of Medicine? A – There are PhDs, PsyDs, etc. It is unknown whether people with nondoctoral degrees have positions.
    - Do we have a rule currently about degrees for Faculty Senate membership? A – right now it is just rank.
    - Why do APPs not hold higher faculty rank as a group? A - some do. It hasn't been common because they haven't been given the opportunities to lead and direct programs. We do have some APPs who have advanced to at least the Associate Professor rank. There is nothing stopping them in the rules, although they do need a path to promotion which isn't always clear before appointing them to assistant professor.
    - Many of our fellows hold the rank of Instructor. Is there a reason we wouldn't want trainees on the senate? A – This is Instructor / Fellow, positions that remain in GME. The Instructor / Fellow is utilized to allow them to act in clinical roles such as Internal Medicine attendings and to allow billing. They are not truly considered faculty. They are still under GME benefits and rules. It is unclear as to whether or not the proposed rule change would mean they would be eligible to be voting members. It had not been considered whether this group should be included – APPs and other doctoral degree folks that are at Instructor and Senior Instructor ranks are what we focused on.
    - What is the rationale to have senators at least hold the rank of assistant professor vs just saying any faculty? A – there was an old rationale. Some of the departments felt they had such large numbers of APPs that they became afraid that all of their department representatives would be APPs. This has not been brought up recently and it became part of the rules changes without a lot of discussion.
    - Is this saying that anyone holding the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor could be part of the Senate? That is a very different issue from APPs being nonvoting participation members? A – the rules currently prohibit someone at the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor from being a voting member of the Faculty Senate. The two questions at hand are as follows: 1) Do people agree that this in an appropriate requirement or is there interest in revising the rules? 2) Because that cannot be done in a timely fashion, in the interim, would people be willing to appoint some number of APPs as non-voting observers of the Faculty Senate?
    - Who is this body representative of? Is there a reason why we would say that Instructors would not be included in this group?
    - It is true that APPs can be members of the Faculty Senate now, they would just have to be appointed to the level of Assistant Professor or above? A – that is correct
    - Where would these APP representatives come from if their departments are already represented? Is there a separate group? A – no, they would come from their home departments.
    - What is the desire of the APP group? Would being a nonvoting member fulfill this desire?
- Other Issues / Thoughts Discussed
    - If this rule was based in discrimination, it may be different than if there were other reasons, such as thoughts on longevity.
    - There are some thoughts among certain specialties that APPs are replacing physicians. There are also concerns about APPs expanding roles.
    - Prior to this past October, all faculty members at all ranks were eligible. The rationale behind this portion of the rule change is unknown and was not extensively discussed. It is unclear how intentional this rule change was, although it is thought to have been somewhat intentional.

    - This may disproportionately affect APPs, but stating the rank of Instructor and Senior Instructor is not equivalent to stating APP
- Vote not completed secondary to time and to allow additional discussion

<u>Uniform Grading Policy (Shanta Zimmer, Sr. Associate Dean for Education and Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion)</u>

- We received a memo on February 22, 2022, notifying us of a plan to update the Uniform Grading Policy (UGP)
- This would apply to all of the campuses, both undergraduate and graduate
- Rationale for the change:
    - COVID caused many challenges for students across the 4 campuses
    - Undergraduate campuses opted in 2020, without an official change, to add a P+ grade to the usual P/F grading in order to comply with the Colorado Department of Higher Education requirement that P must represent C- or higher. Previously a D had also received a P, so the P+ was added to distinguish between the D grade and the C- or higher grade.
    - Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory was also added for experiential learning, which was happening mostly outside of the classroom
    - The SOM did not adopt any of these changes in response to COVID-19. The SOM did change some courses to P/F, which was already an option in the UGP
- Since April 1, 2009, the SOM has had an exception to the UGP which includes the use of H / HP / P / PR / F. This is in lines 106 and 107 of the policy.
- A vote is needed to accept the UGP (utilizing P+ and satisfactory / unsatisfactory) for the other campuses. We would not use these in the SOM and would continue to have the April 2009 exceptions.
- Questions
    - Would the graduate programs in which B is needed to be a passing grade be affected? A – the rules for a passing grade is set by the individual programs. This change would not affect what would be considered a passing grade for the individual graduate programs.
- Vote: approved

<u>Other issues brought to attention of Senate</u>

- None