

| | | |
|------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | Gry Clark |
| 42 - 4PM | Faculty Council Steering Committee Activities Report | Jennifer McBride |
| 45 - 5 PM | Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the HEC | Maureen McEnery |
| 6 - 7PM | Review of June Presentation and Vote on Creation of | |

New Business

Adjourn

Members Absent

Corinne Bazella

the ballot is ready to go, some technical problems have surfaced in getting a valid ballot to all facilities. The second vote concerned a number of proposed bylaws amendments.

The bylaws are reviewed on a five-year cycle. After an extensive discussion and revision of those amendments, they are almost ready to go out. Once the endorsement/approval of the Bylaws Committee is received, it then goes to the Faculty of Medicine for approval, followed by the Dean, Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and lastly the Faculty Senate before it can become operational. This change should occur during this academic year.

There are three open slots on the NEC for Faculty Council representatives which will run concurrent with their term on Faculty Council -- two for basic science and one for clinical. Faculty may nominate each other or self-nominate if they are willing to serve on the NEC. In October, it will be put on the floor to vote and hopefully these spots will be filled. At this point, the committee membership is very diverse consisting of faculty members from MHMC, UH, CCF, and Case.

Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the June 17, 2019 Meeting

Dr. Clark stated that there were no submissions of edits or corrections to the June 17, 2019 Faculty Council meeting minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as presented. When asked if there was any other discussion, the question was posed as to why we were no longer using the electronic voting devices. The owner of these devices has moved to the HEC and at this time we no longer have access to them. While we will continue to pursue the electronic voting situation, today's votes will be manual.

There being no further discussion a vote was taken. All were in favor, no one opposed, and no one abstained. The motion passes.

Faculty Council Steering Committee Activities Report (Jennifer McBride)

The June 3 Faculty Council Steering Committee meeting minutes were reviewed and approved. Dr. Clark provided an overview of the responsibilities of the Steering Committee, and the committee discussed the Dean's Search Committee meeting that was held with Faculty Council representatives on July 1. Other topics of discussion were an update of the status of the bylaws amendment adding Faculty Council representatives located at the VA; NEC, CAPT, and CBR annual reports that will be presented to Faculty Council, supplemental voting for SOM Committees, and discussion of possible Faculty Council meeting locations to increase participation of faculty members.

The update on the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on the HEC was on the agenda last June and will be placed on the September Faculty Council agenda. Since we did not have a quorum for a vote in June, the proposal to create an Awards Committee will be presented (for the benefit of new Faculty Council representatives who did not hear the original presentation) at the September Faculty Council meeting for a vote. The ad hoc Committee on Professional Conduct was discussed, and the agenda for Faculty Council will be approved via e-mail.

Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the HEC (Maureen McEnergy)

This committee was formed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate with the intent of convening with three senators from each of the schools that are housed at the HEC. Members consist of Mark Hans (Chair – SODM), Allison Webel (SON), Chris Winkelman (SON), Evelyn Duffy (SON), Laura Voith (MSASS), Maureen McEnergy (SOM), Renato Roperto (SODM),

Theresa Jasinevicius (SODM), Thomas Kelley (SOM), Darin Croft (SOM), Andrew Reimer,

There is no chalkboard in the lecture hall, and review sessions have not gone smoothly. An I-Pad was provided but the surface is too tiny to use as a replacement for a chalkboard.

The Dean stated that some efforts have already been

learning that we do not have an awards committee, it was suggested that an ad hoc committee be created to enable us to have a more uniform process.

The p

vote was taken. All were in favor, no one was opposed, and there were 5 abstentions. The motion passes.

SCHOOL O

E TE S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

Faculty Council Meeting
Draft Meeting Minutes
Monday, June 17, 2019
4:00-5:30PM – BRB 105

| | | |
|--------------|---|----------------------------|
| 4:00-4:10PM | Chair Announcements | Sudha Chakrapani |
| 4:10-4:12PM | Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the May 20, 2019 Meeting | Sudha Chakrapani |
| 4:12- 4:15PM | Faculty Council Steering Committee Activities Report | Gary Clark |
| 4:15-4:25PM | New Academic Departments CCLCM (Plastic Surgery, Emergency Medicine, and Neurology) | Gene Barnett |
| 4:25-4:55PM | Discussion on Faculty Council Structure and Representation | Jennifer McBride |
| 4:55-5:00PM | Vote on the Senate Model | |
| 5:00-5:10PM | Remote Participation Amendment -- Bylaws Recommendation on the Language | Darin Croft |
| 5:10-5:18PM | Proposal 3 of the Faculty Proposed Amendment Petition (and Bylaws Recommendation) | Danny Manor Darin Croft |
| 5:18-5:20PM | Committee Reports (Bylaws) | |
| 5:20-5:25PM | Proposal for the Awards Committee | Sudha Iyengar |

Maureen McEnery

Members Present (cont.)

Piet de Boer
Pamela Davis
Philipp Dines
William Dupps
Judith French
Monica Gerrek

Cynthia Kubu
Suet Kam Lam
Maria Cecilia Lansang
Charles Malemud
Danny Manor
Jennifer McBride

Phoebe Stewart
Charles Sturgis
Daniel Sweeney
Patricia Taylor
Krystal Tomei
Carlos Trombetta

Dr. Chakrapani gave

1 prove that there were no adverse effects, that this alignment was preferred, and that it would
2 allow for better showcasing of unique accomplishments. These new departments will better
3 reflect the academic diversity of CCLCM of CWRU. Research publications authored by faculty
4 with appointments in the new departments will make note of the CWRU faculty appointment.
5 All CCLCM research will continue to note the CCLCM of CWRU appointment. These new
6 departments will not require funding from the School of Medicine, and this will be affirmed by a
7 five-year business plan. The new departments will have no financial impact on CWRU and/or
8 SOM. The visibility of these new departments may also spur further pursuits and encourage
9 engagement at HEC.

10
11 The Department of Neurology is an already established SOM department at UHCMC and
12 MHMC. It was originally placed under the Department of Medicine when CCLCM began.
13 Kerry H. Levin, MD, is being proposed as the academic chair. He has held various committee
14 positions for the American Board of Psychiatry & Neurology, from 1997 to the present. He has
15 41 peer-reviewed publications, 33 book chapters, and more than 100+ CME teaching and
16 presentations to his credit.

17
18 The breadth and depth of the identified faculty's teaching and research productivity consists of
19 120 professional staff in many subspecialties, who teach medical students from CCLCM in year
20 1 and 2, and CCLCM & CWRU students in year 3. The residency program has 40 trainees per
21 year. Twelve different fellowship programs (accredited and non-accredited) are offered.

22
23 Research projects exist in all subspecialties with grants covering many topics (adult and
24 pediatrics) including epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, movement disorders, headaches, sleep
25 medicine and dementia.

26
27 The Department of Plastic Surgery is already established as a SOM department at UHCMC and
28 MHMC. James E. Zins, MD, is proposed for the academic chair of the department. Dr. Zins
29 was a founding member of the American Society of Craniofacial Surgery in 1992, and Director
30 of the American Board of Plastic Surgery from 2016-2022. He has authored 204 peer-reviewed
31 publications, 20 book chapters, and given 269 presentations and abstracts.

32
33 The breadth and depth of the identified faculty's teaching and research productivity includes 21
34 physicians, 4 fellows, and 13 residents. They teach medical students, residents, and fellows from
35 CCLCM, CWRU and other institutions. They are in the process to receive ACGME approval for
36 a new integrated residency program. There are research projects for faculty and trainees as well
37 as writing book chapters. Grants cover many topics (adult and pediatrics): face transplant,
38 nerves, holographic surgical planning, breast reconstruction, and limb perfusion.

39
40 When the department starts off, we will meet with the individuals to address questions about
41 their actual roles as part of the application process, and their expectations. These new
42 departments exactly mirror the departments at the other institutions (MHMC or UHCMC) and
43 are in line with the other centers. The interfaces between the academic departments at CCLCM
44 and the SOM are substantiated by a seat at Faculty Council and a seat at chair meetings. The
45 interface between academic department chairs and the leadership at CCLCM works directly with
46 the SOM. Not much contact exists between academic chairs and the Dean; an intermediary

1 participates in both activities. To address students who wish to apply for various positions at
2 Cleveland Clinic, each clinical department has an academic coordinator that serves that purpose,
3 and this will not change under the new system.

4
5 The question was asked that if the primary driver is alignment with the other institutions, other
6 than internal processes, and since we have functioned all these years without department entities,
7 why is this changing now? Dr. Barnett replied that, there has been a yearning among faculty for
8 an appropriate academic identity. Now that the program has matured, these departments can
9 clearly stand on their own as academic identities, with alignment through the SOM as the
10 secondary reason.

11
12 Dean Davis explained that when we do education in the third year clerkships and electives in the
13 4th year, the LCME states that no matter where you do those, you should receive the same
14 clinical experience and be evaluated in the same manner. Representatives of all of these groups
15 decide on the examinations, criteria, what proportion of students get honors and commendable,
16 and objectives and requirements in each discipline. Third year required clerkships -- 32 from
17 CCLCM, with a great deal of commingling in the 3rd year, and 4th year (plastic surgery, face
18 transplants and holographic imaging) is under Medical Education. This makes for a better
19 alignment when there are national programs and national research that want multiple sites; this is
20 the mechanism of getting to those sites.

21
22 When asked about yearly evaluations, Dr. Barnett clarified that if you are UHCMC faculty, your
23 yearly evaluation comes through the SOM. The understanding is that there is to be an internal
24 review at CCLCM, just as it is at MHMC, through the respective department chair.

25
26 A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal to create a new academic department
27 of Plastic Surgery at CCLCM. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 29 were in
28 favor, 5 were opposed, and 4 abstained. The motion passes.

29
30 A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal to create a new academic department
31 of Emergency Medicine at CCLCM. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 28
32 were in favor, 3 were opposed, and 4 abstained. The motion passes.

33
34 A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal to create a new academic Department
35 of Neurology at CCLCM. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 31 were in favor,
36 5 were opposed, and 3 abstained. The motion passes.

37
38 **Discussion on Faculty Council Structure and Representation (Jennifer McBride)**

39 Jennifer McBride, Chair-Elect of Faculty Council, proceeded to give a brief overview of the
40 Senate model option for Faculty Council structure and representation.

41
42 Faculty Council serves as the executive body representing all SOM faculty. In February 2018,
43 Faculty Council tasked an ad hoc group of peers to explore, meet several times, and come back
44 with data. Key points indicated that the size of Faculty Council, as an executive body, is too
45 large at 70+ representatives and will continue to grow with the addition of the new CCLCM
46 departments. It was noted that there seems to be a lack of faculty engagement.

- 1 Some points for consideration are that the senate model would provide a more efficient process
- 2 without discussions at these council meetings. The senate model proposes 3-4 elected members from these entities

Case, when it does not impact all of the

1
2 Jo Ann Wise’s comment: The proposed response to adoption of the Senate Model seems
3 extreme at first glance. However, it is worth noting that a boycott of the new HEC by basic
4 science faculty who participate in the University Curriculum has also been advocated as a way to
5 protest the lack of CWRU-related signage.”

6
7 Dr. Bonomo stated that currently the VA is only allowed one vote representing many diverse
8 faculty. The VA is not represented fully and completely through our connection at this point with
9 the opportunity to participate and contribute.

10
11 Dr. David Katz read comments from Dr. Richard Zigmond, who could not attend today’s
meeting. “Today’

1 kind of structure would be most useful given those changes. The Dean reiterated that she is
2 neither for nor against the senate model, she just thinks that the sequence is out of whack.

3
4 Discussion from the floor continued. A motion was made to postpone and a point of order was
5 raised. The vote that was put forward for this meeting was to vote specifically for the senate
6 model and does not dissuade Faculty Council to discuss it if voted down. The only vote to be
7 postponed is the vote on the senate model.

8
9 Dr. Chakrapani clarified that when making a motion to postpone and seconded you must give a
10 specific date or postpone indefinitely; it cannot be tabled. I want to postpone indefinitely the
11 vote on the senate model. The postponing was superior to the motion. The end debate is
12 superior to the postponement. We cannot debate that, we have to vote. If get 2/3 then we end
13 the debate and go to vote.

14
15 A motion was made and seconded to end the debate. There being no further discussion, a vote
16 was taken. 33 were in favor, 4 were opposed, and 0 abstained. The motion passes.

17
18 The Chair stated that someone would have to be recognized to unpostpone it, to bring the issue
before the committee, and then back to it again. If iov (o unpos)-1 (t2 (o)TJ(b)Tj(r)3 (i)-2 (ng7 ()-10 (I)TJ-0.00

1 A motion was made and seconded to accept this proposal to create an ad hoc Awards Committee
2 of Faculty Council. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 22 were in favor, 2
3 were opposed, and 2 abstained. It was noted that at this time we no longer have a quorum.
4 Faculty Council will revisit this topic at a future meeting.

5
6 There being no further business to be addressed, the meeting was adjourned at 5:42PM.

7
8 Respectfully submitted,

9
10 Joyce Helton

Summary of ad hoc Committee HEC

Report to David Miller, Chair of the FS

This committee is an *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Senate convened at the April FS ExCom meeting. The members of this committee are:

- Mark Hans, Chair, SODM
- Allison Webel SON
Chris Winkelman SON
Evelyn Duffy SON
Laura Voith MSASS
Maureen McEnery SOM
Renato Roperto SODM
Theresa Jasinevicius SODM
Thomas Kelley SOM
Darin Croft SOM
- Andrew Reimer, FS Personnel Committee
- Mendel Singer, FS Budget Committee

Action Items suggested by the HEC Transition Committee:

¹ Establish a temporary "landing area support kiosk " for faculty traveling from the CWRU campus to the HEC campus; we see this as an urgent strategy to meet the HEC goals of being both welcoming and committed to interprofessional education.

Ñ This is an urgent item as temporary/transient and new faculty will be arriving to this campus in the upcoming days and weeks.

¹ Identify strategies to welcome and orient faculty--particularly part-timers, guest lecturers, and intermittent speakers who provide essential content and value to our programs at the HEC. Make this unified across schools and inclusive across categories of faculty.

Action Items suggested by the HEC Transition Committee (cont....)

1 Publicize hec.case.edu as the main information portal for anything related to the HEC; should be used to:

Ñ Disseminate up-to-date information about topics noted above

Ñ Provide information/FAQ for faculty anticipating a visit to the HEC

Ñ Provide a mechanism for easy feedback about HEC issues that arise (e.g., web form that is appropriately routed for follow-up reply and response)

1 Clarify the importance of scholarship as a primary faculty activity.

1 Clarify the status of signage; discuss the anticipated/future changes to signage.

1 Clarify the ownership of the Samson Pavilion and the Dental Clinic.

• Note: the ad hoc committee recommend that staff also have a committee or other avenue to voice concerns, find solutions, and strategize processes of work in the HEC.

Proposal for Creation of School of Medicine Awards and Honors Committee

Regionally, nationally and internationally a large number of groundbreaking and discipline-specific honors and awards are given to individuals who advance various biomedical fields, be it in research, service or teaching. Identification of opportunities and crafting of materials describing the extraordinary accomplishments is left to individual faculty who may be unaware that they can and should apply for honors and awards, or may not be experienced in crafting materials. Many organizations send repeated requests for awards and honors applications because an insufficient number of individuals submit materials, or the applications received are not judged well because they are poorly constructed, not necessarily because they are not meritorious or faculty particularly underestimate the value of their work. To increase the number of faculty who are nominated to awards and honors nationally and internationally, we propose creating an Awards subcommittee, appointed by Faculty Council. This committee will work hand-in-hand with Chairs of Departments and Centers to identify opportunities for CWRU faculty to be nominated to various awards/honors.

Purpose:

1. To identify new and existing opportunities for faculty at every rank and increase the number of faculty members at CWRU/SOM who receive awards/honors
2. To create a nomination process and assist faculty in determining when they should apply for various honors/awards
3. To recommend procedures for crafting materials including producing templates for some very important awards/honors

Committee Member role:

1. Develop a searchable listing of honors and awards, eligibility, frequency, deadlines (to the extent possible)
2. Solicit nominations in conjunction with Department and Center Chairs
3. Review any department or center to have the broadest representation
2. Chair should be at least Associate Professor or above with general knowledge of meritorious awards/honors such as the Nobel Prize, National Academies, AAAS Fellows program, and at least one discipline-specific award/honor

Time Commitment and Resources

1. The first year will probably be the most intense as uniform procedures and guides do not exist, and the committee may need to meet monthly to advance the agenda. Once a regular agenda is established quarterly meetings (or less work can be done online or via Zoom) may suffice.
2. IT support to develop the database and centralize materials