The meeting commenced at 4:33 p.m.

I. Welcome

Dr. Nicole Reisdorph, President of the Faculty Senate for 2013-2014, called the meeting to order.

II. Approval of Minutes of October 10, 2013 Faculty Senate Meeting

Kimberly Kelsey motioned to approve the minutes, which was seconded. Minutes from the October 2013 Faculty Senate Meeting were unanimously approved.

III. Dean’s Comments

Dean Krugman was present and discussed 3 candidates to lead the ethics program. Matt Wynia’s situation has changed and is talking with his employer (the AMA) and will have to be part time until his son completes school, about a year or so. Dean Krugman is waiting to hear from the AMA on the part time situation. Senior assoc dean for education search is also going but there is no update available. Chip Ridgeway is Chair and we hope to hear something soon.

For President and CEO of University of Colorado Health (the health system), the Dean met with the search firm today, Witt Kieffer, with Karen Otto. Potential candidates for this important position would be important financially speaking. This represents real money, more than we get from the state of Colorado. We
benefit if they do better, but we get 3% if they don’t do better. This will be a significant infusion into our overall operation.

With regard to affiliations, there are lots of rumors, information, and misinformation between the school and National Jewish. We are having monthly meetings with NJH. We are trying to manage the affiliation well. It is clear that our strategic planning to move immunology back to this campus has had an impact. National Jewish’s decision to forge a relationship with Exempla will have an impact. The Dean’s main goal is to reduce collateral damage. It will take much conversation and understanding, perhaps more than both sides have had to this point. Tomorrow at Hensel Phelps I will give the state of the school address.

IV. Discussion and Approval Items

Dr. Dennis Boyle was introduced by Dr. Reisdorph to talk about volunteer faculty.

1) Volunteer Faculty

Dr. Boyle explained the various duties and locations of the volunteer faculty around the state. He discussed benefits of library access and parking for volunteer faculty. There is a website for volunteer faculty that offers a full description. Crowd wisdom offers a series of modules for training and also offers faculty profiles. The common application is now digital, streamlined, and easy to do. It has a lot of triggers on it depending on your interest or type of teaching, medicine you want information on. We focus on “learning through teaching”, and the website is marketing to and recruiting teachers, especially as we go down
south. We are making a large effort with regard to teaching at the Colorado Springs branch (list who we have, recruit, teach). We do have some hurdles. One is background checks.

Dr. Boyle: The 2 biggest hurdles are computers and RVU (Rocky Vista University). It depends on what level learner you are, the earlier students struggle with all of the computer stuff related to documentation, procedures, etc. The other hurdle is that RVU pays $500/month/per student. We are trying to talk about UC name recognition as well as get some benefits as we all as training that we do to market to volunteer faculty. We are open for business.

Question from a Senator: Dennis how do you envision MOC?.
Dr. Boyle: We are working with Ron Gibbs now to get points for MOC through education. I think at some point in time that’s a possibility.

2) Overview of Learner Mistreatment
Dr. Reisdorph introduced Dr. Lowenstein.
Dr. Lowenstein: A number of you have indicated that we need a broader conversation, that it’s not about a promise. We agree. So to update all of us about learner mistreatment, our students continue to report a level of mistreatment that is higher than the national average. The most common issues are threats of retaliation, public humiliation, etc. This threatens our accreditation. Disrespectful comments about patients also potentially bring serious negative
consequences to the university. We recognize that this is a shared responsibility. The Faculty senate has taken a leadership role historically. In 2004 it approved an Enhancing Professionalism code, developed a Professionalism First outreach, made modifications of the teacher – learner agreement. In 2013 the professionalism code was expanded and included a faculty promise. These are intended to uphold a respectful learning environment, prohibition against retaliation, etc. But we agreed that this is not enough. We need more coordination, investment, and planning. The Faculty Professionalism Committee will be responsible for intake and response to reports of mistreatment. We will create an expert Faculty Care, Support, and Accountability team, which is an awkward name, but will focus on repeated and more serious episodes, guide evaluation of faculty. For the oversight of all of these activities, we have the Professionalism Coordinating Council. This committee will guide the Faculty Professionalism committee, and emphasize accountability for improving our culture. They will have a focus on reporting and responding.

This is our shared commitment, as passed by the Faculty Senate Nov 12, 2013.

Dr. Reisdorph: Is the structure that Steve just showed clear to everybody?

Dr. Lowenstein: This is a skeleton, so we are not ready to present an outline to you.
Question from Attendee: I have been asked if we have a transparent process that is easily available for faculty or staff to grieve a complaint?

Dr. Lowenstein: You mean a disciplinary action?

Question from Attendee: For any disagreement or action. Will it be transparent?

Dr. Lowenstein: For nearly every action against faculty there is a grievance process, but this is not clear for all actions. It may be more apparent once we finish the outline. But I hear what you are saying.

Question from Attendee: For any disagreement or action. Will it be transparent?

Dr. Lowenstein: Are you asking from the reporting side or the defending side or both?

Question from Attendee: Yes

Dr. Lowenstein: Yes

Question from Senator: How are you planning on presenting this to the general faculty?
Dr. Lowenstein: The real answer is that we don’t know; you are reminding us that we need to do the groundwork.

Question from Senator: For example on the website there are examples of conflicts of interest, some were black and white some were not. Something like that.

Dr. Reisdorph: Would you suggest sending a report to chairs? I think it would help if Steve presented this.

3) Faculty Professionalism Committee

Dr. Kelsay offered a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the professionalism reporting statistics. Although the numbers are small, we are double from last year. We have to glean from the reports where these events are occurring but we hope to provide this functionality soon. We take all reports, and this is the reporting diagram. This system generates an email from us to the reporter asking if they would like to talk with us further. They get a number, an access code, but if they do not write the number down, the report is lost. Do you have any questions at this point?

Question form a Senator: Do you act on the first report from an anonymous reporter?
Dr. Kelsay: We have not done that.

Question from a Senator: So there is a process in 3rd and 4th year. Part of that hidden curriculum is culture of medicine. You might want to include this.

Dr. Lowenstein: That meeting has begun. It’s a great idea. We are also looking at increasing use of ombuds office as well.

4) Faculty Promise

Dr. Reisdorph: If you look under the fourth bullet that was the language added for faculty action if disciplinary action is recommended.

Steve Lowenstein: What we tried to do with this is to respond to the important points raised about protecting faculty and due process. That’s what we did. All those elements should be there in the context of action. You charged with me and we did that. Steve Zweck-Bronner is here as well.

Comment from Attendee: Was there any discussion that the shared responsibility included the learners?

Dr. Reisdorph: They have their own code of conduct, that is my understanding.
Dr. Lowenstein: My point is that this is our code-faculty. So I don’t know if this is the place for assigning or placing blame. I hear what you are saying. It may not be the right place for that. We are trying to address systemic stresses, but I just don’t know about putting the learners in there.

Shanita Punjabi: Are students going to get a copy of this?

Dr. Lowenstein: We do not have secrets here so we should make this available.

Question from Senator: Are there aspects of professionalism in the evaluation for the faculty?

Dr. Lowenstein: It is absolutely there, let me get it for you.

Dr. Reisdorph: I’d like to thank Steve for all of his work on this.

Question from Attendee: It is not clear how you are going to get his information from more than just a few students. How do you change this to get all 100 people reporting?

Dr. Lowenstein: We have talked about how to do this. We don’t want to put the burden on the students. We are going to fix this and try to close this gap.
Dr. Kelsay: I don’t know if the 60% are really bad things or just differences in opinion.

Question from Attendee: Rather than just filling in a bubble, the students could identify a department.

Dr. Lowenstein: We need information to faculty members for the reasons I keep bringing it up. If no one tells me, I can’t improve and I can’t apologize. This cannot continue. I don’t think the faculty have a sense what these comments are like.

Question from Attendee: My perception is we don’t really know what the students perceive as abusive. I don’t know where the line is drawn between an offensive environment or a change in job duties. Some of these infractions might be more related to being asked to do something that they feel like is not part of their education, these days.

Dr. Lowenstein: There are so many grey areas, you might be right.

Question from Jeffrey Druck, President-Elect: Is it possible to have a summary of the type of reports or cases there are?

Dr. Kelsay: I think the data is there, but we still need to protect reporters.
Dr. Lowenstein: The examples are very useful. I think we can do that. We can do Hidden curriculum. They are detailed and hard-hitting. We need this information to improve our behavior, our culture, our approach.

Question from Attendee: I am puzzled why people are not confronting this. Faculty are going to need to develop the skills to confront a faculty bully if that’s what we are expecting them to do.

Question from Senator Nuccio: A procedural question. Sine the senate passed a version of the promise, now that this is quasi-changed, do we need a vote of approval?

At 5:38 p.m., a motion was made to vote for approval the faculty promise and that was seconded. There were seventeen yes votes, zero no votes, and three abstentions.

A motion was made to adjourn. The motion was seconded.
Dr. Reisdorph adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Yeager, Ph.D.

Faculty Senate Secretary