Minutes Faculty Senate
University of Colorado School of Medicine
February 11, 2014

The meeting commenced at 4:35 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 January 14, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting

A motion was offered to approve the minutes, which was seconded.

Minutes from the January 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting were unanimously approved.

Dr. Reisdorph acknowledged the Michael Salem, CEO of National Jewish, as a guest to the faculty senate.

III. Discussion and Approval Items

1. Immunology/Microbiology Dept. Merger 4:37 p.m.

Dr. Reisdorph introduced Dr. John Cambier.

Dr. Cambier discussed the history of the issue of the Immunology dept. and the Immunologists vis-à-vis National Jewish and CU. 12 faculty will be moving to CU this summer. Dr. Cambier outlined the ways in which microbiology and immunology dept. being combined makes sense in terms of administrative efficiency. He asked for questions at 4:40.
Q: Will it affect the numbers of grad students and post-docs?
A: There will be no effect on students. They are looking forward to having more students around, on RC1N 9th floor.

Dr. Reisdorph: The only con seemed to be a reduction in dept. power?
Dr. Krugman: I can address that. The priority is to support the best science we can do, not necessarily all the science we can do. It just makes sense to try to bring people together along lines- immunology and microbiology just makes sense. Neuroscience is having these discussions so has biochemistry and genetics, and the pathology dept. About 25-30 of the over 100 faculty could fit into these combined areas. There needed to be an understanding about resources and space that might be available. July 1 getting everyone here and with the lease ending with National Jewish, we concluded that we should get on with these moves. If the other departments can get together we can put together what we have talked about by July 1, 2015 if that’s what we want to do, before my replacement comes on.

Dr. Reisdorph: Those mergers would need to be voted on by senate and so senators please go back to your depts. with this information.

Dr. Lowenstein: What are the risks or implications to the medical school curriculum by this merger?
Dr. Cambier: The undergraduate medical course is heavy on immunology and microbiology. We intend to recruit teachers to fill those needs.

Dr. Nuccio: What kinds of collegial activities are needed to smooth the transition?
Dr. Cambier: We have done things like mountain retreats, research in progress, and other things. We intend to keep doing these to maintain ties between National Jewish and Anschutz.

Dr. Reisdorph: Are there any more questions? Then we will now take a vote to approve the merger.

Vote: 24 approved; 0 against, 0 abstentions

IV. Dean's Comments

Dean Krugman was present and discussed the status of searches and affiliations. The search committee will select a group within the collective group for confidential interviews around end of March beginning of April. They will select 2-3 for finalists positions to be brought to campus for several days of interviews and conversations with stakeholders. By July 1st it should be concluded. Sometime on the next week Lily Marks and Don Elliman will pull together an RFP to get a search firm to search for my successor as Vice-Chancellor of health affairs and Dean. They are going to invite 506 firms to provide information and interview 2-3 of them. They will select a firm no later than mid-March at the latest. David Goff, the Dean of Public Health, to chair that committee. They hope to have finalists/semi-finalists at the time the UC Health System has made their decision, June or July.

I reported last time for the search of the Bioethics program. The selectee, Matt Wynia, will be part time at first, then come on full time. The radiation oncology search is underway.
With regard to the National Jewish relationship, I’m glad Michael is here and I would like to give you my perspective. We have been struggling in the last 6 months. I have personally been involved in this affiliation since 1993. It is much looser than some of our other affiliations. It states that we should do what we can to work together, keep each other informed, and resolve out issues. We should be notifying each other of recruitments, and that we should do it together. The relationships in many departments and among many people over the years have been terrific. In the late 1990s when this campus became available we hoped to accommodate NJ on this campus. We had many discussions with NJ at that time. We felt bad that we were not able to have NJ be out here at that time. About 2 years ago, we began conversations about whether it was possible to create affiliations to have NJ be part of the hospital system. We had conversations with UH, Children’s, and NJ about how to make this work. Over this past year the conversations broke down and ended. Different people describe differently how they ended, but basically, there was no agreement and they ended. NJ was having conversations with Mt. Sinai and others about an affiliation and clinical service. That’s where things evolved to. We still don’t know how all of this is going to play out. There have been rumors that the inability to get together around the clinical enterprise is going to end this affiliation. I would like to dispel that. I don’t think we should end it, but there will be consequences. There is nothing going on in Immunology research relationships should be lessened. However, if patients move to St. Josephs as we believe will occur, this hurts our faculty and possibly some of our training programs. Michael and I and
David Schwartz and Greg Downey have been meeting to discuss this. That’s where we are. The final thing I will say, Michael can say, we have heard that the clinical enterprise should not be interfering with the long-standing research affiliations. The problem is that that the bulk of our resources to support the research come form our clinical enterprise and UH, Children’s, etc. For us to assume we can just ignore that and support NJ clinical practice at another hospital is difficult for us to deal with.

Michael Salem: I appreciate the Dean’s comments. The academic and research affiliation with CU is important to NJ. We share a common history and vision. It is important to the citizens of Colorado. NJ will continue to support teaching and training of graduate students, medical students, fellows, residents, the common research programs between the 2 institutions. We invest about $1 million in scholarship programs and $6 million in subcontracts with CU. These programs are known worldwide and we plan to continue to invest in them and to do the work required to get through the difficulties the dean articulated. We have been supportive of the University program. It is 20 times the size of NJ clinical programs. We will provide any opportunity that anyone wants in these new affiliations. We will support the continued flow of patients to CU systems. We are commitment to this relationship. The rumors are affecting faculty on both sides. We are committed to validating faculty on both campuses. I appreciate the senate for this opportunity to state how committed we are to his relationship. But
we understand the challenges with these clinical enterprises. In Boston and other places there are examples of clinical overlaps that work positively.

Dr. Reisdorph: Any questions or comments? Hopefully the message can trickle out from here that both sides are working hard and the relationships can continue to work.

Dean: I don't want my comments on the clinical enterprises to extend to the research enterprises, the clinical is the challenge.

**III. Discussion and Approval Items (cont’d)**

2. Hematology Name Change

Dr. Reisdorph introduced Dr. Schwartz.

Dr. Schwartz: Initially, we thought that it was important to recognize each component within the new division in the name. Certain recruitments have resulted in everyone working together and getting along. The feeling of the group is that they don’t need such a cumbersome name for their division and they want to simplify it. We wanted to make the name consistent with other institutions. The SOM exec committee has vetted this. We are coming to the senate for approval. Comments or questions?

Dr. Lowenstein: Yes all of the original members of the committee were consulted about annulling the cumbersome name. So this is a formality.

Dr. Schwartz: We wanted to make sure everyone was acknowledged on this name change.

Dr. Reisdorph: Ok so now we’ll vote on the name change proposal.
All were in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Dr. Reisdorph: Vote on the Immunology/Microbiology Dept. Name:
All were in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention.

3. Faculty appointment Type Task Force Update
Dr. Yeager presented a set of powerpoint slides (attached to these minutes) on the discussion of the at-will task force.
Q; What is the alternative to at-will?
Dr. Lowenstein: At-will will remain an employment type as there are state laws on some positions. We have been asked by chairs to come up with guidelines, but it has never been discussed. Faculty have a role in discussing the policies that relate to their positions, promotions, etc.
Q: Will some education go out with the survey? For example: some of my junior faculty will say “At-will as opposed to what?”
Dr. Reisdorph: This is the education and we hope you can educate your faculty and take the survey.
Dr. Lowenstein: There is a link to the 4 appointment types. We are convinced you are correct that most faculty do not reflect much on their appointment type.
Q: Is there an option for longer time periods for limited appointments?
Dr. Lowenstein: Yes. Since tenure has been disappearing, perhaps one best way to reward highly effective faculty is longer-term appointments based on success.
Right now we have very few appointments longer than 3 years.
Dean: Some of this is negotiable. It is unlikely that someone who is going to move here and uproot their families would take at-will.
Dr. Lowenstein: There may not be much discussion or negotiating that takes place.

Dr. Cambier: At NJ there is no tenure so we have a range of terms. People do pay attention to these terms. Through my years I have recruited at CU and NJ so I can directly compare. The faculty I have recruited are more interested in the long-term prospect of tenure. When you are recruiting the very best people who have alternatives, they respond to the offers of longer terms.

Q: A question on the survey should be added. How are you arriving at your responses; were there surveys, meetings, etc.?

Q: Part of the education and background, what is the turn-around time and cost for these contract renewals? Is there admin support for the constant renewals.

Dr. Lowenstein: There are no processing costs to do it and the admin time is minimal.

Q: Do dept. chairs know that the survey is going out to senators? The data may be better if you include faculty.

Dr. Reisdorph: We are asking chairs to complete a survey as well. We will put this on survey monkey so there will be plenty of room for comments. We are looking for summaries.

Dr. Lowenstein: The mechanics of this are difficult. There are many options about how to survey and who to survey.

Q; It would be nice if the chairs had a heads up that this was going on.

Dean: We can do that at Exec committee to give a heads up.
Q: My sense in some depts. is that there will be a more honest response if it is conducted anonymously.

Q: The dept. of medicine does not have dept. meetings, so the senators represent small parts of the department and divisions. So basic scientists in some divisions may not get as much heads up or discussion as needed.

Dr. Reisdorph: We are trying to get a balance to create guidelines for potential changes.

Dr. Lowenstein: We can ask questions that avoid heated rhetoric and get the information out that we need and get the information we need.

Q: Maybe it would be helpful to allow us time to educate and then follow up with a survey. We might get the best data that way. We also could benefit from hearing why the chairs prefer at-will appointments. Then we could appreciate their position as well as our own.

Dr. Lowenstein: One possibility is to provide the senators the appointment types document, allow 3-4 weeks for education and discussion, then prepare the campus for a survey.

Q: What happens at CU Boulder?

Dr. Lowenstein: All faculty are tenured who are associate or full professors. For new asst. professors, they get a 3 year term appointment have a mid course review another 3 year term, a review and then are tenured or gone.

Dr. Reisdorph: So to summarize we will send a bullet point PDF, we will give time for discussion, continue the task force, and revisit this again before the survey.
A motion was made to adjourn. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Reisdorph adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Yeager, Ph.D.

Faculty Senate Secretary