Minutes

FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

November 14, 2017
4:30pm – 5:30 p.m.

Location: Anschutz Medical Campus – Academic Office 1 Building, Room 7000

I. Welcome:

Faculty Senate President Kathleen Torkko, PhD, called the meeting to order.

II. Approval of Minutes from October 10, 2017 meeting

Faculty Senate President, Dr. Kathleen Torkko, made a motion to approve the minutes. Minutes were approved as presented.

III. Dean Reilly’s Comments

A. Miscellaneous:

CU Annual Medicine Business Meeting takes place tomorrow night (November 15th). Come for drinks and updates on practice accomplishments from the last year. The news is going to look a lot like it has for the last 5 years year + a little Medicaid twist.

B. Status of searches and affiliations

1. Affiliations:

There is a new Ambulatory Health building at Denver Health

2. Searches:

Active recruitment for the Chairs of Psychiatry,
PM & R, and Immunology & Microbiology continues.

Candidates for the Director of Health and Wellness Center are being interviewed

IV. Discussion/Approval Items

1. GME Annual Review

Carol Rumack, M.D. and Associate Dean for Graduate Medical Education (GME) presented

GME is required to look annually at what we are doing in terms of resident and fellowship training:

- Increased by 20-30 residents/fellows (trainees) per year
  - Crossed over into the non-ACGME programs
  - Including subspecialty fellowships that are not yet board certified
  - ACGME wants to be part of certifying the residents and fellows

- We support 2400 CU faculty
  - Includes 140 Program Directors and 94 Program Coordinators
  - There are several major Program Director changes this year

- 30 CU med students entered our programs this year
  - Nationally competitive organization
  - Similar results for primary care and specialty care
• Same average x 5 years
• Int med ped is new and into it’s first graduating class in June
• Under rep minorities we are not doing very well
  ▪ Happy to have Dr. Zimmer help PDs with bias etc.
  ▪ Any help from faculty is appreciated

• Housestaff reports of professional treatment are all above 90%
  ▪ Much better than the med student survey on Professionalism -> they give very positive results

• If you want to stay in Denver- primary care is the best route
  ▪ 72% of Primary care residents stay in CO
  ▪ This has increased by 10% in the last 1 year
  ▪ Job market is more saturated in specialties
    ▪ This is good for us because we need Primary care

• Student debt:
  ▪ Nearly 20% of fellows graduate owing >300K

• Housestaff BURNOUT:
  ▪ ‘Have you become more callous?’
    ▪ ~50% say yes-
    ▪ Similar to national average for question of ‘burnout’
    ▪ Working with allied health providers and EPIC seem to contribute to this rate
• Since 2011: ACGME has given no citations and we are accredited every year
  o Healthy strong institution
  o Some programs have citations & we track all of them until they are resolved.
  o KEY ISSUES that we monitor:
    ▪ Fatigue (new requirements on wellness, burnout, managing fatigue)
    ▪ Ways to transition care when fatigue is an issue
    ▪ Education not compromised by service (higher than the Nat’l average)
    ▪ Data about practice habits (complications, infections, etc.)
      Residents are supposed to be getting this data and learning how to use it (comparing complication rates to a national database)
  o Underperforming programs are tracked annually
    ▪ Resident survey is the strongest trigger
    ▪ Special reviews for 9 programs until all issues are addressed (duty hours, timely evals, service over education)
• Clinical Learning Environment Review (CLER)
  o It’s not enough to review the program- need to review the learning environment
  o This acts as an early warning system-
  o Initiated 11/16 (Q2yrs) this was our 2nd visit
  o Includes:
Efforts to engage in Quality & Safety
- Engage in improving pt care
- Opportunities for trainees and faculty to get involved
  - Residents reported non-punitive and respectful environment
  - Reporting safety events and Q and S training is variable
  - Bonus Programs can be implemented
  - Foundations of Patient Safety was MISSED

2. Review of Changes Considered for Regent Article 4 and Policy 5
   (Attachment sent in previous email)

   Micheal Lightner, Vice President for Academic Affairs presented

   Regent decided it was time to review and update laws and policies

   - Administration was charged with reviewing/suggesting changes
     - Motive was simply to update and improve
     - President Benson believes that less is more for rules and regulations
   - Process was to look at laws and policies and categorize by HR, Academic, Regent/Legal
     - Each area had a subject matter expert group

   Academic Affairs laws and policies must be consistent with:
   - Federal & state law
   - Regents
- Administrative Policy Statements (system wide guidance)
- Campus policies
- School or College policies
- Department policies (these are supposed to be consistent - although they can be refined)
- Faculty Senate bylaws are parallel

Approved Article changes will be made effective in by the following process:
- Subject matter group makes rec changes
- Goes out for public comment for 60 days
- Campuses are notified by a variety of notifications -
- Comments can be made on a website
- Version 2 follows the same review process - but for 30 days
- Version 3 is meant to be brought to the regents - buffer is governance committee - can send directly to board - or ask for re-work
- Cycle around until approval rec to full board - then goes through 2 readings with the board

At each stage - all meetings etc. - anybody can come in and say 'We don't like this. There are many avenues for input because these changes are believed to be important.

- Current Timeline:
  - A set of ideas & concerns has been out ~ 60d
  - Dec 8th = 1st revised version
  - Hope by the end of Spring semester to have 3rd revision - goal to have whatever changes we are going to be make to be completed by end of cal year 2018 (two very experienced Regents leave in 2018
and they will be replaced with very inexperienced Regents that do not know the system)

Changes to Policy 5 aim to separate ‘freedom of speech’ from ‘academic freedom’. Freedom of speech is a federal and state legal issue that differs from academic freedom. Academic Freedom challenge lies in the concept of ‘shared governance’:

- The Regents laws recognize shared governance and the participation of ‘the faculty’ in all of these things.
- ‘The faculty’ is poorly defined, so some of the work is in further clarification of this definition.

Academic Freedom is assigned to each individual faculty member. Therefore we are challenged with individual faculty saying ‘This is the text- syllabus-etc.- and that’s my right under Academic Freedom.’

- This is relative to THE faculty who oversee curriculum etc.
- There is a need to balance a faculty vs. the faculty
- Becomes a real issue when we have the large coordinated courses (i.e. calc 2)

Question:

1. How will this impact the teaching of controversial topics like reproductive healthcare?

   This is a great example- this is where academic freedom really plays out. I can’t imagine the faculty of a dept saying we will not discuss X. In 4 different cases last year- on different campuses- when called out about controversial subjects- in every single one the board of regents said no- this is academic freedom. They have been very clear on this. If we don’t capture this well- then we need to hear about it.
The next issue relates to Tenure. This is not necessarily a big issue- but where are you tenured? Dept? campus? University? It is simply ambiguous.

- If you are trying to move- do you have to change your tenure home?
- We are taking the position that you are tenured once
  - The regents tenure you as faculty of CU
  - The receiving unit needs to have a process by which the faculty would review the faculty coming-in whatever way deemed appropriate- then vote to see if the transfer of tenure makes sense.
  - Faculty do not need to ask for tenure twice.

Question:

1. What does that mean for financial responsibility?

You have a ‘home’ as a faculty member. For example, I’m an engineering professor- but I love theatre. I have a salary in engineering- but I publish in theatre. They say OK- they will pay you from the theatre salary line- not engineering. The receiving unit takes on the salary.

The next issue is Tenure Criteria. It’s not clear with respect to ‘Excellence in Teaching’ and Excellence in Research.

- Research is common across every dept. in this institution. We look for impact and validation of impact.
- Teaching is treated differently in units across campus.
• Excellence in Teaching requires external impact that is validated externally; textbooks, protocols, pubs, & pedagogy - not just good ratings in a classroom.
• We want to understand that there is no different value assigned to Excellence in Teaching vs. Research.

Question:

1. Criteria for tenure are higher in SOM than anywhere else in the system - also require Nat’l and internat’l rep - much harder to establish a national reputation for teaching - lack of international of national forums for teaching - can qualify if known on campus - challenging if we have to determine external impact.

    I don’t think this will be hard - because there are asterisks everywhere for the SOM (exceptions for SOM bc it is a different environment - and there is a long history of doing this.

Changes suggested for Instructional Faculty (career faculty - critical to the function) vs. ‘non-tenure track faculty’ (broader bucket) have resulted in the largest number of comments.

• Concern is that the current state means that many Instructional Faculty have no particular rights or privileges
• >50% of student credit hours are taught by these members of our community
• The challenge is how to appropriately recognize and support them throughout their careers (they can spend their entire careers here) Each campus has different ways that they support these faculty
• Want to put in place some more general supports in lieu of each campus and sometimes
schools and colleges having different systems
This is a fact of life in modern universities and
how we incorporate them and provide them
connections and rights is a challenge
- Current rule is that they have whatever rights
tenured faculty vote them to have and everyone
is concerned about this and wants to improve
this.

Question:

1. How will grant supported faculty in SOM be managed?

Research faculty have not complained because we are not using the term
non-tenure track faculty. This is to keep things a bit clearer. Advanced
practice providers etc. will not fall into this bucket. We are trying to look at
broad categories and say general things about them.

Last issue! ‘Dismissal For Cause’ is the last place where
changes are being suggested.

- This includes different types of faculty:
  - Many faculty have either limited or term
contracts.
  - Tenured faculty have a continuous
contract.
  - The regents give tenure. They don’t hire
you and they have little to do with you if
you are not tenure- they simply provide
framework for operation.
  - Tenured/tenure track or term faculty
have a path for ‘dismissal for cause’ that
takes you through the Regents
  - Tenured faculty can’t be dismissed- they
can have their tenure revoked for cause
and then dismissed. This goes to regents

- Other faculty have a process that ends with an appeal to the president instead of regents.
- For example, the Regents - not Provost or Chancellor - give degrees. This is based on the recs of X- they grant degrees- so they are the only ones that can revoke a degree.
  - We are aiming for the same type of parallel-ity on dismissal for cause

Question: SO HOW DO WE GET ACCESS?
It will be posted in CU Connections- Cheryl will have it and can share it.