

AHC FACULTY CONSULTATIVE MEETING

March 9, 1999

Minutes of the Meeting

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

Present:

Mickey Bebeau (Chair), Carole Bland, Patricia Ferrieri, Judith Garrard, David Hamilton, Stephanie Valberg, Timothy Wiedmann

Regrets: Dan Feeney, Kathleen Krichbaum, Frederic Hafferty

[Meeting Topics: Grant Review Process, AHC Staffing, E-mail Listservs,]

1. Report on the Grant Review Process

Professor Bebeau presented an update as to what has happened with the grant review process since the issues were discussed at the last meeting of the Faculty Assembly. As agreed at the Assembly meeting, AHC Senators and Committee members submitted names of people to serve on the review boards to Professor Bebeau who forwarded them to the Vice President's Office.

VP Cerra asked Dr. Bebeau to consult with John Fetrow on the proposed names and on a draft of the proposed process for the review of faculty development and seed grants. Professors Bebeau and Garrard reviewed the processes and suggested the following revisions:

The draft stated, "If the review committee is not confident that they can recommend appropriate reviewers, the needed topic areas will be referred back to the AHC FCC to recommend suitable evaluators." Professors Bebeau and Garrard thought referring back to the FCC would unduly lengthen the process. Further, since FCC members may also lack the expertise to recommend suitable reviewers, it was suggested that if the review committee could not find suitable reviewers, they should request that the principal investigator submit a list of potential reviewers.

The draft, which indicated "the final rankings will be forwarded to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and the Dean's Council for final evaluation," was modified to state "the final rankings will be forwarded to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and the Dean's Council for final for "approval," so as to clarify that the role of the Dean's Council was to ratify the review committee's judgments rather than to engage in a separate evaluative process. The following statement was also added, "if the Dean's Council disagrees with the review committee's selection, they must provide a written rationale for the reordered recommendations."

Comments:

Professor Valberg noted that the draft, as it stands, does not indicate who would receive the written rationale regarding disagreement with the review committee's selection, and that should be clarified. Others commented about problems with receiving reviews of proposals. Some people complained that they were not able to get reviews of their grant because the reviews were apparently lost.

After discussion, two suggestions were made with respect to further improving the process:

- 1) An AHC FCC representative could be invited to a discussion where review committee selections are discussed, even if it is not a Dean's Council meeting. Further, the review committee should present their recommendation to the Dean's Council in a regularly scheduled open meeting (an AHC FCC member is present at each of the Dean's Council Meetings). Minutes of the meeting should reflect rationale given for any reordering of the review committee's recommendation.
- 2) To counter past experiences, written reviews must be made available to the grantee upon request, including any rationale provided by the Dean's Council for reordered priority scores.

Professor Bebeau indicated she would convey the AHC FCC's suggestions in a letter to Dr. Fetrow (copied to Senior Vice President Cerra). The letter would also request clarification on how and to whom the Dean's Council would convey their views about the review committee's recommendations, as well as how reviews would be made available to the grantees.

Professor Bebeau then reported on the names submitted for the various review committees, and results of the request from John Fetrow to rank order the names within each category to determine an order of preference for selecting members of each review panel.

Professor Garrard remarked that in the future review committee membership could include those people who received an award the previous year. However, the grantees should be informed of that they when they receive their grant.

Professor Bebeau pointed to changes in the original list of recommendations for the School of Nursing and College of Veterinary Medicine. FCC members recommended these changes because the nominated individuals were not able to serve. One member noted that administrators were not ruled out as candidates for the review committees, as some appear on the list and the lists were approved by the FCC.

Professor Hamilton noted that a large amount of money available in grants through the AHC and some of the normal University process for application of AHC grants has not been followed (e.g., filing a BA 23), but that will be investigated and resolved in the future.

Review Panel: * indicates first choice where multiple names were submitted:

Faculty Research Development Grants:

Duluth School of Medicine - Jean Regal

College of Dentistry - Patrick Mantyh

TC Medical School: basic science - Ashley Haase

TC Medical School: clinical sciences-Dan Mueller, Tim Behrens and Robert Hebbel

School of Nursing - Jean Wyman

College of Pharmacy-Cheryl Zimmerman*, Joe Hanlon, Pat Hanna

School of Public Health - Ken Sexton

College of Veterinary Medicine-Gerry Sullivan*, Mike Murtaugh

Faculty Education Development Grants Rankings:

§ UMD School of Medicine-Steve Downing and Arlen Severson

College of Dentistry - Muriel Bebeau

TC Medical School: basic science

TC Medical School: clinical science - Tom McKenzie and Greg Vercellotti

School of Nursing - Marsha Lewis

§ College of Pharmacy-Robert Cipolle, Mary Beth, Don Uden

School of Public Health - John Finnegan

College of Veterinary Medicine - David Brown

Faculty Seed Grants:

Duluth School of Medicine - George Trachte

College of Dentistry - Charles Schachtele

TC Medical School: basic science - Henricus (Harry) Hogenkamp

§ Medical School Clinical Sciences-Susan Berry*Charlie Moldow

School of Nursing - Carol Pederson

§ College of Pharmacy-Rick Wagner*, Angela Birnbaum

School of Public Health - James Boen

§ College of Veterinary Medicine- Han So Jo* and Vivek Kapur

2. AHC Staffing

Members discussed a report "A Report of the Changes in Staffing September 1998 to September 1999" which submitted to the Committee by Senior Vice President Cerra. The report represents part of a response to the FCC by Vice President Cerra regarding perceived increases in administrative staffing. Following a general discussion of the Report, the committee made several observations and will ask Vice President Cerra for clarification on a number of issues at the next meeting. The committee expects the on-going discussion will eventually result in a report to the AHC Faculty Assembly.

The report summarizes changes in employment levels for two budget centers in the AHC: units in the SVP-HS Office and AHC Shared Programs. The committee noted that the biggest changes are in the administrative information systems, but employees were transferred out of the Medical School and centralized. Research computing had the second biggest increase, but that was also due to centralization.

Reflecting on the 13 AHC Shared Programs, the committee will ask Senior Vice President Cerra to define what constitutes a shared program. For example, the Community University Health Care Clinic (CUHCC) shows increases, but it is not clear why it is a shared program since the Medical School has been supporting it for over thirty years. Does considering CUHCC a shared program reflect the move towards a more interdisciplinary focus? Does CUHCC have an educational role in any AHC schools? What are the revenue streams for the shared programs? It should be known which cost centers generate revenue and whether or not those funds cover the costs of the centers.

Given that "point-in-time comparisons" may understate or overstate the actual number of employees in a unit, where decreases appear, are these temporary or permanent? Where it appears there are increases in staffing (e.g., Human Resources, Communications, Financial Officer) are these actual increases or the result of point-in-time comparisons, and if so, how are they justified? Can the increase in staffing be justified by noting the complexities of running the AHC; with all of the centers, research, regulatory bodies, human resources, ethics, etc.?

The report clearly explains the perceived changes between September 1998 through September 1999, but it is not clear what has prompted an increase in the administrative structure and whether or not it is necessary. The committee will ask that Senior Vice President Cerra develop a historic overview to develop a rationale for what exists today, and information relating to moneys transferred with the positions that were centralized.

Research could be done by Senior Vice President Cerra's office to determine the percentage of employees to the people served is at other academic health centers in similar institutions. The information requested is designed to provide insight and understanding.

3. Other Business

E-mail listservs

Professor Hamilton informed the committee that the e-mail accounts for AHC FCC members to communicate with their

faculty with an e-mail account that does not go through any administrative structure has been developed. However, access to them will not be available until next week.

Professor Bebeau has also investigated the development of e-mail accounts and thought they are available through the AHC administration, the accounts can be configured in such a way that there would be no link to administrative offices when the messages are distributed. She has developed a memo that can be sent for the initiation of discussion. This will be forwarded to members when their account is ready.

Professor Weidmann has already developed his own listserv and has received responses. Those, along with any others, will be discussed at each meeting.

Joint AHC FCC/FCC Consultative Workshops

Professor Bebeau informed the committee of progress she and Vice President Cerra and FCC Chair Sara Evans have made regarding enhancing the consultative process in the AHC. Dates for workshops on faculty consultation have been set for April 6, 14, and 26. Dates were selected to accommodate both President Yudof and Vice President Cerra, who will attend and present at each of the workshops. Deans, department chairs, and one faculty member from each department in the AHC will be invited.

The goal of the workshop is to inform deans and department chairs, who do not have an effective consultative process in place, how to set one up. A panel comprised of individuals from other areas in the university will describe instances where faculty consultation has enhanced decision making. The FCC is asked to assist with selection of representatives from each of the departments.

Committee members made the following suggestions: 1) It would be helpful to have people already involved with the consultative process at the workshops, so members of the AHC Faculty Assembly should be invited. 2) It may be more beneficial to invite associate deans from certain schools. 3) The workshop should stress the AHC consultative system as well as what may exist in their own colleges.

Strategic Facility Plan "Options for Development"

Professor Bland informed the committee that a "space allocation" report (referring to the Strategic Facility Plan distributed with the meeting agenda) was distributed at the Dean Council's meeting she attended. She wondered whether the report was in line with the way faculty members believe space issues are decided. She thought that VP Cerra needed to explain space allocation, as this was not clear to faculty.

Professor Bebeau remarked that it was her understanding that the document is not so much a matter of space allocation, but rather priorities of development. The document results from work of the Strategic Facility Planning Committee and reflects the priority ranking assigned by each school. Issues remain as to how priorities are assigned across the AHC. The report was forwarded to the AHC FCC by Frank Cerra, presumably because he intends to ask for consultation on the report at our next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.