

AHC FCC

August 15, 00

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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

[In these minutes: Selection of chair; Report from the past year; Visioning Process]

PRESENT: Muriel Bebeau (chair), Jean Forster, James Boulger, Christine Mueller, Timothy Wiedmann, Denis Clohisy, Ted Oegema

REGRETS: Robert Miller, Daniel Feeney

ABSENT: Stephanie Valberg

GUESTS: Marty Dworkin

Professor Bebeau called the meeting to order and asked members to introduce themselves.

The next item of business was the selection of the chair for 2000-01. Professors Tim Wiedmann and James Boulger were nominated. Professor Bougler respectfully declined, citing commuting from Duluth as a major obstacle. Professor Wiedmann accepted the nomination and was elected committee chair for 2000-01.

Professor Bebeau provided an overview of the committee's work. Her report follows:

### **History of our relationship to the FCC**

The AHC Faculty Consultative Committees was established in 1996. The AHC FCC has strong support from Senior Vice President Cerra. It consists of representation from each of the colleges within the AHC, with two representatives from the Medical School—one from basic sciences and one from clinical sciences. In the first couple of years, the committee operated somewhat less formally with monthly meetings to discuss faculty issues, and a monthly meeting with the SVP to bring faculty concerns to the attention of the SVP as well as to discuss issues for which he sought our consultation. In year two, we established the Faculty Assembly, began to attend Dean's Council Meetings and established subcommittees on Finance & Planning (chaired by Dan Feeney) and Faculty Affairs (chaired first by Carole Bland, and currently by Ted Oegema). Sub committee chairs serve as ex-officio FCC members.

In November of 1998 and January of 1999, conversations between University FCC and AHC Senators and Department chairs and Heads suggested that the consultative process in the AHC wasn't as effective as it could be. In fact, there was a perception that consultation was just window dressing. Most faculty were not aware of when and whether consultation had occurred or how consultation had impacted decision making. At that point, Fred Morrison, Sara Evans (then Chair of the FCC), and I (M Bebeau) met with VP Cerra to discuss the faculty perceptions and to devise ways to enhance the consultative process.

We instituted a number of changes, in particular better communications about the results of consultation. In the March 1999 Issue of AHC Community News four suggestion for improving AHC level communications were presented:

- Create a list of AHC projects under consideration and make that list available to all
- Post minutes from AHC FCC and Assembly meetings on the web site
- Provide a review of the effectiveness of consultation
- Post Deans Council agendas and minutes on the web site.

Four suggestions for school and department level communications were proposed:

1. Ask each school to develop a mutually agreed upon consultative process and a plan for communicating the results of consultation
2. Hold deans and department heads accountable for communication through annual compacts and evaluations
3. Offer workshops on consultation

#### 4. Ask deans to attend Faculty Assembly meetings

In addition to the changes in communication, we proposed and implemented a workshop for all AHC administrators and selected faculty representatives from each of the schools. Four workshops were held in the spring of 1999. President Yudof, members of the University FCC and heads from other units within the University participated. Attendance of all heads of units was required. The long-range plan was to have each school or units then hold their own workshop on shared governance. To date, the follow-up plan has not been implemented. However, there is great variability among AHC schools in the extent to which principles of shared governance are operational. Some, like public Health, Vet Medicine and Pharmacy have well-established consultative committees. Medicine and Dentistry do not.

### **Activities from July, 1999 to July, 2000**

The main issue addressed over the past year was the "Visioning Process." Last summer, as we discussed progress with respect to improving the consultative process, we decided to ask faculty for issues and concerns and to hold a retreat to set direction for our future activities. At a retreat last September, we reviewed the faculty responses, we found three major themes: lack of visionary leadership; lack of accountability in leaders; lack of state support for health profession education. Tim Delmont from HR facilitated our discussion about the direction the AHC should be going. In addition to recommending a faculty lead visioning process, we decided that to improve accountability of leaders, we would engage in a review of policies relating to yearly performance review, yearly review for compensation, and process and procedures for post tenure review. (We noted that all units have not yet developed process and procedures for post tenure review). Review of these documents was assigned to committees of the AHC Assembly

#### AHC Faculty Affairs Committee

The Faculty Affairs Committee is engaged in the examination of policies and procedures for post tenure review and yearly performance review. Much of the past year was spent collecting the documents from the various Departments. By April, the Faculty Affairs Committee had most of the documents in hand, and has begun its work on the review of documents. That work is in progress. All members of that committee have agreed to continue on the committee until the work is complete.

#### AHC Finance and Planning Committee

The Finance & Planning Committee took on the review of policies for merit review and compensation as well as three other major issues. Chaired by Dan Feeney, the F& P committee (devised a questionnaire that was sent to all department heads inquiring about the process for implementing the University Policies on Merit review and compensation. Their report is now complete, and is being reviewed prior to its release—possibly in September. The intent is to publish the results of the survey in the AHC Community News (as well as on our web site) so the community is aware of how their unit and/or department compare with others in terms of compliance with University Policies.

The committee also reviewed the Allied Health Programs (at their request) and prepared a report to SVP Cerra on realigning allied health programs in the Medical School.

Shortly after the first of this year SVP Cerra asked the Committee to garner some perspective on the Medical School finances. A series of questions were developed (also forwarded to SVP Cerra for use during interviews with AHC CFO candidates) and the committee set about discussing possible answers. During the discussions, several things came to light regarding "core" financing, the need for an FTE analysis to assure that what needs to be done is covered (but not flush) and to determine what is "noncore." Although it was not specified in the report, a similar view was put forth in the AHC Accountability and Service document developed during Phase II of the AHC Vision & Planning process. In other words, should "noncore" endeavors be self-supporting instead of a cash and FTE drain on the Medical School/AHC?

The report is being finalized. It addresses the questions developed and the committee hopes that this will give some insight about some issues (including Associate Dean and RSO positions). Because this report would be informative for anyone interested in the current AHC/Medical School financial situations, the committee hopes (with SVP Cerra's permission) to distribute the report to the AHC Faculty and make it available on the Senate web site.

#### The Visioning Process

In October 1999, the AHC FCC, recognizing that it would be difficult to engage faculty in governance when it is not clear how their professional lives fit with the vision of the AHC, mandated that a critical self-examination and visioning process be undertaken. The committee felt that identifying a vision for the AHC seemed key to promoting involvement, contributions, and well being of faculty. Shortly thereafter, SVP Cerra, in his Annual State of the AHC Address focused this review in the form of six defining questions. See the AHC web site for details of the questions and copies of the documents.

A faculty task force was formed (under the direction of Marty Dworkin) to carry out this mandate and, during a five month period, met to examine and debate the six defining question. The process was endorsed by the Board of Regents a, and a regential subcommittee, chaired by Regent Maureen Reed, was set up to participate in the process. In the initial phase, each

of the questions was discussed and analyzed from an individual collegiate perspective. Reports for this phase were presented to the colleges and to the Regent's subcommittee. In the final phase, each of the questions was discussed and analyzed by a multi-collegiate faculty committee. Their individual reports are included in a report that was again presented to the Regent's subcommittee in June. The Regent's committee reviewed that report, made suggestions for modification, and presented the visioning document to the full Board on July 14. The Board accepted the report and work has now begun on development of a Strategic Plan. The Plan will be reviewed by the Deans Council, the AHC FCC, and the faculty before presentation to the Board of Regents this fall.

### Additional Issues

Reviewed the job descriptions for deans and department chairs.

Dealt with the flyer entitled "From the War Room" - specifically about the "lone ranger" mentality and lobbying efforts in the face of the unified "visioning process."

Faculty Research Development Process - Grants – Reviewed a proposal for the Genomics Project that had been awarded. The committee passed a resolution in June stating that the "FCC strongly opposes the allocation of monies in any focused area or strategic categories and requested that the process to support funding for interdisciplinary education and research be done in a competitive and fair process, open to all.

- Reviewed the process and criteria for the AHC Faculty Research Development Grant Program 2000. The committee made several suggestions to improve the process, reiterating the importance of keeping the process open—even if there were targeted areas for development. The committee also asked for a report on the status and outcomes of projects funded during previous funding cycles (implemented in 1997).
- Made suggestions for members who would serve on the review team for the review of the Dean of the School of Pharmacy.

### **Conclusions:**

We have achieved a vision statement for the AHC that represents the faculty's perspective on direction for the future.

We have enhanced communication regarding the shared governance activities of the AHC FCC.

We have addressed accountability in leadership in a number of ways: (1) by pushing for job descriptions for Deans and Department Chairs, (2) by participating in the review of Deans--commenting on the review process, reviewing reports, and making recommendations for membership on the review teams, (3) by collecting and analyzing documents for implementing University Policies, (4) by conducting a survey of the process for merit review to draw attention to how well leaders implement the compensation policy within departments and units, (5) by reviewing compacts and other financial documents to reflect on fiscal responsibilities of leaders, and (6) by lobbying for fairness in the allocation of AHC Faculty Research Development Grants.

Next, Professor Dworkin provided an update on the "visioning process." He pointed out that the process was initiated by the FCC last fall and began in February 2000. It was mandated to take six months and in July a final report was available. The process took place in three parts, beginning with a set of six questions defined by SVP Cerra for setting the process in motion. The six questions include: 1) What is the mandate of the AHC; 2) How can the AHC be a leader in the delivery of health care; 3) What is the AHC's vision for the educational process; 4) How can the AHC improve and enhance its research standing; 5) How does the AHC view the impending digital revolution; 6) Dealt with communication and governance.

The report was presented to the Board of Regents on July 14. The Board enthusiastically accepted the report, Professor Dworkin reported. It was clear from the response from members of the Board as well as the President that they viewed the report as an important document, he said.

Professor Dworkin then summarized a number of points that emerged from the report:

- SVP Cerra and Terry Bock are using the report to assemble a strategic work plan that will be part of the biennial request. This piece is expected to be worked on during fall and early winter semester and ready for presentation next year.
- Muriel Bebeau has represented the FCC throughout the process.
- A new approach to funding the educational activities in the AHC emerged, referred to as "a new covenant."

- One value that was shared by just about all faculty has to do with the importance and quality of the research effort. Thus, a way must be found to protect, increase, and encourage clinical research and improve the AHC's standing in the national rankings. This will involve hiring and nurturing more research oriented faculty.
- From an economic point of view, many of the problems stem from the Medical School. Many of the Medical School's problems have emerged in that many clinical research faculty have been diverted more and more to clinical activities to bring in revenue. Grant proposals have dropped; NIH standings in terms of ROI have dropped from 15<sup>th</sup> to 27<sup>th</sup> over a period of about ten years. One way to revert this is to protect the research time of clinical faculty and to hire more research oriented faculty.
- Almost all colleges emphasized an integrated approach to the education of health professionals and the delivery of health care.
- With respect to the role of digital technology, a major effort will have to be made in that direction with the AHC as the hub of the model.
- The idea of an aging chronically ill population led to a new model of health delivery, perhaps even a new physical unit devoted to an integrated approach.

The effort now is to translate these ideas into a strategic work plan, Professor Dworkin concluded.

When asked what the role of the FCC would be involved in the future, Professor Dworkin suggested members talk to SVP Cerra about it. He added that as a faculty member he would be available to the committee at any time.

Another member inquired about whether an official announcement had been made regarding the Board of Regents support of the report. It was noted that there was a couple of articles in the newspaper, the DAILY, and announced in the BRIEF.

Members then spent some time discussing the importance of getting the legislature to take a stand so it will be remembered as a legislature with a vision.

It was agreed that the FCC would meet on the second Tuesday of the month from 1:00 - 2:30 during 2000-01.

#### Future Agenda Items

- Meet with new Education VP, Director of Communications and Mark Paller
- Review reports on post-tenure review; compensation, merit survey and finance
- Fairview/University merger
- Strategic visioning process
- IRB issues

The following items will be raised with SVP Cerra at the upcoming meeting:

- Fairview/University merger
- Legislative request
- Strategic plan - financial support for implementation
- Financial support for the health benefit for state employees and salary increases
- Efficiency plans in terms of teaching and research

Vickie Courtney

University of Minnesota