

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTER
DEANS COUNCIL
Tuesday, July 8, 1997
475 ChRC
2:00 p.m.

AGENDA

OPEN SESSION

- | | | |
|----|---|--------|
| 1) | Status of Semester Conversion in the AHC
Discussion
Peter Zetterberg | 30 min |
| 2) | Process for Reviewing Academic Administrators
Presentation and discussion
Jeanette Louden | 30 min |
| 3) | Process for Allocating Strategic Investment Funds
Follow-up discussion
Frank Cerra | 15 min |
| 4) | Review of School Strategic Plans | 90 min |
| | School of Medicine, Duluth (pink)
Ron Franks | |
| | School of Public Health (white)
Edith Leyasmeyer | |

Information Item Only:

- Task Force on Faculty Consultation (yellow)
-

SIGN UP SHEET FOR DEANS COUNCIL MEETINGS

Midway 20

May 27

June 3

June 10

June 17

June 24

July 1

SIGN UP SHEET FOR THIS THURSDAY COLUMN

Due Date

Publication

May 28 - *David H*

June 5

June 11 *midway*

June 19

June 29

July 3

*would like Cindy to update on
epidemiology*

Received: from mhub2.tc.umn.edu (mhub2.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.52])
by mailbox.mail.umn.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA29188
for <courtney@mailbox.mail.umn.edu>; Fri, 2 May 1997 09:27:33 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub2.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 2 May 97 09:27:14 -05
Received: from x84-27-153.ejack.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 2 May 97 09:2
From: "Muriel J. Bebeau" <bebea001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Reply-To: "Muriel J. Bebeau" <bebea001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: courtney@mailbox.mail.umn.edu
Subject: Re: AHC FCC Business
Message-Id: <3369f9c218e9002@mhub2.tc.umn.edu>
Date: Fri, 2 May 97 09:27:14 -0500

Vickie: I was not at the meeting either, so would need copies. Tell Judy I think another meeting on June 5, would be a good idea. We have lots of issues.

In message <65669.courtney@mailbox.mail.umn.edu> "Vickie Courtney" writes:

>
>
> May 1, 1997
>
>
>
>
> TO: AHC-FCC Members
>
> FROM: Vickie Courtney
>
> RE: PIDP Report and other Business
>
>
> At the meeting on Tuesday with Frank, it was agreed that committee
> members review the revised PIDP report, write down comments, send
> them to me, and I will put into one document. I will then circulate the
> document to the committee, Frank and Leo. Members present at the
> meeting felt that this would eliminate one more meeting - after these
> comments, etc. have been incorporated into yet another draft, Frank
> and perhaps Leo will talk with you again.
>
> Frank also distributed:
>
> a. Development of a Master Plan for AHC Facilities
> b. Document from the Board of Regents meeting on Promotion and
> Tenure Recommendations
>
> I am only sending documents to Peter, Sheila and Dan because they were
> not at the meeting. If for some reason you need another copy, let me
> know.
>
> Also, Judy would like your reaction about holding another Assembly
> Meeting on Thursday, June 5, 11:30 - 1:00?

Muriel J. Bebeau, Ph.D.
Professor, School of Dentistry
Faculty Associate, Center for Biomedical Ethics
Director of Education, Center for the Study of Ethical Development
University of Minnesota
15-136 Moos Tower
515 Delaware S.E.

Judith OK
Muriel OK
Cynthia OK
Sheila - NO *prefer not*

Received: from mhub2.tc.umn.edu (mhub2.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.52])
by mailbox.mail.umn.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA26828
for <courtney@mailbox.mail.umn.edu>; Thu, 1 May 1997 09:36:44 -0500 (CDT
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub2.tc.umn.edu; Thu, 1 May 97 09:36:24 -05
Received: from x244-58.hsr.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Thu, 1 May 97 09:36:24
Message-Id: <v0300780eaf8e54475661@[128.101.244.58]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Thu, 1 May 1997 09:38:33 -0500
To: Muriel J Bebeau <bebea001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,
Daniel A Feeney <feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>, dwh@med.umn.edu,
Peter B Bitterman <bitte001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,
Cynthia R Gross <gross002@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,
Sheila A Corcoran-Perry <corco001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,
fhaffert@d.umn.edu, courtney@mailbox.mail.umn.edu
From: Judy Garrard <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Subject: Faculty Recognition
Status: U

May 1, 1997

To: AHC-FCC
From: Judy Garrard

While working on the This Thursday column regarding promotions, I remembered something that a junior faculty member told me this year (which is also something I experienced myself both times I was promoted): It is very hard to know just when you are ACTUALLY approved for promotion -- other than (perhaps) a slight boost in salary. (There are so many layers and it's so convoluted) Given that lack, what would you all think about the following:

What if we proposed to Frank Cerra that there be a Faculty Recognition Day in late May or early June (perhaps to be held out in that area in front of the Biomed Library) which would be sponsored jointly by the AHC-FCC and the Provost's/Vice President's office that would recognize and congratulate the 58 people promoted this year. This would have to be scheduled after the Regents meeting (May 8-9). The deans and department heads could be invited (this could go thru the Deans' Council) and faculty would be urged to invite their families and colleagues. We could ask Frank to pay for this (!) and his new Communications Director (Chris Roberts) and new Human Resources Director (Jeanette Loudon) could help organize it and send out the invitations. It could be held at noon some weekday. We could have cake and balloons..... What do you think? Could I hear from all of you today or sometime this week? I think we (AHC-FCC) need to be more visible. I also think that we need to have more faculty awards, recognitions, positive attention of every kind -- the faculty morale is low, and this might be a LITTLE something we could do. Can you think of a downside to this? Let me know. Judy

XX

Judith Garrard, Ph.D.
Professor, Institute for Health Services Research
School of Public Health
Box 729 UMHC
420 Delaware Street, S.E.

Received: from mhub1.tc.umn.edu by mailbox.mail.umn.edu; Fri, 7 Mar 97 08:27:29
Return-Path: <feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub1.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 7 Mar 97 08:24:17 -06
Received: from x108-40.cvm.openpn.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 7 Mar 97 08
From: "Daniel A. Feeney" <feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: courtney
Subject: Re: Sign Up Schedule
Message-Id: <332025112e19245@mhub1.tc.umn.edu>
Date: Fri, 7 Mar 97 08:24:17 -0600
Status: U

Vickie,

Here are my commitments, if nobody has chosen them first. If so, let me know and I'll rearrange.

Thanks,

Feeney

*****>

> THIS THURSDAY

>

> Column due by published Person who will write the column

>

> Feb. 25 Mar. 4 Judy Garrard

>

> Mar. 5 Mar. 13 Cynthia Gross

>

> Mar. 19 Mar. 27 David Hamilton

>

> April 2 April 10 DAN FEENEY

>

> April 16 April 24 Sheila Corcoran-Perry

>

> April 30 May 8

>

> May 14 May 22

>

>

> Council of Deans Meetings

>

> Jan. Sheila Corcoran-Perry

>

> Feb. 11 Aborative Attempt

>

> Feb. 18 Judy Garrard

>

> March 4 David Hamilton

>

> March 11 Peter Bitterman

>

> March 18

>

> March 25 DAN FEENEY

>

> April 1 Peter Bitterman

>

> April 8

>
> April 15 Cynthia Gross
>
> April 22 Sheila Corcoran-Perry
>
> April 29 DAN FEENEY
>
> May 6 Cynthia Gross
>
> May 13 *Sheila Corcoran-Perry*
>
> May 20
>
> May 27
>
>
> Thanks.

Daniel A. Feeney
C-350 Veterinary Hospitals
University of Minnesota, St. Paul Campus
1352 Boyd Ave
St. Paul, MN 55108
(612) 625-9731 (phone and voice mail)
(612) 624-0751 (Fax)
(612) 538-4487 (pager)
feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu (e-mail)

Received: from mhub2.tc.umn.edu (mhub2.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.52])
by mailbox.mail.umn.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA06663
for <courtney@mailbox.mail.umn.edu>; Tue, 29 Apr 1997 16:46:37 -0500 (CD
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub2.tc.umn.edu; Tue, 29 Apr 97 16:46:10 -0
Received: from x244-58.hsr.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Tue, 29 Apr 97 16:46:10
Message-Id: <v03007804af8c1ca9f1f4@[128.101.244.58]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 29 Apr 1997 16:48:18 -0500
To: Muriel J Bebeau <bebea001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,
Daniel A Feeney <feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>, dwh@med.umn.edu,
Peter B Bitterman <bitte001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,
Cynthia R Gross <gross002@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,
Sheila A Corcoran-Perry <corco001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,
fhaffert@d.umn.edu, courtney@mailbox.mail.umn.edu
From: Judy Garrard <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Subject: Draft This Thursday

To: AHC FCC members

From: Judy Garrard

I wrote this draft for the This Thursday column -- due tomorrow -- .
It's incomplete and I have Frank looking at it for corrections. If
you have any suggestions for improvement, please e-mail me NOW -- I
have to turn it in tomorrow. Thanks, JUdy

<fontfamily><param>Helvetica</param>
AHC Faculty Promotions and Tenure

How did faculty promotion and tenure decisions in the Academic Health
Center fare in this year of change? Over this past month, AHC-FCC
members have received a number of questions about the process and
outcomes of faculty promotions and tenure in the AHC. At the request
of AHC-FCC, Provost Cerra provided an advance copy of the report of
recommendations for promotion that will be presented at the May 8
meeting of the Board of Regents. That report is available as a public
document. You can request it from the Provost's office (call 6-3700).
I will summarize some of the information in that document in the form
of questions and answers.

Q. What was the promotion process? Why did some AHC faculty files go
through an AHC P&T Committee and others were approved/disapproved at
the school or college level?

A. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure in three AHC
colleges/schools (Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health) must be reviewed by
the AHC P&T Committee because their subdivisions do not have official
departmental status. Faculty files in the Duluth School of Medicine
are reviewed in the Twin Cities Medical School structure. Decisions
recommended by the Deans in the Twin Cities Medical School, Veterinary
Medicine, and the Dentistry do not undergo review by the AHC P&T
committee.

Q. Who was on the 1996-97 AHC P&T Committee and by whom were they appointed?

A. Each of the constituent schools/colleges of the AHC had a representative on the committee. The AHC Provost appointed them. The members this year were:

Twin Cities Medical School --

Duluth School of Medicine --

Public Health -- Robert Kane

Pharmacy --

Nursing --

Dentistry --

Veterinary Medicine --

Q. What is the process after the faculty files are evaluated by either the AHC P&T Committee or at the school/college level?

A. The files for all AHC faculty reviewed for promotion and/or tenure are forwarded to the Provost for Health Sciences. The Provost reviews each file in depth and makes recommendations to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (Marvin Marshak). Following a review by Academic Affairs, including a separate review by the Dean of the Graduate School, a list of faculty recommended for promotion and/or tenure is forwarded to the Board of Regents for their approval. Final approval rests with the Board of Regents.

The report (from which I am quoting in this Q & A) will be presented to the Board of Regents on May 8 and 9, 1997, at their regularly scheduled meeting. Promotions and/or tenure will become effective with the beginning terms of appointment in 1997-98.

Q. How many faculty files were reviewed by each school/college? Of the total number of faculty proposed for promotion and/or tenure, how many were approved by each school/college? How did the approval rates at the school/college level compare to the approval rate by the AHC P&T Committee?

A. The AHC-FCC members specifically asked Provost Cerra these questions. He consulted with Professor Ed Foggelman, chair of the Senate Committee on Judicial Affairs. They agreed that such information could not be provided at this time because the decision of the Regents is not yet final (at the time this column goes to press). Also, because of small numbers within each school/college, it might be impossible to guarantee the confidentiality of individuals. The

AHC-FGC will try to provide this information in the future and in such a way that individuals cannot be identified.

Q. Of the total number of AHC faculty files reviewed by the Provost, how many were approved and recommended for promotion and/or tenure?

A. Across all of the six AHC schools/colleges, a total of 59 faculty were considered for promotion and/or tenure at the Provost's level. 58 of the 59 were recommended by the Provost for approval. The one faculty file not approved was for promotion from associate professor to full professor and did not involve a consideration of tenure.

Q. Of the 58 faculty recommended for approval, what was the breakdown by AHC colleges/schools?

A. Of the 58 faculty, the number of faculty recommended for promotion and/or tenure by the AHC Provost were: Dentistry (1), Nursing (2), Pharmacy (5), Public Health (4), Veterinary Medicine (2), Duluth School of Medicine (1), and TC Medical School (43).

Q. How does the approval rate for all AHC faculty compare to the approval rates of faculty in the other provostial and chancellor units?

A. The AHC approval rate was 98% (58/59 files) compared to 85% (39/46 files) in Arts, Sciences, & Engineering, 89% (32/36 files) in Professional Studies, and 100% in each of the chancellor units of Crookston (3/3 files), Morris (7/7 files), and Duluth (9/9 files). These 148 faculty files were recommended to the Board of Regents for promotion and/or tenure.

Q. What was the total number of faculty members recommended for tenure and/or promotion throughout the University. What was the breakdown by gender and race/ethnic origin?

A. A total of 160 faculty files were approved by Deans of all colleges throughout the University. Of these 160 files, 148 were eventually recommended by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs to the Board of Regents for promotion and/or tenure this year. (Thus the approval rate at the University level was 92.5% (148/160).

Of these 160, 2 (2 males; 0 females) were for tenure only, 65 (42 males; 23 females) were for tenure and promotion, 81 (58 males; 23 females) were for promotion, 6 were for continuation in rank (which usually means that the promotion from associate to full professor was denied) and 6 were for non reappointment (which usually means that assistant professors were denied promotion to associate professor). The non approvals did not have a gender breakdown in the table provided.

Received: from mhub1.tc.umn.edu by mailbox.mail.umn.edu; Wed, 26 Mar 97 08:37:46
Return-Path: <feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub1.tc.umn.edu; Wed, 26 Mar 97 08:33:33 -0
Received: from xl08-40.cvm.openpn.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Wed, 26 Mar 97 0
From: "Daniel A. Feeney" <feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: rinard
Cc: Judith M Garrard <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>, dwh@med.umn.edu, courtney,
Frank B Cerra <cerra001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Subject: AHC Consultative Committee Article
Message-Id: <333933bd1a9e004@mhub1.tc.umn.edu>
Date: Wed, 26 Mar 97 08:33:36 -0600

Hello Peggy Rinard,

Please find enclosed my submission for the "This Thursday" column from the AHC Consultative Committee. If my memory is correct, the article is due the first week in April for the edition out the second or third week in April. I thought it wise to get it to you sooner rather than later.

If you have any questions or problems, please let me know. My schedule is often tight, so last minute communication may be difficult. If there are any editorial changes you may suggest, I must approve them before publication. I am typically on clinic duty on Mondays, Tuesdays, and many Wednesdays so communication with me is best executed through voice mail, e-mail, or a digital pager (numbers listed below).

Thank you for your cooperation.

Dan Feeney

AHC, Heal Thy Self!!!

Apologies in advance to those who feel uncomfortable seeing biblical quotes twisted to fit circumstances. Many of you probably recognize the title as a modification of Luke 4:23, RPhysician heal thy selfS. However, these words fit the current situation surrounding the Academic Health Center (AHC). We face pressure on a variety of fronts including: those from our students seeking a state of the art, yet relevant education; those from the public wanting maximum efficiency from all types of healthcare providers; those from our State Capitol colleagues looking for maximum return per dollar invested; those from the Board of Regents advocating consummate institutional flexibility; those from our campus colleagues beyond the AHC questioning our expenditures; and those among faculty in the AHC as we compete for scarce resources. This forces the AHC academic community (and the individuals in it) to repeatedly assess our perceived worth. It also fosters concern about where we will be next year, next month, next week???

The restructuring of the Faculty Senate Governance System to accommodate the multiple Twin City Provost Model has given the AHC something it lacked to date, an AHC wide system for faculty, student, and administrative interaction. This could be likened to the transition from a feudal system to a representative system. Because of our circumstances, we must rely on ourselves for whatever solutions we can expect. Through the recently constituted AHC Provostal Consultative System, we have the opportunity to use our collective wisdom for the betterment of the AHC and its members. Consider this! A working

partnership among faculty, students, and administrators wherein ideas can flow in all directions, open discussion and debate on issues would be expected, collegiality should be the operating mode, and PRE-decision buy-in could become the norm. Who knows, we might even begin to trust each other???

The skeptics are already lining up to say, RSend me a card from FantasylandS! (This quip came from one of our students to give credit where credit is due.) OK, so this is a quantum leap from the infamous QRTC period, the CIC Index debacle, the RegentUs Tenure mandates, and the ever dynamic external environment driven by the HMOUs, the VetSmarts(, and the federal/state regulators. However, if we donUt work together to solve our problems, the prospects for help from across campus or from outside the institution look quite grim. It is also likely that what may be available will come with unwanted strings attached (e.g. RacceptableS tenure reform in exchange for technology dollars as we witnessed in 1995-96). Who know what awaits us with the legislative visitation of publically available student evaluations???

Trust in an operation of any size is difficult to build and even harder to restore. However, the alternatives are hidden agendas, suspicion, favoritism, and unfulfilled expectations through Rtop downS management styles. We have the opportunity through the emerging AHC Assembly, the currently functioning AHC Consultative Committee, and the evolving interactive relationship with AHC Administration to change our course, but only if we are willing to expend the effort. The role of an interactive governance system is to rebuild eroded trust, to break down barriers created during the darker era(s), to foster communication among all internal and across campus constituents, and to create a formal opportunity for consultation with AHC Administration. If we pass up the chance, we can only blame ourselves.

We must be ever mindful of the difference between RconsultationS vs. being Rthe first to knowS. That, hopefully, will not be an issue as experience and trust build in our consultative system. Active participation in our consultative process is a must, if the values that academicians hold dear are to be preserved. Our institution (it seems) has been in the midst of continual (? overlapping) planning cycles for at least the last decade. Despite being in a state of Rplanning burnoutS made worse by the increasing workloads associated with downsizing and restructuring, we must use our common thread, the AHC governance system, effectively. The goals would be to assure our input is received, to promote accountability through visibility, and to limit the RweS vs. RtheyS mentality that stifles productive administrative, faculty, and student interaction. There is a tendency for academic community members to retreat to laboratories and libraries in order to weather the storms threatening the institution. The danger of that approach is that less and less of the academic perspective is available to administrators as planning exercises (e.g. the current strategic planning endeavor) are undertaken. If we donUt or wonUt participate in these exercises, we dare not criticize the results as being Rtop downS.

In closing, I leave you with another quote which is relevant to health care providers, but is also relevant to student, administrative, and faculty interaction. (seek) R..to help or at least do no harm.S, Hippocrates.

Daniel A. Feeney, DVM, MS
Professor of Veterinary Imaging
College of Veterinary Medicine

Daniel A. Feeney

Received: from mhub2.tc.umn.edu by mailbox.mail.umn.edu; Mon, 27 Jan 97 08:58:05
Return-Path: <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub2.tc.umn.edu; Mon, 27 Jan 97 08:57:03 -0
Received: from x244-58.hsr.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Mon, 27 Jan 97 08:57:03
Message-Id: <v03007804af12640f2c1b@[128.101.244.58]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 27 Jan 1997 08:57:46 -0500
To: courtney
From: Judy Garrard <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Cc: Today's@maroon.tc.umn.edu, agenda@maroon.tc.umn.edu

To: Members of the AHC-FCC
From: Judy Garrard

I sent this memo to Frank Cerra on Friday. He acknowledged it this morning (he was evidently out of town all weekend.) We're set to go at noon. I'll bring a draft of the letter of invitation to Pres. Yudoff -- I talked to Virginia on Thursday and found out the procedure. Also, I had an e-mail 'conversation' with Carole Bland and she/they are very interested in meeting with us. I suggested to her that while we couldn't see going the whole nine years with their plan, that there were many very important elements and perhaps we could collectively work on them. She agreed. See you at noon in Frank's suite.

Friday, Jan 24

To: Frank Cerra
From: Judy Garrard

We would like to concentrate most of our time at our Monday (Jan 27) meeting from 12-1:30 on the following items:

1. Role of faculty consultation to facilitate decision making in the AHC
 - a. Need for clarification
 - b. Progress to date on faculty indemnification issue -- See enclosure #1
2. Better communication between AHC-FCC and the AHC faculty--See enclosure #2
3. AHC-FCC invitation to President Yudoff to meet with AHC faculty

In order to give you some background information for our discussion, we are including two enclosures that members of our FCC wrote. Thanks, see you Monday at noon.

Enclosure #1

In order to support faculty and enable them to assume the responsibilities for conducting research and managing grant funds, the AHCPFCC has decided that a faculty indemnification plan is needed. This plan would provide faculty with legal representation with appropriate expertise in research and academia in the event of an external accusation of scientific misconduct. The rationale for this plan is as follows:

The university attorneys must protect the interests of the university. When it is in the interest of the university, its university attorneys may assume an adversarial position with an individual faculty researcher. Since it is never

Received: from mhub1.tc.umn.edu by mailbox.mail.umn.edu; Fri, 7 Mar 97 10:24:08
Return-Path: <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub1.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 7 Mar 97 10:20:55 -06
Received: from x244-58.hsr.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 7 Mar 97 10:20:54
Message-Id: <v03007800af45e2f62feb@[128.101.244.58]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=====-1354374355==_=====
Date: Fri, 7 Mar 1997 10:22:18 -0500
To: courtney
From: Judy Garrard <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Subject: Try #2

=====-1354374355==_=====
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Vickie,
I saved the Armstrong letter in 'text only'. See if you can read it.
Judy

=====-1354374355==_=====
Content-Type: text/plain; name="armstrong_letter"; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="armstrong_letter"

March 5, 1997

Michael B. Armstrong, Chair
Provostal Student Consultative Committee
Box 101 Mayo
Campus Mail

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

I am writing in response to your letters of February 3 and February 24. The AHC-FCC meets once a month as a committee. We met with the Faculty Task Force on Faculty Governance at our February meeting to further discuss the ideas of faculty governance. As you will see in our minutes of that meeting, both the AHC-FCC and the Task Force Committee agreed that there should be a separate faculty voice in all faculty governance issues. I appreciate your concern about joint efforts in governance issues, as long as the faculty and student voices are clearly separate. The AHC-FCC and the Task Force members also agreed that joint meetings between the PFCC and the PSCC would be very beneficial, depending on the issues to be discussed.

You and the other members of the PSCC are invited to meet with our AHC-FCC at our next meeting, Thursday, March 20, from 12:45 to 1:30. I have asked Vickie Courtney, the Senate staff person who works with our committee, to find a room large enough for all of us, and to notify you of that location.

We are looking forward to meeting with you and your colleagues on the PSCC.

Sincerely,

Judith Garrard, Ph.D.
Professor

cc: Frank Cerra, M.D., Provost
Vickie Courtney, Senate Staff
Members of the AHC-FCC

-----_ -1354374355==_ =====
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

XX

Judith Garrard, Ph.D.
Professor, Institute for Health Services Research
School of Public Health
Box 729 UMHC
420 Delaware Street, S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Telephone: (612) 625-9169
FAX: (612) 624-2196

XX

-----_ -1354374355==_ -----

Received: from mhub1.tc.umn.edu by mailbox.mail.umn.edu; Wed, 5 Mar 97 11:08:07
Return-Path: <gross002@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub1.tc.umn.edu; Wed, 5 Mar 97 11:04:59 -06
Received: from x158-140.pharmacy.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Wed, 5 Mar 97 11:
From: "Cynthia.R.Gross-1" <gross002@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Reply-To: "Cynthia.R.Gross-1" <gross002@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: courtney, Judith M Garrard <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Subject: Article for This Thurs
Message-Id: <331da7bb6393290@mhub1.tc.umn.edu>
Date: Wed, 5 Mar 97 11:05:00 -0600

Vickie and Judy,

Who does this go to? Will you forward it to them for me or contact me re delivering it another way? cindy

March 5, 1997
AHC - FCC Faculty News

Focus on Faculty Issues: A 3-Part Series on Faculty Indemnification
Part 1: Statement of the Problem - A Miranda Warning to Faculty Investigators

Scientific misconduct is defined in federal regulations under the Public Health Services Act as "fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for proposing, conducting and reporting research. Misconduct does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data.(1)" Institutions like the University of Minnesota which accept federal dollars must have procedures and policies for investigating alleged scientific misconduct. These investigations should be prompt and unbiased fact-finding missions to determine if the allegations have substance or are groundless misperceptions.

What happens when a complaint of scientific misconduct is made against a university investigator? What actions should the researcher take during a preliminary investigation of alleged scientific misconduct? If university counsel represents the University, who represents the faculty member? Are faculty researchers unprotected?

These issues were raised by the investigation of charges made against University of Pittsburgh faculty members directing the National Cancer Institute's National Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project (NSABP). In this multicentered clinical trial, one participating center (not located at Pittsburgh) was purported to have falsified data. The University of Pittsburgh hired legal counsel to investigate these allegations. Eventually, University of Pittsburgh faculty, including the chairman of the NSABP, Bernard Fisher, MD., and the head of NSABP Biostatistical Center, Carol Redmond, Ph.D., were charged with misconduct by the federal Office of Research Integrity. Redmond and Fisher contend that contact with university counsel early in the investigation made their situations more difficult than they would have otherwise been. These faculty thought the university counsel was there to represent them. They contend that they were misled by university counsel.

In a thoughtful review of the issues raised by this situation, Mr. Hershey, Law Professor at the University of Pittsburgh (2) emphasizes that all faculty need to understand their relationship to university counsel. The university, as an organization, is the client of university counsel. Individual faculty employed by the organization are not the client. If, during the course of an investigation, it is decided that the interests of the university and the interests of a particular faculty member diverge, anything previously disclosed

to the university counsel can be used against the faculty member. There is no attorney-client privilege for communications between an individual and an attorney, unless the individual is the attorney's client. Hershey states that anything said to a university attorney can be shared with others, even if sharing the information is detrimental to the faculty member's interests. Since in the early stages of any investigation, it will be impossible to determine if the interests of the faculty member and the university will eventually be in conflict, Hershey recommends faculty retain their own lawyers. But this is very expensive, and moreover it can be extremely difficult it is to find lawyers with the relevant expertise for academia and research. What is an individual faculty member to do? One option is indemnification.

According to Webster, To indemnify is to secure against hurt, loss or damage. While an accusation of scientific misconduct is sure to hurt one's reputation, even if later proved groundless, financial losses due to legal expenses may be controlled. There are examples of faculty insurance, through the AAUP or purchased by individual units (the AHC's own Department of Surgery). In Part 2, these and other examples will be described.

Forthcoming

Part 2: Process of Fact-Finding about Indemnification- Examples and Interviews with Experts

Part 3: Indemnification Proposals for the AHC

1. 42 Code of Federal Regulations Sec. 50.102
2. Hershey N. The Clinical Investigator as Target. Controlled Clinical Trials. 17, 183-190, 1996

Cynthia R. Gross, PhD
gross002@maroon.tc.umn.edu
University of Minnesota
College of Pharmacy
School of Nursing
Minneapolis, MN

Enclosure "Indemnification. Part1" received as "file:///C:\MINUET\ENCL\Indemnif

Received: from mhub1.tc.umn.edu by mailbox.mail.umn.edu; Thu, 27 Feb 97 15:15:12
Return-Path: <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub1.tc.umn.edu; Thu, 27 Feb 97 15:12:23 -0
Received: from x244-58.hsr.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Thu, 27 Feb 97 15:12:22
Message-Id: <v03007820af3b95cd702b@[128.101.244.58]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Thu, 27 Feb 1997 15:13:37 -0500
To: courtney
From: Judy Garrard <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>

Vickie,

Several things need to be coordinated. Would you arrange these?

1. We need volunteers (from the PFCC) to write a 400 word column for This Thursday. Here's the schedule:

Column due by writes the column NOON of this date:	For This Thursday issue to be published on this date:	Person who
--	--	------------

Feb 25	March 4	Judy Garrard
March 5	March 13	
March 19	March 27	
April 2	April 10	
April 16	April 24	
April 30	May 8	
May 14	May 22	

2. We need a sign-up sheet for the Council of Deans meeting: Tuesdays, 2-5 pm in Frank Cerra's office. These are VERY important meetings. In fact, the person writing the This Thursday column might want to attend the CoD the week before.

Since Sheila and I have each attended one (Mickey had an abortive attempt to attend one), I've divided the remaining dates into two major groups. Each of the seven of us needs to sign up for each of two sessions. Then Vickie, could you let Frank Cerra know our schedule--who's going to be there--so he can send the agenda, etc., to that person ahead of time?

I suggest that if there are any more executive council sessions and an FCC member doesn't have to go for that session at all, then the pool of those FCC members who didn't get to go can compete for the May 27 slot. (Of course beginning in June, we'll start all over with more sign-ups.)

Jan 8 or Feb 4 -- Sheila Corcoran-Perry (sorry Sheila, I can't remember which date)
Feb 11 -- abortive attempt
Feb 18 -- Judy Garrard
Feb 25 -- CoD in executive session -- no FCC member
March 4 -- David Hamilton
March 11
March 18
March 25
April 1

