School of Medicine IDEAL Team Project  
Faculty Discussion Group Summary, Narrative Report and Consolidated Comments  
April 13, 2012

Summary

Institutions Developing Excellence in Academic Leadership (IDEAL) is a three-year program funded by the National Science Foundation to seed gender equity and institutional transformation academic S&E at six universities in the northern Ohio region (BGSU, CSU, CWRU, KSU, UA and UT). See www.case.edu/provost/ideal/. Each institution annually selects three Change Leaders to develop a customized Annual Change Project with plans and actions for improving gender and underrepresented minority equity in S&E on its respective campus, including implementation and sustainability plans. The 2011-2012 IDEAL Change Leaders are School of Medicine basic science faculty: Walter Boron, MD/PhD, Professor and Chair of Physiology and Biophysics, Alison Hall, PhD, Professor of Neuroscience and Associate Dean for Graduate Education, Ruth Siegel, PhD, Professor of Pharmacology and Neena Singh, MD/PhD, Professor of Pathology.

Using the SOM Faculty Climate Survey results the Change Leader team identified the following goal for their Change Project “to improve retention of tenured women faculty in the Basic Sciences of the School of Medicine by improving the overall climate.” In order to recommend activities for career development and climate improvement the team proposed a series of faculty discussion groups with tenured faculty. The IDEAL team project process was established and was shared with participants in the discussion groups.

Project Steps:

- Schedule and hold four discussion groups
- Consolidate comments (see page 8)
- Distill consolidated comments into a summary of concerns for discussion with key groups
- Schedule and hold meetings with four key groups for feedback: Faculty Council, Research Committee, Department Chairs and Climate Task Force
- Incorporate feedback from key groups into the summary of concerns and suggestions and narrative report of the concerns and suggestions for submission to the dean.
- Present the summary, report and comments to the dean for feedback
- Make the final summary, report and comments available to the SOM faculty on a CWRU sign in website.

The dean and the department chairs were informed about the project and the plan for faculty discussions. The discussion groups were led by IDEAL team members Professors Ruth Siegel and Neena Singh in November and December of 2012.

Participant demographics:

- 33% of the 143 tenured faculty members invited, participated
- 48 attended plus 7 personal interviews with faculty by Drs. Singh or Siegel
- 51% of the tenured basic science participated (40 out of 77)
- 41 of 55 (74%) of total participants have received NIH funding in the last five years.
- 25 full professors, 30 associate professors
- 39 male, 16 female

A confidential online forum was established for faculty to provide comments or to continue a discussion, with a total of 8 comments entered and approximately 150 views of the forum site.

Faculty Discussion Process

Four questions were proposed at each discussion by means of the white board, handouts and also by the discussion leaders. Discussion leaders captured ideas on the white board and asked participants to review the
comments from their session, and help consolidate into categories. Additional notes were taken by hand to
supplement the white board notes and provide quotes.

The questions that were proposed at each group discussion were:
1. What do you like best about the research climate at SOM?
2. What changes would greatly improve the research climate?
3. What types of faculty activities deserve recognition and how might that happen?
4. What steps could you and the administration take to promote collaborative research activities?

Once the notes were transcribed they were stripped of identifying factors like proper names, titles and
departments names, and the IDEAL team met to consolidate the comments from the four discussions and group
them into major themes reflecting the identified concerns, needs, opportunities and strategies for creating a
supportive environment. Major themes emerged that have been grouped into these four key areas:
1. Faculty engagement and recognition
2. Research sustainability
3. Promoting collaborative research
4. Promoting the careers of women faculty

The Major Themes:

1. Faculty Recognition and Engagement
   a. Primary Concern of the Faculty:
      SOM Faculty feel disempowered, disengaged and seek recognition, acknowledgement
      and rewards for their full roles as faculty members. Faculty do not feel they are active
      participants in decision-making or school governance and suggest that department chairs
      and the dean need timely accountability in achieving the academic vision of the school.
   b. Suggestions:
      i. Endorse efforts to describe the value of faculty contribution to the department, school
         and university to include teaching and service as components of professional
         achievement for purposes of compensation and promotion.
      ii. Maintain the academic mission of the school as the primary focus for interpreting the
          business model.
      iii. Expand faculty participation and governance through increased transparency and
           communication and by examining faculty bylaws, nomination structure and committees
           to reflect faculty majorities.
      iv. Empower department chairs to build their departments, develop their faculty and
          participate in steering the direction of the school,
      v. Promote culture change by instituting periodic evaluations of department chairs,
         senior SOM administrators and the dean by faculty.

2. Research Sustainability
   a. Primary Concern of the Faculty:
      A strong focus of the comments was regarding a perceived shift in the SOM from a mission of
      education to that of a business. The majority of the suggestions focused on establishing
      significant and accessible bridge-funding. Faculty were also concerned that the long-term
      outcomes of unsupported graduate education for basic science is that we are losing a generation
      of researchers because of this behavior.
   b. Suggestions:
      i. Provide a transparent and fair system of tuition support to encourage funded faculty
         to take graduate students as well as post-docs.
      ii. Establish a transparent, equitable multi-year bridge funding mechanism in order to
sustain research, retain faculty, and improve morale.

iii. Improve communication issues and address constraints to research success involving purchases of computers and office supplies.

3. Promoting Collaborative Research
   a. Primary Concern of the Faculty:
      Increase in team science has raised the need for the university to address IDC returns and individual rewards. Faculty shared the need for collaborative research projects to be facilitated.
   b. Suggestions:
      i. Establish recognition and financial rewards for all participants in team science that crosses department and school lines.
      ii. Encourage collaboration through resources and development of new projects by initiating forums to bring together investigators from different departments to focus on single issues.

4. Promoting the Careers of Women Faculty
   a. Primary Concern of the Faculty:
      Women faculty felt for the most part that their concerns were similar to those of the faculty as a whole. Many faculty anticipated that the new position of Vice Dean for Faculty Development could provide the means for advocating for faculty needs.
   b. Suggestions:
      i. Address the culturally based gender bias through the above changes and empower the new Vice Dean for Faculty Development to focus on improving the climate issues.
Faculty Recognition and Engagement

Narrative Summary of Discussion Group Comments

Faculty morale, as reflected in the results of the climate survey, continues to be very low. Faculty members feel disempowered and disengaged. The statement “things are done to us, not with us” is an example of the sentiments of expressed during the discussions.

A perceived lack of transparency and poor communication combined with politics and “the rumor mill” have resulted in an atmosphere of distrust and fear. Many faculty spoke of experiencing or witnessing punitive actions from chairs and consider the administration to also be vindictive. Faculty members do not feel they are active participants in decision making or school governance, with some faculty noting that some departmental faculty meetings are “staged”. DCAPT is also a point of friction where faculty reported being pressured for votes and an inconsistent application of standards.

Faculty members blame the current imbalance of power (the top-heavy, hierarchical administrative power structure) for facilitating the deans’ and chairs’ inappropriate treatment of faculty. Examples were given of chairs controlling lab space and departmental funds to expand their own research and the dean forming committees where her appointments outnumber the elected members, effectively leaving the faculty without a voice. The apparently secretive, non-transparent attitude of the administration pits chairs against each other and makes the departments less cooperative with each other. What the dean calls “focusing resources” is perceived as playing favorites. Other faculty commented on the emasculating affect this had on some chairs and said chairs needed to be given back their power to run their departments and develop their faculty. Some faculty thought that department chairs accountability would improve through job descriptions and evaluations by their faculty.

The Office of Faculty Affairs, the means for lodging a complaint of alleged abuses or conflicts, is perceived as a mechanism to serve the dean but not the faculty, leaving no avenue for resolution. Additionally, central administration is viewed as supporting the dean and not the SOM faculty, both publicly and privately. The perceived passivity of university administrators and fear of retaliation within the SOM were mentioned as reasons for not making formal complaints, including the use of the Faculty Conciliation/Mediation Program.

Teaching and service are required to run the school but are under appreciated and unrecognized as part of the annual review. Instead, because tuition money is not counted as revenue, there is a stigma attached to teaching, and the time and effort spent by faculty are minimized. One faculty member called it demoralizing and remarked:

“Twenty years ago it was an honor to be involved in teaching here; now it is a booby prize for those who don't bring in enough grants”

Faculty discussed the many ways a person can be an outstanding faculty member but how only one component is currently recognized - funding.

Narrative Summary of Suggestions:

Faculty wish to engage in respectful, shared governance with the dean and the department chairs. Suggestions for improving the perceived imbalance of power and creating better accountability included creating a mechanism for the chairmanship to rotate every 3 – 5 years among the department faculty, establishing a schedule of annual anonymous chair evaluations from their faculty, and having a confidential instrument similar to the faculty climate survey, serve as an annual evaluation of the dean’s performance. Rotating the chairmanship was proposed as a means of demonstrating that the faculty are valued and that leadership can be provided from within. Defining the responsibility or job description of the administrators and chairs would allow both the faculty and the dean to
evaluate performance more comprehensively.

Transparency was repeatedly raised as an immediate need with respect to the budget and other major school-wide decisions. Increased direct communication soliciting significant input during decision processes would renew a sense of trust between the faculty and the administration, especially with respect to involvement in budget management. Engaged faculty with a participative voice may be able to envision additional possibilities for budget or crisis management. It was proposed that two SOM faculty members should be elected to bring faculty concerns to the Provost, President and Board of Trustees independent of the Dean. Some faculty were skeptical of others assertions that Faculty Council is newly empowered and working on behalf of faculty, other felt progress was being made.

Other suggestions include establishing uniform CAPT criteria for recognizing Co-PI contributions and requiring a DCAPT member from other departments (including a PhD faculty member in clinical departments) in order to maintain standards, and having DCAPT report to the dean rather than chairs.

To reestablish and support the value of teaching and service in addition to research as part of the mission of an academic institution, faculty suggest that tuition money should be considered equivalent to indirect costs from grants and rewarded as such. Teaching courses and the mentoring post-docs or junior faculty can be assigned a percent of contribution to salary. Some faculty suggested that tuition dollars are a revenue stream that can be expanded through industry partnerships and increased combined degrees if there were encouragement and recognition from the administration.

---

**Research Sustainability**

**Narrative Summary of Discussion Group Comments**

A strong focus of the comments was regarding a perceived shift in the SOM from a mission of education to becoming a business. One prominent senior researcher remarked:

“Funded for 60% of my salary, publications each year and an international reputation and I am made to feel like a failure. We are all failures by this system.”

A majority of Faculty said they feel it is degrading to calculate the contribution of a faculty member using “dollars per square foot”. This system does not take into account the hours spent teaching, preparing for teaching, grading and giving exams or other traditional faculty activities such as university service, paper review and serving on study sections. Rather than being valued as a contribution to the school, activities outside of research and generating grants are regarded as “extras”. Those faculty members without sufficient funding, or who are viewed as not fulfilling the required hours, are assigned more teaching. This has caused teaching to be viewed as “punishment” rather than an essential part of the mission of the School of Medicine. An additional difficulty is a reported disparity across departments in the calculation of faculty teaching hours, and alleged arbitrary reductions of hours by departmental administrative staff.

Losing funding is perceived as a death spiral for faculty who have little or no recourse for bridge funds to generate the additional data or publications needed to reestablish their funding. Faculty with strong funding records who are currently underfunded feel disrespected to be called “legacy faculty”. Those with status as Co-Investigators on grants are dismissed because the indirect costs do not go to their department.

A further complication of the current economic model is faculty reluctance to take on graduate students. Faculty stated that student stipends are manageable, but for some faculty the tuition burden is too high when measured against the amount of research the students can generate during their early years of training. The return on investment for a researcher is better with a post-doc especially if your grant is only one or two years of support. Faculty are concerned that the long-term outcomes of unsupported graduate education for basic science is saying:
“We are losing a generation of researchers because of this behavior.”

Narrative Summary of Suggestions

The majority of the suggestions regarding how to improve the research climate at the SOM focused on establishing significant and accessible bridge-funding. One recommendation was to reserve 10% of the indirect costs per grant as a “bridge bank” for that investigator. This mechanism would be a way for faculty to have a small measure of security as the federal funding pool continues to contract.

To create a sense of “bridge funding equity” it was proposed that the Dean charge the Research Committee with establishing uniform, transparent criteria for allocating available bridge funding. Potential criteria for receiving funds included:

- funding history
- publication record
- external scores

Participants thought that funding should not require a match from the department chair and that funds should be restricted from being allocated toward salary. A time limit was debated with the result being a recommended three-year duration for the funding based on norms at other universities. Faculty also indicated that a three-year period of bridge funds would effectively allow an unfunded researcher to re-establish their funding. To increase transparency it was proposed that all bridge funding information, including the criteria, extent of the funding, committee membership and recipients, would be transparent on the SOM internal website.

To address the reluctance to assume graduate students presented by the financial burden, it was suggested that where a student would receive support that was portable to whichever lab they chose. Having the tuition “follow the student” was perceived as a more equitable way of ensuring that faculty had adequate access to students, and for students to engage with their researcher.

Promoting Collaborative Research

Narrative Summary of Discussion Group Comments

Faculty pointed out that the increase of team science, due to the trends in grant funding, is a source of ongoing stress because of a lack of adequate recognition by the administration, CAPT and department chairs. Despite the movement toward increased team science, there is no incentive to collaborate because indirect costs are recovered by the PI’s department with no percentage counting toward a Co-PI faculty members department. Lack of equitable financial rewards and recognition for all participants involved hinders the development of team science.

An additional complication that was mentioned by several participants; that some faculty believe that some senior faculty allegedly exploit the research of junior faculty members and exclude them from the grants once funded. These faculty members were portrayed as untouchable despite repeated incidents because they bring in money. It was also pointed out that money generated by indirect costs is used for startup and equipment purchases for new faculty but then the equipment is considered personal and not shared with other faculty.

Narrative Summary of Suggestions:

Suggestions for promoting collaborative research focused heavily on establishing standards for recognizing Co-PI status. Specifically, financial rewards, such as a percentage of salary contribution for all participants, and uniform recognition of activities used in promotion criteria for CAPT. Faculty also desire a means to reduce the indirect costs and possibly funnel some portion to Co-PI departments as an encouragement to team science. The question was raised – how might we view overhead given not everyone on a proposal is in the same department?
In responses to the question “What do you like best about the research climate at SOM?”, participants mentioned the access to accomplished research collaborators and that facilitating more interaction between faculty for the creation of new projects would be beneficial (Proteomics and Transgenic Cores were highlighted as good examples of this). It was suggested that expanding access to visitors who give talks and symposia through round-table meetings would allow for wider interaction. Meeting with select individuals in private offices does not maximize the potential for developing collaborations. Encouraging an attitude of collaboration with respect to equipment and other research resources could also be accomplished through an online database. And finally, it was suggested that a new means for resolving junior/senior faculty disputes be established, as there was dissatisfaction with the currently available offices charged with this activity.

Promoting the Careers of Women Faculty

_Narrative Summary of Discussion Group Comments_

At the end of each discussion the women participants were asked the additional question “Does your gender have an impact on your life as an SOM faculty member?”. While one participant stated that she was unaware of gender bias and had not experienced any, other participants stated that gender bias is part of the culture and that SOM is a difficult environment for women. Lack of on-campus child-care and work-life balance support from department chairs and dean were cited as ongoing issues. A prevailing attitude that “women are whiners” ensures that most women do not bring up even blatant gender based issues.

Pointing to the evidence in the numbers of women in upper ranks, as department chairs and directors, the women faculty noted that “up or out” seems to have disproportionately affected women. Examples of incidents of unconscious gender bias on appointments and promotion committees, as well as by department staff, require women faculty to be attentive and advocate for fair treatment for themselves and others.

_Narrative Summary of Suggestions:_

It was noted that gender issues can vary by department chair, and a good department can become difficult very quickly. No additional suggestions were offered for improving the SOM climate for women because the problems are perceived to be cultural and deeply ingrained. Women faculty felt that their concerns were the same as the rest of the faculty as a whole and referred back to prior suggestions from the group saying that steps like department chair evaluations, uniform Co-PI status and service recognition would all be beneficial. Many faculty, women included, anticipated that the new Vice Dean for Faculty Development position could be the means for initiating the cultural change needed in SOM.
Consolidated Comments from SOM Faculty Discussion Groups

Process for consolidating comments:

- Faculty comments and concerns were transcribed and stripped of identifying factors like proper names, titles and departments names.
- IDEAL team members met to consolidate the comments and group them into major themes reflecting the identified concerns, needs, opportunities and strategies for creating a supportive environment. Comments included:
  - The handwritten notes of the team members and notes captured on the white board visible during the four 90-minute discussion groups.
  - Seven personal interviews were conducted with notes prepared by the team member conducting the interview.
  - Online comments offered on the SOM Faculty Forum.
- Any commentary by IDEAL team members is presented in this document in italics.
- Quotation marks are only used when a direct quote that was recorded by a facilitator is included.
- The four questions listed are the questions asked in the discussion groups. The fifth question about ways that gender impacted the daily lives of women at SOM was asked at the end of each session of all the women participants.

1. What do you like best about the research climate at SOM?

Consolidated Comments:
  a. SOM has a good reputation. One of the best universities in the country. Respected for research and teaching.
  b. Strong faculty, good research activity, openness of communication among faculty, adequate opportunity for cross-collaboration and interaction, Very accomplished scientific collaborators.
  c. “I am here because I like the work I do”.
  d. Research atmosphere is good. Adequate research facilities & proximity to other researchers although facilities can be scattered and sometimes mismanaged.
  e. Symposia and talks enrich the research environment.
  f. PhDs in clinical departments feel valued and respected.
  g. The combined Masters level degrees are a plus for industry and may be a good source of income for the future.
  h. The Cores are great – Proteomics, Transgenic, CTSC, etc. Takes the pressure off the individuals. Equipment cores are essential.
  i. We have great students.

Suggestions:
  a. When we have Symposia and talks, there should be round table meetings scheduled with these outside speakers to allow wider interaction. Having the speakers meet with select individuals in private offices limits exposure to other faculty.

2. What changes would greatly improve the research climate?

Consolidated Climate Related/School as Business Related Comments
  a. There has been a dramatic change in the mindset of the SOM to be a business instead of a school. We used to feel that what we did was important, now it is only how much money you make. (Facilitator comment: This concern was strongly reinforced in each discussion.)
  b. Core values of a research and teaching institute have been lost; It no longer feels like an academic
institution; Basic science is not valued; Education of students is not valued.
c. Feel at cross purposes to what we thought we would be – Faculty who govern, train, teach, mentor, and write grants. We undervalue faculty as a function. Only money counts.
d. Faculty are “profit centers” to the administration; Faculty value is calculated in terms of dollars per square foot. The current model of 60-70% of salary generated from grants is not sustainable; Calling faculty without funding “legacy faculty” is a slap in the face and disrespects careers spent generating money for the school.
e. There is a complete disconnect between faculty and administration in the philosophy and future of the university.
f. Atmosphere of pending failure: “Funded for 60% of my salary, publications each year and an international reputation and I am made to feel like a failure. We are all failures by this system.”
g. Even if I fund 80% of my salary off co-PI grants my chair doesn't care because he does not get any of the indirects. The amount of the indirects needs to go down.
h. Clinicians are increasingly focusing on patient care, converting UH into a community hospital rather than an academic center.
i. Administrators have too much power and use it unfairly. Too many layers and too many deans.

Suggestions for Improvement: Climate/School as Business
a. Clarity about the job of administrators and why they are compensated a certain amount—same as faculty. XYZ plan should apply to administrators—bonuses should be declared and justified.
b. Look critically at mid-level management hierarchy [administrative leadership] and make their salaries commensurate with faculty salaries. Where possible replace with tenured faculty instead of hiring of business managers who shift academic focus and create a rift between faculty and administration.
c. Provide explicit metrics for tenure and promotion. Faculty handbook is not clear.
d. Value research, teaching, and service-wholeness of being an academic institute.
e. Need an advocate for faculty to help resolve disputes. An ombudsman. Can the new Faculty Development person do this? This person should be elected by faculty, not appointed by the Dean.

Consolidated Budget Related Comments
a. Unify compensation structure across all schools.
b. Transparency of all salaries and expenses at every level. Where does the money go?; Salary raises should be transparent and based on established criteria. Staff, top-level administrators, and faculty are all treated differently; Waste of money to give higher salaries to a select group of people.
c. No transparency in allocation of money, especially indirect costs from grants. Faculty generate the indirect costs and are entitled to know how it is distributed; Not just transparency but co-governance. Need to know the capital needs and uses, need a voice in the budget system.
d. Faculty are required to contribute 70% towards salary, pay stipend and tuition for graduate students, pay fixed salary for lab personnel, as determined by HR, and 30.1% fringe. This leaves minimal money for research, decreases chances for continued funding, and starts a downward spiral. This structure ensures that administration gets money from both indirect and direct costs.
e. Tuition with graduate students is a problem. Post-docs are cheaper and then there is no incentive to develop the career of the post-doc. We can pay the stipend for grads from the grants if the school pays the tuition.
f. No secretarial support for grant paper work; Too many secretaries that don't do anything. They print recipes and other stuff on department printers and then block faculty from printing research papers due to cost of paper. Some faculty are not allowed to use color printer unless the secretary decides it is necessary for them to have a color print.
g. No bridge funding; Funds available through the research committee are not advertised and then only given to selected faculty; Chairs have used the awarded bridge funds toward that faculty members salary, defeating the purpose; Having the department have to match the funds leads to some faculty not even able to approach the committee. Some departments have no way to match for their faculty. [Facilitator comment: Faculty at each session shared information about
available bridge funds. Many participants, not aware of these funds, were disturbed by the lack of transparency and the feeling that you had to be a part of an “old boys” network to know or get funds. Significant time was spent on the topic of bridge funding in each of the four sessions.

t. Too much red tape in compliance committees, especially radiation safety, IRB, IACUC. Processing of an MTA is a “pain”.

i. [Some faculty believe that] indirect costs directed to departments are funneled into Chair’s lab. The budget is kept “confidential”; No transparency of department budget or policy for faculty raises; Inequity in distribution of department funds; There always seems to be more department money when you have an acting chair than a permanent chair.

j. Only the percentage of your salary contribution is counted towards a raise. No importance is given to any other activity including research, scholarship, teaching, service, or grant funds acquired from different agencies; “I have not had a raise in years because if I fund myself at 70% I have almost nothing left for staff, supplies and so on. So I take no raise.”

k. [Some faculty said that they] Cannot view grant statements on time and then hidden charges from companies go unnoticed. [Facilitator comment: Other faculty disputed this as not true for all departments & faculty. This issue could be addressed through budget systems education for faculty.]

Suggestions for Budget Related Comments

a. Bridge funding should be an open process where faculty can compete. Funds should pay for at least one technician to prevent an established lab from shutting down; Research committee should create visible criteria; Make transparent on web; Restrict bridge-funds to not be used by chair for the faculty members salary.

b. Bridge funds can be structured like other universities. Bridge fund like CCF has.

c. Transparency of SOM and department budget at all levels, including salaries and bonuses, money acquired from grants, other sources, and expenditure. “If there was transparency about the indirects we might be more likely to collaborate.” [Facilitator Comment: A school-level budget committee is mandated by the Provost but SOM does not have one.]

d. If all the indirect costs go towards maintaining buildings, change the temperature to reduce cost; Outsource labs to a cheaper buildings.

e. At least 10% of indirect cost should be returned back to the faculty who are now unable to buy computers, printer cartridges, office supplies, powder milk for Western blots, batteries, pens/pencils etc. from NIH grants. Department secretaries are rude and unprofessional when requested to provide such supplies from department funds.

f. Reduce salary contribution to 50% and count co-PI contributions. “Even if I fund myself at 80% of my salary with Co-PI grants, my chair does not care because he does not get any indirects.”

g. Cut down secretaries/staff in departments and compliance committees. Too many secretaries with limited work. Not helpful to faculty. Their only goal is to please the Chair.

h. Provide support for graduate students to maintain graduate education. Current policy discourages faculty to take in a graduate student.

i. Reduce staff in compliance services such as IRB, radiation safety, IACUC. Most are unhelpful and contribute to red tape.

j. Reduce unnecessary moving of labs to appease selected individuals who happen to like a particular lab area. Likewise for new hires. Disrupting functional labs to appease new hires is counter-productive.

k. Make the ordering process less cumbersome and less dependent on a few vendors. Fisher charges double what it costs if I buy it elsewhere.

2. What types of faculty activities deserve recognition and how might that happen?

Consolidated Faculty Engagement Comments

b. Very low morale. No engagement; No voice. Climate committee has four members elected by
faculty and eight appointed by the dean. This illustrates the problem.

c. Basic science faculty are treated like second class citizens because “we don’t generate money like clinical faculty”; Basic science faculty are told “there are too many of us in the school. We are expensive but we have a different mission than the clinical faculty.”

d. Faculty want to help with co-governance but are shut out. Things are done “to us not with us”; What is the economic plan? Is there a strategic plan or goals for SOM? Need better and more communication.

e. Sense of secrecy (confidentiality) by the administration is a problem.

f. Many departmental faculty meetings are staged and are of no benefit to anyone; [Some faculty stated] their department does not have faculty meetings.

g. Staff salary is increased without input from faculty—regardless of grant money.

h. Administration is perceived as vindictive. [Some] Chairs are perceived vindictive and unfair. There is no recourse for faculty under such situations.

i. Representation from other departments is necessary to maintain uniformity of standards in department DCAPT; A PhD faculty should be included in the DCAPT of clinical departments; In some departments the DCAPT is a rubber stamp vote done by e-mail. Faculty are pushed for their votes by their chair.

j. Meaning of tenure is unclear. Having tenure but no position or salary; Contract renewal letters are not uniform across departments.

k. No diversity at CWRU. Requires a change in culture; Very few women in leadership positions except at the very top.

l. Too many resources are given to a few

Faculty Engagement Suggestions

a. Change CAPT criteria to recognize Co-PIs.

b. DCAPT should report to dean instead of chairs.

c. Define the charge of research committee. Research committee should facilitate collaboration.

d. Departments should hold research retreats to encourage team science.

e. Administration needs to show respect to faculty and directors. Not inform them of a leadership changes by email.

f. Faculty still care and would help if asked.

g. Value the leadership within the SOM, promote from within and provide counter offers to regular faculty, not just directors and chairs.

Consolidated Faculty Governance Comments

a. Imbalance of power; Top down governance, hierarchical, and misuse of power by the Dean and Chairs; [Some] Chairs misuse power by inequitably controlling lab space, annual raises, and assigning activities without discussion with faculty members; Is there a plan to erode faculty power or is it random?

b. Administration appoints faculty members to committees to serve the purpose of the dean. Appointed members outnumber elected members, defeating the process of election and making sure the faculty have no voice; Faculty council is a rubber stamp.

c. Dean pits chairs against each other; Dean says she is “focusing resources” but it creates tension and makes the departments not cooperate with each other; [Some] Chairs have too much power; [Some] Chairs who are not “favorites” have been emasculated by the Dean, have too little power. Are not even part of the deans leadership team. What power [some chairs] still have is used to do “bad”, not to help their faculty.

d. [Some faculty believe that] Chairs use Department funds to expand their research and push faculty for space to expand their own agenda; Chair’s lab is considered most important—development of other faculty is not considered.

e. Faculty of all ranks fear punitive actions by the Chairs and Dean; No expectation of help of any kind from the SOM administration; “There is a secretive, non-transparent attitude of Chairs, the Dean and administration in every sphere.”; Faculty are afraid to participate in any open forum for
fear of punitive action from the administration; No faculty involvement in major decisions. “We are told things.”

f. Dean’s vision [for the SOM] is not clear - is it the same as the faculty’s?
g. No plan for faculty who lose funding. What about bridge funding?
h. [Some faculty believe that the] Secretaries and chair develop their own method of counting square feet of space and which seem to vary between faculty. The criteria are not shared and only an aggregate graph is made available; Allocation of lab space is inequitable. Different criteria of counting money and measuring lab space are used for different faculty.
i. Too many committees with titles that confer money and serve the Dean. Are not useful for faculty. Why are so many Associate and Vice Deans required? What are their job descriptions and how are they evaluated?
j. No input from faculty in medical school curriculum
k. No recourse if faculty are dissatisfied with the Chair or the Dean; Faculty Affairs office serves the Dean, not the faculty; Faculty Affairs is subjective with the information presented to the administration.
l. Central administration says that they care about the SOM faculty but never interfere or help; Central administration publicly supported the deans positions 100% so it is clear they will never help SOM faculty; Central administration said to faculty “no money, no mission” at the town hall.

**Faculty Governance** Related Suggestions

a. Chairs and Dean should be reviewed/evaluated by faculty every year and held accountable – much like faculty; Chair responsibilities and faculty responsibilities should be written down.
b. Chairs should be rotated every 3-5 years. Is practiced effectively in Brown University medical school and in other schools at CWRU but not SOM; Turn authority over to the chairs for curriculum, salaries, space allocation and mentoring reviews.
c. Institute an anonymous chair evaluation form and climate survey for dean every year. [Several mentioned a 360 degree evaluation]
d. Define the responsibility of Chairs and the dean and hold them responsible. There should be a procedure in place to recall the Dean and Chairs by the faculty, same as faculty are held accountable if they do not perform according to set standards (e.g. 70% salary contribution).
e. Need bottom-up, not top-down model of administration. Show people they are valued; By-laws should be changed to reduce misuse of authority and to give some power back to faculty; Need re-balancing of power without fear of punitive action.
f. Review and reduce the office staff in some departments; Review and reduce the number of research compliance staff, including radiation safety, IACUC, IRB.
g. If “focusing resources” is necessary as the Dean says, give faculty voice about that focus. The dean’s preference for certain departments creates tension between departments.
h. Focus on retention instead of hiring new faculty and chairs with huge start-up packages; Restore sabbaticals.
i. A faculty representative should be nominated that can bring faculty concerns to the Provost or President without fear of punitive action by the Dean or Chair; Two faculty members should be elected to represent faculty to the board of trustees

**Consolidated Teaching and Service** Related Comments

a. Twenty years ago it was an honor to be involved in teaching, now it is a booby prize for those who don't bring in enough grants; Punitive, demoralizing, stigma attached to teaching, no recognition of time or effort spent by faculty.
b. Unfair comparison of contribution with R01s, no incentive for clinical teaching.
c. Tuition money is not counted as revenue for the University.
d. Teaching is not counted towards promotion and tenure.
e. No structure for graduate and post-doc mentoring. No rewards for post-doctoral work such as travel awards to encourage research; “We are losing a generation of researchers because of this behavior.”
f. If faculty were to stage a walk out the teaching would be paralyzed.
g. There is no money attached to service but it has to be done, therefore it should be part of your annual review; There are many ways to be an outstanding faculty member and only one is recognized.

**Teaching and Service Suggestions**

a. Value and reward teaching, and service [as part of] the wholeness of being an academic institute; Teaching is 50-60% time and only gets 10% support.
b. Tuition money should be considered equivalent to indirect costs from grants and rewarded as such.
c. Count teaching courses and the mentoring post-docs and junior faculty as a percent of contribution to salary.
d. Format of graduate student teaching should be changed given the current situation; Gear it towards industry. Combine PhD with MBA, JD; Initiate workshops to prepare students for industry. Teach communication skills; Develop partnership with industry; Start internet classes and initiate creative courses to generate revenue.
e. Improve the setting: Update the school web site to advertise current course offerings; Update equipment for teaching. Many current classrooms are “very poorly equipped”.
f. Initiate flexible mentoring for students and faculty.
g. Administration should participate in graduate education.
h. Have other rewards for teaching and service

3. What steps could you and the administration take to promote collaborative research activities?

a. Consolidated Collaborative Research Comments
   i. [A few faculty complained that] Some senior faculty get undue credit. No recourse if a senior faculty exploits a junior member. Chairs tell those with problems to work it out with the senior faculty, and Dean refuses to intervene; Some senior faculty use unethical means to extract data from junior faculty to write grants and then exclude them once the grant is received. ([Facilitator comment: Four different faculty members had this complaint against one specific PI. It was reported that this person has allegedly been misusing faculty in this way for over 20 years with no consequence because money is being raised—even though that money comes from the data of junior faculty.]
   ii. [Some faculty believe that there is] No acknowledgement of team science by CAPT; Need to uniformly allow some percentage of team science to count toward your required salary contribution. ([Facilitator comment: Over the last two years CAPT has begun to consider team science. Continued development of policy on this is needed and should be disseminated.]
   iii. No incentive for collaborative science. Only indirect costs are counted, not research.
   iv. Indirect costs are used to provide start-up funds for new faculty hires, and yet equipment purchased from these funds are considered ‘personal’ and not shared with other faculty.
   v. [Some faculty stated] Chairs are not interested in helping faculty unless they are currently funded. They exercise absolute power with no input from faculty. Chairs use indirect costs and ‘need’ as criteria for space, but “need” is determined by the Chair, not by faculty performing research or getting the grants. It’s another way to exercise power over faculty.

b. Collaborative Research Suggestions
   i. Chairs need to develop the department and the faculty. Not just their own agendas; Rotate department chairs, maybe every three years like some other schools/colleges at CWRU.
   ii. Reduce HR interference in hiring of research associates like short term hiring, pay levels of the associates etc.; More administrative support for paperwork of grants.
   iii. The indirects have to be figured out for sharing with Co-PI’s.
iv. Some recourse for resolving junior/senior faculty issues. [Some university and school level offices/options] don't work.

v. Improve and clarify how to do team science. Colleagues are fabulous here, we need to encourage and acknowledge contribution; Facilitate collaboration, provide sessions on a particular problem and invite a lot of people to talk about how they intersect with this topic.

4. Does your gender have an impact your life as an SOM faculty member?

a. Consolidated Gender-Related Comments
   i. No support from chairs. Dean did not help when there was a crisis. [Facilitator comment: The specific event of the crisis was removed for confidentiality reasons.]
   ii. Women seem to be disproportionately affected by “up or out”; Need data on how many men, women and minorities come up for tenure and the rates at which they are successful; A woman was asked to fold her lab in order to assist her husband even though her performance was equivalent or better than his. This was considered “better” for the woman.
   iii. Need Child-care on campus. No support for young families.
   iv. There is gender bias. SOM is a difficult environment for women; No uniform support for women; Need education about gender bias issues in evaluation for P&T;
   v. Going up the ranks is limited. Too few women in upper ranks, chairs, directors.
   vi. Women are considered whiners. Most women do not bring up an issue even if it is clearly gender based. If women bring up the issue it is considered ‘using’ this option because they have nothing else to bring forth.
   vii. When given a choice, woman with a better record is picked for an unpleasant outcome in comparison to 5 different men with significantly poorer performance for fear of resistance. This is practiced at all levels, including the chair, dean, dean’s advocates, and chair’s advocates including department staff.
   viii. Older women faculty are treated differently than older men faculty.
   ix. Women are started at Instructor more frequently than men; On CAPT, even with similar credentials, women are offered positions as Instructor and men are offered assistant professor. Women on CAPT have to pay attention and advocate on behalf of the incoming women.
   x. One woman said she didn't think women were treated any differently, it had never happened to her.
   xi. One woman said women are not given credit for their work no matter how hard they work.
   xii. Several women stated that gender issues vary with the chair. A good department for women can turn into a bad department for women when the chair changes.

b. [Facilitator comment: No additional specific suggestions were offered for improving the climate for women. The women faculty participants stated that the gender/diversity problems are cultural and doing any of the suggestions offered in the larger session such as rotating and evaluating department chairs, Co-PI status calculation for indirects and service/teaching recognition would all improve the climate for women faculty.]