

**Faculty Council Meeting**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
Monday, February 17, 2020  
4:00-5:30PM – BRB 105

4:00-4:10PM	Welcome and Chair Announcements	Gary Clark
4:10-4:15PM	Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the January 27, 2020 Meeting (with proposed edits)	Gary Clark
4:15-4:35PM	Update on the Office of Equity	Darnell Parker
4:35-4:55PM	Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report	Cynthia Kubu
4:55-5:25PM	Professional Code of Conduct Presentation	Cynthia Kubu
5:25-5:30PM	New Business	Gary Clark
5:30PM	Adjourn	

**Members Present**

Corinne Bazella	Beata Jastrzebska	Satya Sahoo
Cathleen Carlin	David Katz	Ashleigh Schaffer
Shu Chen	Allyson Kozak	Hemalatha Senthilkumar
Gary Clark	Varun Kshetry	Daniel Sweeney
Darin Croft	Cynthia Kubu	Patricia Taylor
Piet de Boer	Suet Kam Lam	Carlos Trombetta
Pamela Davis	Maria Cecilia Lansang	Heather Vallier
Philipp Dines	Charles Malemud	Allison Vidimos
Todd Emch	Maureen McEnery	Susan Wang
Thomas Gerken	Anna Miller	Nicole Ward
Monica Gerrek	Vincent Monnier	Jo Ann Wise
Anna Maria Hibbs	George Ochenjele	Richard Zigmund
Darrell Hulisz	Anand Ramamurthi	

**Members Absent**

Robert Bonomo	Jeffrey Hopcian	Vicki Noble
Matthias Buck	Alex Huang	Clifford Packer
Sudha Chakrapani	Robert Hughes	Nimitt Patel
Jae-Sung Cho	Ankur Kalra	Steve Ricanati
Travis Cleland	Laura Kreiner	Ben Roitberg
Brian D'Anza	Vinod Labhasetwar	Barbara Snyder

**Members Absent (cont.)**

Jennifer Dorth

William Dupps

Judith French

Amy Hise

Peter MacFarlane

Jennifer McBride

Ameya Nayate

Krystal Tomei

Satish Viswanath

Jamie Wood

**Others Present**

Alicia Aguilar

Mark Chance

David Miller

Nicole Deming

Joyce Helton

Matthew Lester

Anna Miller

**Chair Announcements**

Gary Clark, Chair of Faculty Council, called the meeting to order at 4:00PM. He reminded the members of an e-mail that they had recently received from the Office of Interprofessional Education, Research and Collaborative Practice at Case Western Reserve University announcing that they are hosting a retreat on Tuesday, March 3, 2020, from 8:00AM-5:00PM in the Samson Pavilion at the HEC. All should consider attending this event.

Eleven individuals have submitted their statements of interest for four faculty slots on the Faculty Senate. The NEC is in the process of ratifying the ballot.

Approval of the January 27 Faculty Council meeting minutes will be deferred until later on in the meeting as we do not have a quorum at this time.

**Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report (Cynthia Kubu)**

Dr. Kubu stated that it was a privilege to serve as a SOM representative of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. If any of the council members have questions or concerns they should feel free to reach out to her and the other senators. The broad topics that will be covered today are: safety, teaching, benefits, new initiatives, and Think Big.

The administration is committed to safety and there has been considerable discussion on this topic. While the perception has been that crime has increased, it has, in fact, remained the same. There have been, however, an increase in sending out alerts. The safety data for the past three years is available online for anyone to review. Other safety measures in place are the Rave Guardian smart phone app, an increase in Safe Ride vehicles, more than a thousand security cameras on campus, an available escort service, and plain clothes officers who patrol the campus. When tasked with how best to address faculty concerns regarding safety, the Senate looked at the expertise within faculty across the university to come up with the best practices to help develop policies and resources.

Under the topic of teaching, the Committee on Undergraduate Education and the General Education Requirement Task Force report came out in November and addressed course evaluations and bias, online courses, and tuition allocation for interdisciplinary courses. The allocation of tuition for interdisciplinary courses (who gets tuition money and how it is distributed equitably between departments) was a topic of discussion.

The Music School Settlement and CWRU have come to an agreement whereby the Music School Settlement will provide a \$1,000 subsidy for childcare at either location. Paid parental leave (includes adoption, foster care, and birth of children) has been extended to eight weeks for all post-doctoral students and staff beginning July 1, 2020. The cost is covered by the host department, not by grants.

The idea of a Space and Classroom Utilization Committee was raised as something that may be very relevant to faculty, and a study consultant will be looking into this. The university is also looking into several other committees that will be coming down the pike. The General Counsel is soliciting faculty input and participation regarding a policy for wheeled transportation (scooters, bicycles) on campus.

The Think Big initiative acknowledges that Case Western Reserve University is a high-impact research university that aspires to be a community where humanity, science and technology meet to create a just and thriving world. They hope to achieve these goals by following four pathways: 1) ignite interdisciplinarity, 2) integrate humanity and technology, 3) achieve social impact, and 4) shape the Agora.

There is funding associated with the Think Big initiative. The deadline for the RFP was January 31, 2020. Think Big provides an opportunity to leverage and to note the strength we have to pursue some of these funding opportunities. An agora would be a safe, welcome environment and space to have and discuss ideas.

There was a competition earlier and we were informed that the medical school was awarded a total of \$650,000 dollars from our submission. These funds would support two recruitments in the medical school, two graduate programs, and an add-on to the prep program for under-represented minorities. This would provide them assistance for getting into grad school and hopefully to persuade more of them to stay here as opposed to going somewhere else.

The total funds available for each year are \$7.5 million, for a 5 year period. It is not clear how much was distributed in the last go round; the relevant people are being notified first. It was emphasized, that while this year's RFP deadline has passed (January 31, 2020), these are annual competitions, and afford us a tremendous opportunity.

The idea of job fairs has been repeatedly brought to the Senate floor. They are a great opportunity (interdisciplinary across schools) to obtain seed money. Faculty Senators present at the Faculty Council meeting were asked to raise their hands so their colleagues could know who their Senate representatives are.

Dr. Clark informed Faculty Council that we now have a quorum.

### **Proposal for an Ad Hoc Committee to Study Professional Codes of Conduct**

The sense is that there are gaps in how unprofessional inappropriate behavior is dealt with on an inter-faculty level. A draft charge has been created for the ad hoc Committee to Study Professional Codes of Conduct with suggestions as to how this might be addressed.

Discussion of the professional codes of conduct came up last spring and the Dean addressed it in her May or June meeting with faculty. An ad hoc committee to study professional codes of conduct was approved by Faculty Council. The draft charge states that this committee will study professional codes of conduct at other institutions, and use this information to develop a

proposed Professional Code of Conduct for the SOM's consideration. It could include the formation of a permanent SOM Committee, if deemed appropriate, and would present best practices for resolving professional concerns between faculty members, look at mechanisms that will ensure that we are all the best that we can be.

There are several types of professionalism. Medical professionalism is based on a covenant of trust, a contract clinicians have with patients and society; professional organizations; professionalism in science/research (Nuremburg Code; Declaration of Helsinki, Belmont Report, The Common Rule); and research integrity – a pattern of behavior identified with scientific integrity (honesty, excellence in thinking and doing, collegiality, mentorship, COI, scientific malfeasance and misconduct).

Some common elements indicated that there is significant cost associated with unprofessional behavior (loss of patients, low staff morale and turnover, medical errors and adverse outcomes; malpractice suits). Escalating unprofessional behavior by an individual has been shown to have a contagion effect. It stresses the system and creates an environment not pleasant for some.

The CWRU Code of Conduct states that “The mission of Case Western Reserve University is to improve and enrich people’s lives through research that capitalizes on the power of collaboration, and education that dramatically engages students. This goal is realized through: scholarship and creative endeavors that draw on all forms of inquiry; learning that is active, creative and continuous; and promotion of an inclusive culture of global citizenship.”

While it touches on aspects of professionalism, it does not embody the core features contained in a professional code of conduct.

If there is a conflict between a faculty member and administration (hierarchical) then they proceed to a grievance procedure. If intercollegial, the process is that they first consult with colleagues, their department chair, and then go to the Conciliation Officer (Jonathan Hinton). The Conciliation Office is able to mediate with both parties, who are willing to meet, without escalating further. The problem occurs when both parties are not willing to meet and discuss, then they are stuck. There is a gap in terms of existing CWRU policy.

This proposal is asking for Faculty Council support the formation of an ad hoc committee to study this problem. Professionalism is the key component. The SOM faculty serve as role models of professionalism to students, trainees, and colleagues. Our behavior should dictate how they should behave. It was suggested that this committee could develop into a permanent SOM Committee, if deemed appropriate.

The ad hoc committee would be tasked to study professional codes of conduct at other institutions and use this information to develop and make recommendations for a proposed Professional Code of Conduct for the SOM's consideration. The committee would be comprised of senior faculty, who are either elected by the faculty or appointed by the Dean (a mixed committee). There will be one elected and one appointed faculty representative from each home institution (i.e. CWRU main campus VA, UH, MHMC, and CCLCM) for a total of 10 members. Leadership at each home institution shall make recommendations to the Dean for appointments on the committee and faculty, based at each institution, will elect one member.

There will be five appointed members and five elected members (two from each institution). If the professional code of conduct is endorsed by faculty, it will require the endorsement of all institutions that employ faculty. The joint model addresses both concerns.

While committee members do not need to be current Faculty Council members, current or past service on SOM committees will be preferred. The charge was edited based on the feedback received from the Faculty Council Steering Committee (e.g. committee members must be at the rank of associate professor or professor). The ad hoc committee will elect a chair from among its members and inform the Chair of Faculty Council by April 15, 2020.

The committee shall meet regularly and at least once a month. Members shall solicit input from faculty at their respective home institutions. It is expected that the committee will include ex officio members, in particular from the General Counsel's Office, a representative from the SOM Offices of Faculty and Diversity, and leadership, who will be expected to help enforce any recommendations and to help inform the work early in the process and to review the final recommendations. The Committee will provide a report, with recommendations, to the Faculty Council Steering Committee during their December 2020 meeting. Upon approval of the Steering Committee, the report will then be placed on the agenda for the December 2020 Faculty Council meeting.

This committee will sunset in January 2021 following submission of its final report, including comments from Faculty Council representatives.

When the floor was opened for discussion, a member asked how many times per year, at the SOM, does an incident occur between two faculty members. Dean Davis stated that while she does not have the exact numbers on the total number of interfaculty disputes, she did speculate that there is at least one every 18 months that gets tortured into an agreement. Disputes between faculty members who could not work it out, invariably end with the agreement that somebody in administration should have been able to provide some assistance.

Some forms of professional misconduct are research misconduct, falsification, plagiarism, or fabrication. It does not come under the research misconduct mechanism. Questions concerning authorship and destruction of samples are forms of unprofessional behavior on the part of some individuals, but there is not a mechanism to adjudicate those in advance. Once the samples are gone, there is no mechanism to get them back. There are, in fact, things going on that should be addressed. With nearly 3,000 full time faculty in SOM, the chances are that someone is doing something wrong. Some of them really fester and think there is no recourse. There are a fair number of expectations of staff in the policies of the university, but nothing comparable for faculty at that level. There is not that much available to guide conduct or point to. There are a number of things that wind up in the grievance process.

Each of the affiliate hospitals do have codes of conduct of professionalism. It is critically important that we be the best that we can be and know what we are expected to do. The Faculty Council Steering Committee recommended that it should be sent to the Faculty Senate to see if the text in the handbook was sufficient. There are codes of conduct that determine professional standing of everyone who has a license. Cleveland Clinic has their own code of conduct through their Legal Office of Compliance.

We have the opportunity to provide people a mechanism to discuss their grievances in confidence (including the students who have less access to grievances and do not know where to

go, other faculty and post docs). It is not sufficient to state that is just how that person is and accept bad behavior.

It was noted that the charge is extremely well thought out, supported by the comments from Dean Davis, and puts forth a very well spelled out plan to form a committee stating the composition, objectives, data gathering data, comparing colleagues at other institutions, determining our needs, time involved (monthly meetings), expectations of the committee, and a sunset date. This committee will set guidelines to address other issues of conflict among colleagues and general unprofessionalism, to prevent escalation to the level of legal lawsuits or grievances, by dealing with colleagues and peers in a fair manner.

It was stated that the Faculty Handbook already covers all of these issues. Before starting a new ad hoc committee and wasting a lot of time, it could prove helpful to look at what is already there. Dr. Kubu reminded the members that the ad hoc committee may discover that what we already have is great, but there still exists an intercollegial conflict gap. That point was supported at the Faculty Council Steering Committee meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal for creation of an ad hoc committee to study professional codes of conduct as described and come back with recommendations. David Miller, Chair of the Faculty Senate, was invited to attend the meeting. When the floor was opened for discussion, a representative asked Dr. Miller if the proposal that was seen by several members of the FS was redundant with that is currently in the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Miller stated that this particular proposal had been looked at by members of the FS executive committee (?) and it was decided and determined that while we do have a Faculty Handbook, Faculty Council can take it upon itself to look at it. There is a need to look at the different institutions coming together, and believe that this is an opportunity. Why not pursue anything that can improve intercollegiality between faculty. It was noted that students have seen the faculty conflict and unprofessionalism, and would hope it would be addressed.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 23 were in favor, 8 were opposed, and 3 abstained. The motion passes.

#### **Approval of Minutes from the January 27 Faculty Council Meeting**

Several edits were suggested and made to the January 27 meeting minutes. A motion was then made and seconded to approve the January 27 Faculty Council meeting minutes as edited. There were significant further discussions and objections were raised to the content of the January minutes. It was clarified that the Nomination and Elections Committee did not have the opportunity to review the Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Bylaws ballot before it was distributed. , A vote was taken. 28 were in favor, 2 were opposed, and 2 abstained. The motion passes.

There being no new or further business to be addressed, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor, no one opposed, and no one abstained. The motion passes.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Helton

**Faculty Council Meeting**  
**Draft Meeting Minutes**  
Monday, January 27, 2020  
4:00-5:30PM – BRB 105

4:00-4:10PM	Welcome and Chair Announcements	Jennifer McBride
4:10-4:12PM	Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the October 21, 2019 Meeting (with proposed edits)	Jennifer McBride
4:12- 4:15PM	Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the December 16, 2019 Meeting	Jennifer McBride
4:15-4:25PM	Faculty Council Steering Committee Activities Report	Jennifer McBride
4:25-4:30PM	Senate Report from Executive Committee (continuation from last FC meeting)	Ahmad Khalil
4:25-4:45PM	SOM Faculty Council Ad hoc Committee on Awards and Honors (continuation from last FC meeting)	
4:45-5:05PM	Faculty Senate Ad hoc Committee on HEC (continuation from last FC meeting)	Maureen McEney
5:05-5:20PM	Vote on Nutrition Degree program Offered Online	Hope Barkoukis
5:20-5:30PM	New Business	
5:30PM	Adjourn	

**Members Present**

Corinne Bazella	Thomas Gerken	Jennifer McBride
Robert Bonomo	Monica Gerrek	Maureen McEney
Matthias Buck	Amy Hise	Vincent Monnier
Shu Chen	Alex Huang	Satya Sahoo
Jae-Sung Cho	Robert Hughes	Ashleigh Schaffer
Travis Cleland	Beata Jasztrzebska	Hemalatha Senthilkumar
Darin Croft	David Katz	Heather Vallier
Brian D'Anza	Allyson Kozak	Susan Wang
Piet de Boer	Varun Kshetry	Nicole Ward
Philipp Dines	Vinod Labhasetwar	Jo Ann Wise
William Dupps	Maria Cecilia Lansang	Jamie Wood
Todd Emch	Charles Malemud	Richard Zigmond
Judith French		

**Members Absent**

Alicia Aguilar	Ankur Kalra	Anand Ramamurthi
Tracey Bonfield	Ahmad Khalil	Steve Ricanati
Cathleen Carlin	Laura Kreiner	Ben Roitberg
Sudha Chakrapani	Suet Kam Lam	Barbara Snyder
Gary Clark	Peter MacFarlane	Daniel Sweeney
Pamela Davis	Ameya Nayate	Patricia Taylor
Jennifer Dorth	Vicki Noble	Krystal Tomei
Anna Maria Hibbs	George Ochenjele	Carlos Trombetta
Jeffrey Hopcian	Clifford Packer	Allison Vidimos
Darrell Hulisz	Nimitt Patel	Satish Viswanath

**Others Present**

Mark Chance	Joyce Helton	Raed Bou Matar
Nicole Deming	Matthew Lester	Anna Miller

**Welcome and Chair Announcements**

Jennifer McBride, Chair-Elect of Faculty Council, convened the meeting at 4:00PM. Dr. McBride reminded the members that Faculty Council follows Robert’s Rules of Order in their proceedings.

All of the bylaws amendments recently voted upon by the full faculty have been passed and forwarded to Dean Davis. A spreadsheet with the detailed voting results with shared with the members.

**Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the October 21, 2019 Meeting (with proposed edits)**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes from the October 21, 2019 Faculty Council meeting as amended with the proposed edits. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 30 were in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstained. The motion passes.

**Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the December 16, 2019 Meeting**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes from the December 16, 2019 Faculty Council meeting as amended with the proposed edits. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 27 were in favor, 0 were opposed, and 3 abstained. The motion passes.

A member asked about the election process, including the role of the Nomination and Elections. Discussion was deferred until the end of the meeting under new business.

**Faculty Council Steering Committee Activities Report (Jennifer McBride)**

The Faculty Council Steering Committee met on January 6. At that meeting, they approved the meeting minutes from their October 7 meeting. In order to provide the committee time for review, approval of the December meeting minutes was postponed until the February meeting.



It was noted that ninety-five percent of the equity review process carried out by the FCSC for appointments, promotion and tenure for 2019-2020, has been completed.

Dr. Matthias Buck presented an update on the Committee on Finance, Budget and Compensation. The FCSC suggested that it might be beneficial for the Committee on Finance, Budget and Compensation to hold a second town hall meeting. The previous one, scheduled for November 25 (the day before Thanksgiving), was poorly attended and conflicted with the senate meeting. Dr. Buck will identify a more expedient date and time for a second town hall.

The committee will address the particulars regarding the ad hoc committee on Code of Conduct at the February 3 meeting at which time Dr. Cynthia Kubu will present documentation regarding structure and the charge in process for discussion. The Committee review the SOM CAPT recommendations for equity. The Committee provided advice to the Dean on chair appointments.

**Senate Report from Executive Committee (continuation from last FC meeting) (Ahmad Khalil) –**  
Dr Khalil was not in attendance. The report will be on the next Faculty Council agenda.

**SOM Faculty Council Ad hoc Committee on Awards and Honors (continuation from last FC meeting)**

The charge for this committee has already been approved by Faculty Council. Discussion was opened for the methods to be employed in recruiting people to serve on the committee. The Nomination and Elections Committee is responsible for reading the statements of those interested in serving and putting those qualified candidates through to Faculty Council for approval. While the ad hoc Committee on Awards was initially created as an ad hoc committee of Faculty Council, there is a potential for it to become an ongoing committee. Six members are being sought for the committee.

A motion was made and seconded that the Nomination and Elections Committee will review nominees and create a ballot for the Faculty Council to vote and elect the committee members for the ad hoc Committee on Awards and Honors. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 27 were in favor, 0 were opposed, and 3 abstained. The motion passes.

**Faculty Senate Ad hoc Committee on HEC (continuation from last FC meeting)**

It was noted that this was an outstanding agenda item from the December 16 Faculty Council Meeting.

Some faculty and staff from the School of Medicine, the School of Nursing and the Dental School moved to the HEC campus. In April, an ad hoc committee on HEC transition was formed by the Faculty Senate. The committee is comprised of three senators from each School (SOM, SODM, SON), one senator from MSASS, and a representative from the Faculty Senate Committee on Personnel and Committee on Budget and Finance.

The committee is charged to gather information from faculty, share this information with faculty and the Faculty Senate, and make recommendations on behalf of faculty.

This committee will sunset in in May of 2020. Dr. McEnery stated that the HEC is a vibrant building with a tremendous amount of activity.

The committee met with Ellen Lubers (IPE) and K. Cole Kelly (IPE Transition) to confirm that there was no overlap or duplication of effort between the HEC ad hoc Committee charge and the IPE committees' goals and activities. The IPE committees are concerned with the IPE education curriculum and faculty team building, while the ad hoc Committee's focus is on the communication between administration and faculty regarding the HEC transition.

The committee spent significant time actively soliciting feedback from faculty on their experiences with the Health Education Campus, which has been broken down into the following headings: Campus building management, logistics, process, and philosophical considerations. (see attached report).

Dr. McEnery stated that there was a concern that moving to the HEC would be a barrier to participation from the different affiliates, but this does not appear to be so. Engagement is regarded overall to be incredibly positive. Educators are commenting on the positive environment.

The committee also feels that it is important to encourage a positive climate through a strong sense of community. The committee heard reports that those in the building do not feel that it is their building, but that they are merely tenants. The ad hoc committee hopes the President's Office will get involved.

There have been comments regarding the decoration of the building. A member of Faculty Council stated that the building has no soul. In response, Dr. McEnery shared that the committee shared with the President at the Faculty Senate meeting several statements that agreed to artifacts and history of SOM being represented in the building. President Snyder stated that they have incorporated some of the key moments in all of the schools in the art. Some FC representatives stated that the white walls and lack of art makes the building feel cold and sterile. The ad hoc committee received comments expressing concern that the school's long and distinguished history as an innovator of medical education and many other areas was not displayed in the new building.

The committee also heard concerns regarding the building design as it relates to privacy and confidentiality. Sensitive conversations can be difficult to have when staff and faculty do not have office space. The committee heard support for activities to unite students, faculty and staff. Dr. McEnery encouraged faculty to bring any concerns including possible solutions regarding the HEC to the committee's attention.

#### **Vote on Nutrition Degree Program Offered Online (Hope Barkoukis)**

Dr. Barkoukis, Chair of the Department of Nutrition presented an overview of the department's history in education and its vision for the future. She stated that CWRU trails behind other institutions in terms of online education. While the Nutrition Degree Program already exists; the department would like to add a platform for delivery of content by putting it on-line. She stated that the request has been reviewed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Programs chaired by

Dr. Nicholas Ziats. Dr. Barkoukis stated that the program is a very high quality, top-notch educational program and will not change as an on-line program. It is compliant with the laws in Ohio.

On a regular basis, the state mandates a review of educational programs; a report was submitted in 2019. To graduate with a MS degree in Nutrition a minimum of 30 graduate credits total, a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0, and successful completion of a comprehensive examination (Plan B degree). The department is making zero changes to curriculum and zero changes to requirements whatsoever.

Some of the program's main competitors have gone fully on line and the department must adapt to remain competitive. Not all courses will be offered online. However, there is a need for this as the department discovered through a survey which showed a shocking number of students who have to take night courses to accommodate their schedules.

Faculty and content will remain the same. All courses have been in existence and have not been created for this on-line program. The cost of the online courses is the same as in person courses on campus. As the product will be the same, there will be no discount for online delivery. It is not less of a product; it is not a discount product. We want every faculty member to value teaching both on-line and in person.

Under Cheryl's guidance and strategic thinking, the on-line working community works with faculty for a year. This is not taping your lecture and hitting autopilot. Faculty are trained to have a more sophisticated approach to on-line education by making the student feel welcome and engaged. It is actually a high level of quality – nothing is sacrificed because it is moving to a different format.

Probably 88% of the students who get this Plan B master's degree are clinical oriented and ultimately will be in clinical positions (hospitals, government, public health institutes). Of that cohort some will go on to a PhD. The remaining students are PhD oriented. Probably less than 10% go into industry.

The employment rate to do with regions is high -- from 93% to 88% within 18 months of graduation. Students in internships would have 1500 hours of mandated clinical interface with patients (all different rotations, ICU all the way through).

A motion was made and seconded to approve the online Nutrition Degree Program. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 31 were in favor, 1 was opposed, and 1 abstained. The motion passes.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

The conversation regarding the NEC and the recent ballot on the proposed amendments to the bylaws resumed. The NEC charge stated in the SOM Bylaws was read and there was a disagreement regarding whether the NEC was charged with reviewing ballots for proposed amendments in addition to the clearly stated charge to nominate candidates for elections and review those ballots before they are presented to Faculty Council for the May election and the

faculty for election of the senators and SOM committees. The issue was discussed by the SOM Bylaws Committee at its meeting and Darin Croft, Chair of the SOM Bylaws Committee was in attendance at Faculty Council. The question of whether the SOM Bylaws stated the NEC was charged with approved ballots for proposed amendments to the Bylaws was put to Dr. Croft and he stated it was not. It was agreed that the process for reviewing the ballots for proposed amendments to the Bylaws could be expanded upon by amending the SOM Bylaws. While this matter will continue to be discussed in Bylaws; there was no violation in this past process. It was initially sent to the NEC and they put it on the agenda for October and stated that the NEC will not review the proposed amendments to the bylaws.

Dr. McBride stated that voting on the proposed amendment is closed and the amendments have already passed. Additional amendments can be submitted at a future date, but for now, the matter is closed.

There being no further items to be addressed, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor, no one opposed. The motion passes.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Helton

# Senate Update

Cynthia Kubu, PhD

February 17, 2020

# Broad Topics

- Safety
- Teaching
- Benefits
- New initiatives
- Think Big

# Safety

- Administration is committed to safety
- There has been no increase in crime (stats available online for past three years) but there has been an increase in sending alerts
- >1000 cameras on campus
- Increased visibility of campus police force
- Plain Clothes Officers
- Rave Guardian smart phone app
- Increased Safe Ride vehicles
- Escort Service
- Leverage faculty's expertise in safety, trauma, etc... to help develop policies/resources

# Teaching

- Committee on Undergraduate Education and the General Education Requirement Task Force
  - Course Evaluations and bias
  - Online Courses
  - Tuition allocation for interdisciplinary courses
- Motion to consider cancelling classes the Wednesday before Thanksgiving
  - Decision to wait until GER task force work is completed



# Benefits

- Music School Settlement and CWRU agreement. \$1000 subsidy for childcare at either location
- Paid parental leave to extend to 8 weeks for all post-doctoral students and staff beginning July 1, 2020. Includes adoption, foster care, and birth of children. Cost covered by host department, not by grants

# New initiatives

- The idea of a Space and Classroom Utilization Committee was raised
- Policy regarding wheeled transportation – especially scooters.  
General Counsel is interested in faculty input/participation

# Think Big

Case Western Reserve is a high-impact research university that aspires to be a community where humanity, science and technology meet to create a just and thriving world

Pathway 1: Ignite interdisciplinarity

Pathway 2: Integrate humanity and technology

Pathway 3: Achieve social impact

Pathway 4: Shape the Agora

RFP Deadline Jan 31, 2020 – more to follow

## **Charge for the ad hoc Committee to study Professional Codes of Conduct**

**Approved by Faculty Council February 17, 2020**

Background: Professionalism is a key component of medical school education and conduct. The School of Medicine (SOM) faculty serve as role models of professionalism to students, trainees, and colleagues. Despite the importance of modeling professional behavior, the SOM does not have a Professional Code of Conduct that applies to all faculty. Further, CWRU has limited options to address faculty-on-faculty professionalism concerns.

Faculty Council will form an advisory ad hoc Committee that will study Professional Codes of Conduct at other institutions, use this information to develop a proposed Professional Code of Conduct for the SOM's consideration including the formation of a permanent SOM Committee if appropriate, and present best practices for resolving professionalism concerns between faculty members to the Faculty Council.

- 1) The ad hoc Committee will be comprised of senior faculty who are elected by the faculty and appointed by the Dean. There will be one elected and one appointed faculty representative from each home institution (i.e., CWRU Main Campus, VA, UH, MHMC, CCLCM) for a total of 10 members. Leadership at each home institution shall make recommendations to the Dean for appointment on the committee and faculty based at each institution will elect one member.

*Rationale: Adherence to high professionalism standards is expected of all SOM faculty members. It is fair to have equal representation from all CWRU SOM faculty home institutions. If a Professional Code of Conduct is adopted by the SOM Faculty, it will require the endorsement of leadership at all five institutions that employ SOM Faculty; consequently, leadership should have a voice in selecting representatives. It is equally important that the faculty of the five home institutions have a voice in electing their representative to the ad hoc committee. This joint model addresses both concerns.*

- 2) Committee members do not need to be current Faculty Council members, but current or past service on SOM committees will be preferred.

*Rationale: Knowledge of SOM and CWRU governance as well as existing CWRU resources will facilitate the ad hoc committee's work.*

- 3) Committee members must be at the rank of associate professor or professor who have demonstrated expertise in professionalism. This expertise may be reflected in a variety of ways, including (but not limited to) invited lectures or curriculum development on professionalism, service on committees that entail consideration of topics related to professionalism (e.g., IRB, ethics boards or committees, CAPT), scholarship on topics related to professionalism, expert knowledge of ethics, etc.. Elections will be held at the beginning of March and the final Membership in the ad hoc committee will be presented to the Faculty Council by the end of March 2020.

*Rationale: Limiting membership in the ad hoc committee to those at the associate professor or professor rank ensures that all ad hoc committee members have gone through the same review process and are recognized national or international leaders in their respective fields. Demonstrated expertise in professionalism will facilitate the timely work of the ad hoc committee and ensure that the committee's report and recommendations reflect the relevant literatures and best practices.*

- 4) The ad hoc Committee will elect a Chair from among its members and inform the Chair of Faculty Council by April 15, 2020.

- 5) The Committee shall meet regularly and at least once a month. Members shall solicit input from faculty at their respective home institutions. It is expected that the committee will include ex officio members, in particular from General Counsel's office, representatives from the SOM Offices of Faculty and Diversity, and leadership who will be expected to help enforce any recommendations, to help inform the work early in the process and to review the final recommendations. The Committee will provide a report with recommendations to Faculty Council Steering Committee during the December 2020 meeting. Upon approval of the Steering Committee, the report will be placed on the agenda for the December 2020 Faculty Council meeting.

The committee report will include:

- a) A summary of existing Professional Codes of Conducts and mechanisms for resolving inter-collegial conflicts,
  - b) A draft Professional Code of Conduct for discussion and/or adoption by the Faculty Council and the SOM Faculty,
  - c) A recommendation on the administration of the Code of Conduct in the School of Medicine and across institutions, and
  - d) If a Professional Conduct Committee is recommended, present a draft charge outlining membership and duties.
- 6) The Committee will sunset in January 2021 following submission of its final report including comments from Faculty Council representatives.

*Rationale: Deadlines and requirements regarding regular meetings help maintain progress so that the ad hoc Committee can fulfill its charge.*

# Proposal for an ad hoc Committee to Study Professional Codes of Conduct

February 2020

# What is professionalism?

- Medical Professionalism: based on a covenant of trust, a contract clinicians have with patients and society (Root, 1902; CanMEDS, 2000)
- Professional organizations
- Professionalism in science/research (Nuremburg Code; Declaration of Helsinki, Belmont Report, The Common Rule)
- Research integrity (NAS)
  - Pattern of behavior identified with scientific integrity (honesty, excellence in thinking and doing, collegiality, mentorship, COI, scientific malfeasance and misconduct)

# Costs of Unprofessional Behavior

- Poor adherence to practice guidelines
- Loss of patients
- Low staff morale and turnover
- Medical errors and adverse outcomes; malpractice suits
- Escalating unprofessional behavior by individual
- Stresses the system
- Contagion effect of increasing unprofessional, disruptive behavior among others



# CWRU Code of Conduct

*The mission of Case Western Reserve University is to improve and enrich people's lives through research that capitalizes on the power of collaboration, and education that dramatically engages students. This goal is realized through: scholarship and creative endeavors that draw on all forms of inquiry; learning that is active, creative and continuous; and promotion of an inclusive culture of global citizenship.*

# CWRU Procedure

- "In most cases, a faculty member who desires information about and assistance with university-related "disputes regarding personnel practice" or "inter-collegial conflicts" among faculty (as both are defined below) that may affect him or her should first consult with his or her own colleagues or his or her own dean or department chair."
- "Issues brought by a faculty member alleging discrimination in a personnel practice or inter-collegial dispute must be referred by the Conciliation Counselor to the Faculty Diversity Officer or his/her designee in the Office of Inclusion, Diversity & Equal Opportunity, so that the matters may be investigated. The Conciliation Counselor, after reviewing the issue, will determine if the matter is appropriate for mediation. The Conciliation Counselor shall consult with the Provost and/or the Office of General Counsel in reaching such determinations. In reaching a resolution, the Conciliation Counselor shall ensure that each of the parties has the authority to bind the applicable individual, entity, or the university to the agreed-upon resolution."
- "An "inter-collegial conflict" is a conflict between faculty colleagues about academic matters, other than a decision to take employment-related adverse action, when such a conflict seriously impairs the effective functioning of the academic unit. Examples include disrespectful behavior, refusal to participate or to include others in the decision making process within the unit, and airing conflict to outsiders, thereby causing damage to the grievant, the unit, or the University. An "inter-collegial conflict" may not be the subject of a grievance complaint."
- Jonathan Entin, JD, Conciliation Counselor noted in his December 2019 report to the CWRU Senate that "not all conflicts can be resolved by agreement"

# Charge for the ad hoc Committee to study Professional Codes of Conduct

- Background: Professionalism is a key component of medical school education and conduct. The School of Medicine (SOM) faculty serve as role models of professionalism to students, trainees, and colleagues. Despite the importance of modeling professional behavior, the SOM does not have a Professional Code of Conduct that applies to all faculty. Further, CWRU has limited options to address faculty-on-faculty professionalism concerns.
- Faculty Council will form an advisory ad hoc Committee that will study Professional Codes of Conduct at other institutions, use this information to develop a proposed Professional Code of Conduct for the SOM's consideration including the formation of a permanent SOM Committee if appropriate, and present best practices for resolving professionalism concerns between faculty members to the Faculty Council.

# Charge for the ad hoc Committee to study Professional Codes of Conduct, 2

1) The ad hoc Committee will be comprised of senior faculty who are elected by the faculty and appointed by the Dean. There will be one elected and one appointed faculty representative from each home institution (i.e., CWRU Main Campus, VA, UH, MHMC, CCLCM) for a total of 10 members. Leadership at each home institution shall make recommendations to the Dean for appointment on the committee and faculty based at each institution will elect one member.

***Rationale:*** Adherence to high professionalism standards is expected of all SOM faculty members. It is fair to have equal representation from all CWRU SOM faculty home institutions. If a Professional Code of Conduct is adopted by the SOM Faculty, it will require the endorsement of leadership at all five institutions that employ SOM Faculty; consequently, leadership should have a voice in selecting representatives. It is equally important that the faculty of the five home institutions have a voice in electing their representative to the ad hoc committee. This joint model addresses both concerns.

# Charge for the ad hoc Committee to study Professional Codes of Conduct, 3

2) Committee members do not need to be current Faculty Council members, but current or past service on SOM committees will be preferred.

***Rationale:** Knowledge of SOM and CWRU governance as well as existing CWRU resources will facilitate the ad hoc committee's work.*

# Charge for the ad hoc Committee to study Professional Codes of Conduct, 4

3) Committee members must be at the rank of **associate professor or** professor who have demonstrated expertise in professionalism. This expertise may be reflected in a variety of ways, including (but not limited to) invited lectures or curriculum development on professionalism, service on committees that entail consideration of topics related to professionalism (e.g., IRB, ethics boards or committees, CAPT), scholarship on topics related to professionalism, expert knowledge of ethics, etc.. Elections will be held at the beginning of March and the final Membership in the ad hoc committee will be presented to the Faculty Council by the end of March 2020.

***Rationale:*** Limiting membership in the ad hoc committee to those at the **associate professor or** professor rank ensures that all ad hoc committee members have gone through the same review process and are recognized national or international leaders in their respective fields. Demonstrated expertise in professionalism will facilitate the timely work of the ad hoc committee and ensure that the committee's report and recommendations reflect the relevant literatures and best practices.

# Charge for the ad hoc Committee to study Professional Codes of Conduct, 5

4) The ad hoc Committee will elect a Chair from among its members and inform the Chair of Faculty Council by April 15, 2020.

5) The Committee shall meet regularly and at least once a month. Members shall solicit input from faculty at their respective home institutions. It is expected that the committee will include ex officio members, in particular from General Counsel's office, representatives from the SOM Offices of Faculty and Diversity, and leadership who will be expected to help enforce any recommendations, to help inform the work early in the process and to review the final recommendations. The Committee will provide a report with recommendations to Faculty Council Steering Committee during the December 2020 meeting. Upon approval of the Steering Committee, the report will be placed on the agenda for the December 2020 Faculty Council meeting.

# Charge for the ad hoc Committee to study Professional Codes of Conduct, 6

The committee report will include:

- a) A summary of existing Professional Codes of Conducts and mechanisms for resolving inter-collegial conflicts,
- b) A draft Professional Code of Conduct for discussion and/or adoption by the Faculty Council and the SOM Faculty,
- c) A recommendation on the administration of the Code of Conduct in the School of Medicine and across institutions, and
- d) If a Professional Conduct Committee is recommended, present a draft charge outlining membership and duties.

6) The Committee will sunset in January 2021 following submission of its final report including comments from Faculty Council representatives.

***Rationale:*** Deadlines and requirements regarding regular meetings help maintain progress so that the ad hoc Committee can fulfill its charge.



# Discussion