<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00PM</td>
<td>Welcome and Chair’s Comments</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10PM</td>
<td>Approval of Faculty Council Draft Meeting Minutes for December 22, 2017</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15PM</td>
<td>Chair-Elect Report of Steering Committee Activities</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20PM</td>
<td>Presentation on Health Education Campus (attachment)</td>
<td>Jill Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35PM</td>
<td>Presentation of SOM Bylaws Amendments Regarding Revised Charge for Bylaws Committee (attachment)</td>
<td>Jo Ann Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50PM</td>
<td>Request for topics from Faculty Council Members for the Third Meeting of the SOM Faculty with the Dean in the Spring</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55PM</td>
<td>Review Draft Letter Regarding Faculty Compensation Concerns (Follow-Up from November Faculty Council Meeting (attachment)</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10PM</td>
<td>Report by SOM Representative on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee</td>
<td>Jo Ann Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25PM</td>
<td>New Business</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30PM</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timothy Beddow</th>
<th>Charles Malemud</th>
<th>Aparna Roy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Buchner</td>
<td>Danny Manor</td>
<td>Satya Sahoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shu Chen</td>
<td>Raed Bou Matar</td>
<td>Jochen Son-Hing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justis Ehlers</td>
<td>Jennifer McBride</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Friel</td>
<td>Maureen McEnery</td>
<td>Charles Sturgis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherine Ghafoori</td>
<td>Jonathan Miller</td>
<td>James Howard Swain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmoud Ghannoun</td>
<td>Vincent Monnier</td>
<td>Melissa Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Goldenberg</td>
<td>Kaine Onwuzulike</td>
<td>Anna Valujskikh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Maria Hibbs</td>
<td>Nimit Patel</td>
<td>Jo Ann Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung-Ying Kao</td>
<td>P. Ramakrishnan</td>
<td>Michael Wolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kelly</td>
<td>Nischay Rege</td>
<td>Nicholas Ziats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiranpreet Khurana</td>
<td>Bradford Richmond</td>
<td>Richard Zigmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayme Knutson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
Welcome and Chair’s Comments (Phoebe Stewart)

Phoebe Stewart, Chair of Faculty Council, called the meeting to order at 4:00PM. She provided a brief summary of the agenda items. Sudha Chakrapani, Chair-Elect of Faculty Council, was unable to attend today’s meeting. Dr. Stewart gave the Steering Committee Report on her behalf.

The third meeting with SOM faculty and Dean Davis will be held this spring. As required by the SOM Bylaws, Faculty Council sets the agenda for this meeting and half is open forum. Once the date is chosen, Faculty Council will discuss topics for that meeting. Today we will also be reviewing/editing a draft letter from Richard Zigmond on faculty compensation concerns, and Jo Ann Wise will provide a report on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Faculty Council elections will be held in May. We will be accepting nominations for candidates for Chair-Elect of Faculty Council, Faculty Council Steering Committee, and the SOM Nomination and Elections Committee (NEC). Those nominees for Chair-Elect of Faculty Council must be coming to the end of their first year in Faculty Council, with two years remaining. If they are elected Chair-Elect, their second year will be as Chair Elect, third year as Chair, and fourth year as Past Chair. There are five open positions (one-year term) on the Steering Committee. All representatives that will be on Faculty Council next year are eligible to run for a seat on Steering Committee. Steering Committee members may serve consecutive terms. There are openings for two clinical candidates on the Nomination and Elections Committee who will serve the duration of their terms as Faculty Council members. Those interested in any of these positions should contact Phoebe Stewart via e-mail.

In Dean Davis’ monthly meeting with Phoebe Stewart, she asked her to bring to the attention of Faculty Council the bundled package that will affect funds flow in the university, on which the Faculty Senate will vote. This issue is very prominent on the Dean’s mind and she wants us to be educated about it. Members of the SOM Committee on Budget, Finance and Compensation and SOM Senators will be meeting with Matthew Lester, Senior Associate Dean for Finance.

The bundled package includes the Arts & Sciences “Advising Fee” – tuition money; Distribution of Graduate Tuition –a fixed fee for students who are in one program and take courses outside of their program; and the Allocation of Central University Costs. Currently there are 37 drivers that contribute to this tax we pay every year making it hard to predict the annual amount. This proposal would reduce it to five-seven factors. According to the Dean, the SOM would benefit by proposed components 1 and 3, and lose on component 2. Overall, this could mean $1.4 million per year to the SOM.
Dr. Stewart briefly summarized Roberts Rules of Order reminding the members how they are relevant to the Faculty Council meetings.

Approval of Faculty Council Draft Meeting Minutes for December 22, 2017 (Phoebe Stewart)
Regarding the text relating to the name change for the Department of Nutrition, concern was raised that the blanket statement in the first paragraph inferred that everything that followed was attributed to other members of Faculty Council, but was, in fact, the opinion of the speaker. Nicole Deming will e-mail Dr. Hope Barkoukis for clarification of the credentials (PhD or Master’s) of the registered dieticians in the Department of Nutrition.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as amended. A vote was taken, 28 were in favor, 2 were opposed, and 0 abstained.

Chair-Elect Report of Steering Committee Activities (Phoebe Stewart)
In Sudha Chakrapani’s absence, Phoebe Stewart provided a summary of topics that were reviewed by the Steering Committee at their last meeting. The committee reviewed the emeritus appointment requests and SOM CAPT recommendations for equity in the promotion and tenure packets. They reviewed presentations on the SOM Bylaws amendments, the revised charge for the Bylaws Committee, and a presentation on the Health Education Campus. They considered and edited a draft letter on faculty compensation concerns, and began drafting a charge for the ad hoc committee to study the Faculty Council representation structure. Discussion took place on potential dates and times (spring) for the third meeting of the SOM Faculty with Dean Davis, and possible topics for this meeting.

Presentation on Health Education Campus (Jill Stanley)
Jill Stanley, Associate Dean for Space and Facilities Planning, presented an update on the Health Education Campus. The first and second floors will house the classrooms for all the schools and will have a unique orientation. Each school will have its own quadrant for admissions. There will be rooms that can be made available for interviewing and after hours for students to study.

A tiered lecture hall (capable of seating 236) has been designed to hold an entire class of first year medical students (both college track and university track) at the same time. A capacity that currently does not exist. This will open out into the south winter garden, which can be set up for refreshments following seminars and other events.

Originally, the classrooms were to be two-tiered, but it was decided to keep them flat to provide more flexibility. While they accommodate 32 students, they have the capacity to seat 50 to 55. Divider walls will open up to allow approximately 100 students into the combined room.

Team based learning will have 25 tables for eight students each (an entire university track class will fit in the room). There will be screens across one of the long walls in each room and ceiling microphones. Oblong tables, instead of round, are being considered as better accommodating six students; for interprofessional education, eight students would be assigned to a table. These rooms will also be used for student testing (four students to a table).

The second floor contains small and medium group rooms. Along the west side of the building, Dental will have two large flat-floored lecture halls, nursing will have bed labs and classrooms, and there will be an Anatomy suite, currently in a program to be used by both the university and college track.

One entire wall of each room will be a whiteboard. We are currently having the AV team look at options for interactive screens. CCLCM has developed curriculum with Microsoft, and we are asking the AV Team if they can find another interactive screen that would provide the same functions. We
would then have Lerner College test it out to see if it would work to replace the surface hub Dr. Mehta is helping to evaluate any of the options proposed to date.

Since window coverings were a concern because of all the additional glass walls, Dean Stanley assured the council that blinds would be available for all the windows.

Interactive screens would provide everyone with the option to save their work. While student will still have access to white boards, the interactive screens would provide the ability to capture and save notes.

The construction team has been asked to expedite complete construction by the middle of December 2018. Activation means the installation of equipment, installation of furniture, AV testing, training, and orientation for everyone is completed before people move in. Orientations will continue to be scheduled as people move in. The actual move will start the beginning of May and go to early June in 2019. The Dental Clinic will be shutting down for the entire month of May so they can move everything. The clinic re-opens in the beginning of June. Both CCLCM and the SOM have indicated that they would like to move in early June.

Originally, 600 parking spaces were going to be reserved in the JJ Garage; this number has been reduced to 500 with 100 now allotted for dental patients. Dental parking is adjacent to the clinic itself. In addition to the 500 in the JJ garage, there will be additional, less-expensive parking at the west campus. Since Cleveland Clinic parking costs are less than at Case, this lot would cost less if you currently park in Veale or downstairs. A committee is tasked with moving out Cleveland Clinic employees who currently park at the JJ Garage giving us the promised 500 spaces.

Bike racks will be available at JJ for students, faculty or staff. If you are based at HEC and have to come back to main campus for meetings, courtesy parking will be available. Conversely, if you are based here and have to go to HEC, courtesy parking will also be provided. Shuttle options are currently being investigated. Preliminary information indicated that the Dean and President had committed to an express or flyer route with pick-up points at the back side of Sears Tower. The route would go down Chester to drop off, running from 8:00AM to 6:00PM, but this will change to accommodate the medical school schedule. The route time would take between 15-19 minutes. Shuttle schedules may have to be adjusted to accommodate first class start times, and this will be further explored.

Two stops on the express route (HEC, Sears Tower, Institute of Pathology), is a consideration, and would extend the route time. It was noted that one bus may not be able to accommodate all potential passengers, and two may be required. Another option would be an institute stop. A continuous shuttle will run for the west campus with a projected route time of seven-eight minutes; an additional shuttle will run during peak times.

Study data will be taken from this year to look at who is teaching, when they teach, and where they are based, to get some sense of what the population is going to be. The option of driving to and from main campus to HEC was offered as an alternative, but it may literally take the same amount of time as taking the shuttle. The Uber for business option may prove to be a better choice than the shuttle. Dean Stanley reminded everyone that faculty input is essential in order to accurately address questions and concerns.

**Presentation of SOM Bylaws Amendments Regarding Revised Charge for Bylaws Committee (Jo Ann Wise)**

Jo Ann Wise, Chair of the SOM Bylaws Committee, gave a brief overview of faculty governance to provide background to those representatives who are new to Faculty Council.
The Bylaws Committee, one of the seven standing committees of the faculty of medicine, is the committee originating these proposed amendments. The rationale for the amendments being proposed today is to make the SOM Bylaws compatible with the updated Bylaws Committee charge, which was approved by Faculty Council at its June 21, 2017 meeting.

Our current Bylaws state that amendments can be proposed by any of the following: a petition signed by 20 or more SOM faculty members, the SOM Dean, or a majority vote by Faculty Council. The Bylaws Committee, itself, will now be empowered to propose amendments to the bylaws, instead of simply reviewing amendments from another source. The Faculty Council shall consider proposed amendments, submitted by the Bylaws Committee to the Faculty Council by March 1, within the SOM academic year (no later than June 30).

There is an extensive set of SOM Bylaws amendments currently pending with the Faculty Senate; these should be approved on January 30. The Bylaws Committee is currently completing the five-year review of the SOM Bylaws.

The proposed amendments specify that if no member of the Bylaws Committee is a voting member of the Faculty Council, the Faculty Council Chair shall appoint one of the Bylaws Committee members to serve as a non-voting ad hoc member. The proposed amendments also clarify that the Faculty Senate representative to Faculty Council is non-voting. Non-voting members of Faculty Council are entitled to participate in discussions but not to vote.

The Bylaws Committee advises and makes recommendations to the Faculty Council, and Faculty Council must approve any amendments that come out of the five-year review.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the SOM Bylaws amendments revised charge for Bylaws Committee Article 3.2b. There being no further discussion a vote was taken. 30 were in favor, 1 was opposed, and 1 abstained. The motion passes.

A motion was made and seconded asking Faculty Council if they approve the SOM Bylaws amendments revised charge for Bylaws Committee Article 6. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 29 were in favor, 2 opposed and 0 abstained. The motion passes.

**Request for topics from Faculty Council Members for the Third Meeting of the SOM Faculty with the Dean in the Spring (Phoebe Stewart)**

It is time to schedule the third meeting of the faculty of SOM with Dean Davis. Last year’s town hall meeting was held on Tuesday, April 7, from 7:30-8:45AM. The two options for this year are: Friday, April 6 – 3:00-4:30PM, and Tuesday, May 1 -- 8:00-9:30AM.

A motion was made and seconded to vote on which date/time is preferred for the Dean’s Town Hall meeting -- Friday, April 6 – 3:00-4:30PM, or Tuesday, May 1 from 8:00-9:30AM. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 18 voted in favor of Friday April 6 – 3:00-4:30PM; 8 voted in favor of Tuesday May 1 – 8:00-9:30AM, and 6 abstained. The motion passes for Friday, April 6 – 3:00-4:30PM.

Faculty Council members were requested to solicit input and possible topics for this meeting from faculty in their departments. Phoebe Stewart must receive this information prior to February 5 in order for it to be collated and discussed at the February 19 Faculty Council Meeting. It was suggested that in order to guarantee time for questions and discussion, it might be wise to limit agenda items to three or four topics.
Review Draft Letter Regarding Faculty Compensation Concerns (Follow-Up from November Faculty Council Meeting) (Phoebe Stewart)

As a follow-up from the November Faculty Council meeting, Richard Zigmond prepared a draft letter to the President and Provost regarding faculty compensation concerns. This letter was then reviewed and edited by the Faculty Council Steering Committee. The current draft version of the letter was sent to all Faculty Council representatives prior to today’s meeting for review. Faculty Council plans to edit and finalize this letter today.

It was noted that the SOM financial equation is complicated by the fact that we pay for buildings we do not use (Tinkham-Veale). It is important that we have parity with other institutions in terms of faculty compensation. The comment was made, that if AAMC considers approximately 150 medical schools when determining their statistics and salary table, and CWRU is deemed to be in the top 25, why are we then compared to median AAMC salaries? Members also commented that while faculty are told that the SOM has no money, expenditures for large capital projects continue. The university gives the SOM money and extracts money from SOM. If the money coming in were increased, without going back out, we would have the money needed for raises. The suggestion was made that in order for us to know if raise increases are even a possibility, the fiscal health of the school needs to be known -- how are the limits set, how do we compare with similar schools, etc. It was suggested that Matthew Lester might be able to provide Faculty Council with additional information on these issues.

The senate has a discussion with the President every May to inform senate members about finances and there is always quite a bit of pushback. The schools are treated independently with separate management centers. The President claims that the Deans have the discretion to give better raises. A member stated that writing a letter indicating that the President is the problem would get an expected response that the discretion lies with the Deans.

Phoebe Stewart reported that in her meeting with Dean Davis, the Dean commented that pay compression is the term applied when the market-rate for a given job outpaces the increases historically given by the organization to high tenure employees. It occurs when there is only a small difference in pay between employees, regardless of their skills or experience.

Merit increases granted within a department are not 2% across the board. Both the Dean and the Chair have discretion. Faculty Council plans to review departmental metrics for merit increases. This only applies to the merit increase, not the incentive increases. The compensation plan applies only to people that are 100% CWRU paid. It was noted that some departments in the basic sciences would prefer have their Chair decide rather than adhere to a written metrics document.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the faculty compensation concerns letter as amended. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 21 were in favor, 1 was opposed, and 6 abstained. The motion passes.

There being no further items of business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:28PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Helton
Faculty Council Meeting

January 22, 2018

Chair: Phoebe L. Stewart
Agenda

• Welcome and Chair's Comments (Phoebe Stewart)

• Approval of Minutes from December 11, 2017 meeting (Phoebe Stewart)

• Report of Steering Committee activities (Phoebe Stewart)

• Presentation on Health Education Campus (Jill Stanley)

• Presentation of SOM Bylaws amendments regarding Revised Charge for Bylaws Committee (Jo Ann Wise)

• Request for topics from Faculty Council members for the Third Meeting of the SOM Faculty with the Dean in the Spring (Phoebe Stewart)

• Review draft letter regarding Faculty Compensation Concerns (Follow-up from November Faculty Council meeting) (Phoebe Stewart)

• Report by SOM representative on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Jo Ann Wise)

• New Business
Welcome and Chair’s Comments

1. Upcoming Faculty Council Elections in May

Nominations for candidates for:
   Chair-elect of Faculty Council
   Faculty Council Steering Committee
   Faculty Council members on the SOM Nomination and Elections Committee (NEC)

Chair-elect: FC representatives with 2 years remaining in their FC term
   1 yr Chair-elect, 1 yr Chair, 1 yr Past Chair (4th year in FC)
   **Need 1 or more candidates**

Steering Committee: FC representatives with 1 or 2 years remaining in their FC term
   **Need to elect 5 members for 1-yr terms**
   (members may be reelected successively for the duration of their FC term)

Interested? Contact Phoebe Stewart (pls47@case.edu)
Welcome and Chair’s Comments

1. Upcoming Faculty Council Elections in May (cont)

Nomination and Elections Committee
From Bylaws: NEC includes four Faculty Council members (other than the Chair and Chair-Elect), two each from the preclinical and clinical sciences. They shall serve for the duration of their terms as Faculty Council members.

Continuing FC/NEC members:
   David Buchner, Genetics - preclinical
   Hung-Ying Kao, Biochemistry - preclinical

Need Clinical candidates for two FC/NEC seats that will be open this summer

Thanks to two FC/NEC members whose terms are ending in June:
   Timothy Beddow- Pathology, Metro
   Eli Bar – Neurological Surgery, UH

Interested? Contact Phoebe Stewart (pls47@case.edu)
Welcome and Chair’s Comments

2. Dean Davis asked me to bring the following to your attention:

On February 16 the Faculty Senate will vote on a bundled package that will affect funds flow in the university.

A meeting is being set up by Matthew Lester, Senior Associate Dean for Finance, with the SOM Committee on Budget, Finance and Compensation and SOM Senators.

There are three components in the bundled package:
1) Arts & Sciences “Advising fee” – tuition money
2) Distribution of Graduate tuition – proposal involves a fixed fee for students in one program who take courses outside of their program
3) Allocation of central University costs – currently there are 37 different factors that affect the “tax” paid by the SOM to the University. This makes it difficult to predict the amount each year. The proposal would reduce the number of factors to about 5-7.

According to the Dean the SOM would benefit by proposed components 1 and 3 – and lose on component 2.

*Overall this could mean $1.4 million per year to the SOM*
Reminders regarding Robert’s Rules of Order

After a member has been recognized by the Chair, all remarks must be directed to the Chair.

No member can speak twice on the same issue until everyone else wishing to speak has spoken once.

Handling of a Motion
- A member makes a motion
- Another member seconds the motion
- The Chair states the motion and makes sure that the wording is clear
- The motion is open for debate
- The Chair puts the question to a vote
Approval of the Minutes from the December 11, 2017 Meeting
Report on Faculty Council Steering Committee Activities, Meeting Jan 8, 2018

- Reviewed presentation on SOM Bylaws amendments regarding Revised Charge for Bylaws Committee

- Discussion on topics of interest to Faculty Council related to the Health Education Campus

- Discussion on setting date/time for Third Meeting of the SOM Faculty with the Dean in the Spring and collection of topic suggestions for this meeting

- Reviewed emeritus appointment requests

- Reviewed SOM CAPT recommendations for equity. These included faculty packets for promotion and tenure.

- Reviewed and edited a draft letter on faculty compensation concerns

- Began drafting a charge for the ad hoc committee to study the Faculty Council representation structure (membership policies)
Presentation on Health Education Campus
(Jill Stanley)
Presentation of SOM Bylaws amendments regarding Revised Charge for Bylaws Committee (Jo Ann Wise)
The Bylaws Committee is one of the seven standing committees of the Faculty of Medicine.
The primary rationale for the amendments being proposed today is to make the SOM Bylaws compatible with the current Bylaws Committee charge, which was approved by Faculty Council at its June 21, 2017 meeting.

Sources of amendments

1. Petition of > 20 faculty
2. SOM Dean
3. Faculty Council
4. Bylaws Committee
Relevant sections of the SOM Bylaws Committee charge

Specific charges of the SOM Bylaws Committee:

1. Advise the Faculty Council regarding the rules and regulations governing the operations and procedures of the Faculty Council as authorized and directed by the SOM Bylaws and the University Faculty Handbook;

2. Designate a member to serve as a non-voting *ex officio* member of Faculty Council who shall attend each Faculty Council meeting to identify issues relevant to the bylaws and to recommend that Faculty Council refer these issues to the Bylaws committee;

4. At least once every five years, conduct a full review of the Bylaws, as required by the SOM Bylaws, taking into account all suggestions from SOM faculty, solicited by email and the Dean;

Relevant sections of the SOM Bylaws:

Article 3.2.b (Non-voting members of faculty council)

Article 6 (Amending the Bylaws)
Procedure for proposing amendments for consideration by Faculty Council

1. Amendments to the SOM Bylaws may be proposed at any time in the following ways:
   a. By majority vote of the Faculty Council;
   b. By the Dean of the SOM;
   c. By written petition signed by 20 or more SOM faculty members;
   d. By the Bylaws Committee acting on behalf of the Faculty of the School of Medicine for matters directly related to its specific charges and responsibilities, as described above.

2. Proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Council, the Secretary of the Faculty Council, and the Chair of SOM Bylaws Committee.

3. Proposed amendments submitted by the Bylaws Committee to the Faculty Council by March 1 shall be considered by the Faculty Council within the same academic year (no later than June 30).

Relevant section of the SOM Bylaws:
Article 6 (Amending the Bylaws)
The primary rationale for the amendments being proposed today is to make the SOM Bylaws compatible with the current Bylaws Committee charge, which was approved by Faculty Council at its June 21, 2017 meeting.

Sources of amendments:

1. Petition of > 20 faculty
2. SOM Dean
3. Faculty Council
4. Bylaws Committee
The primary rationale for the amendments being proposed today is to make the SOM Bylaws compatible with the current Bylaws Committee charge, which was approved by Faculty Council at its June 21, 2017 meeting.

**Sources of amendments**

1. Petition of > 20 faculty
2. SOM Dean
3. Faculty Council
4. Bylaws Committee

An extensive set of SOM Bylaws amendments is currently pending before the Faculty Senate and should be approved soon. *Thus, the current amendments proposed by the Bylaws Committee used a version in which these changes had been incorporated.*
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ARTICLE 3 – THE FACULTY COUNCIL

3.2: Membership of the Faculty Council

b. Non-voting Members. Non-voting members of the Faculty Council shall be the president of the university, a vice-president of the university responsible for medical school activities, the dean of the School of Medicine, the associate dean for medical education of the School of Medicine, the chair of the Committee on Medical Education, and student members who shall include not more than two undergraduate medical students, one M.D.-Ph.D. student, and one Ph.D. graduate student. The student members shall be chosen by their respective groups. In addition, if a senator to the university Faculty Senate is not included in the Faculty Council as a voting member, the chair of the Faculty Council shall appoint one of the School of Medicine senators to be an ad hoc member of the Faculty Council. The chair of the Faculty Council may invite other persons to attend designated meetings. Faculty Council meetings shall be open to the faculty. Faculty members may at any time request hearings before Faculty Council, but a request by a faculty member for a hearing before the Faculty Council must be made to the chair prior to the meeting of the Faculty Council.
Proposed amendment providing for a member of the Bylaws Committee to be appointed as a non-voting *ad hoc* member of the Faculty Council

b. Non-voting Members. Non-voting members of the Faculty Council shall be the president of the university, a vice-president of the university responsible for medical school activities, the dean of the School of Medicine, the associate dean for medical education of the School of Medicine, the chair of the Committee on Medical Education, and student members who shall include not more than two undergraduate medical students, one M.D.-Ph.D. student, and one Ph.D. graduate student. The student members shall be chosen by their respective groups.

*If no member of the Bylaws Committee is a voting member of the Faculty Council, the Faculty Council Chair shall appoint one of the Bylaws Committee members to serve as a non-voting *ad hoc* member.* If a representative to the University Faculty Senate is not included in the Faculty Council as a voting member, the Faculty Council Chair shall appoint one of the School of Medicine senators to be a non-voting *ad hoc* member of the Faculty Council. The chair of the Faculty Council may invite other persons to attend designated meetings. Faculty Council meetings shall be open to the faculty. Faculty members may at any time request hearings before Faculty Council, but a request by a faculty member for a hearing before the Faculty Council must be made to the chair prior to the meeting of the Faculty Council.

*As the five-year review of the SOM Bylaws is currently underway, an additional change was made to clarify that the Faculty Senate representative to FC is also non-voting*
ARTICLE 5 - FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND GRANTING OF TENURE

5.1 Classification of Appointments
5.2 Terms of Appointment
5.3 Academic Freedom
5.4 Tenure
5.5 The Pre-tenure Period
5.6 Qualifications for Appointments, Promotions and the Granting of Tenure
5.7 Tenure Guarantee
5.8 Rolling Appointments for Non-Tenure Track Professors
5.9 Consideration of Recommendations for Appointments, Promotions and Granting of Tenure
5.10 The Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure
5.11 Sabbatical and Special Sabbatical Leaves

ARTICLE 6 — AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: Qualifications and Standards for Appointment, Promotion and the Award of Tenure for Faculty Members in the School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University
ARTICLE 6 - AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

An amendment of the bylaws may be proposed by majority vote of the Faculty Council, by the dean, or by written petition of 20 or more faculty members. Proposed amendments will be submitted to the secretary of the Faculty Council and ordinarily will be considered by the Faculty Council within the same academic year if submitted prior to April 1 of that year. The proposed amendments and the recommendations of the Faculty Council will then be sent by mail to full-time members of the faculty and may be discussed at a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty held at least four weeks after the mailing. During discussion of proposed amendments at a faculty meeting, non-substantive changes in the proposed amendments may be made by majority vote. The vote on any proposed amendment shall be by mail ballot of the full-time faculty. Approval shall require an affirmative vote by a majority of those faculty members returning ballots. At least three weeks shall be allowed between the mailing of ballots and the determination of election results. The Faculty Council shall review the bylaws at least once every five years and shall propose amendments as desired to the faculty.
Version approved by the SOM Faculty, now pending before the Senate

An amendment of the bylaws may be proposed by majority vote of the Faculty Council, by the dean, or by written petition of 20 or more faculty members. The amendment must be accompanied by a rationale for the proposed change. All proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Chair and secretary of the Faculty Council, who shall forward all proposed amendments to the Standing Committee on Bylaws. The Bylaws Committee shall review each proposed amendment and report its recommendation to Faculty Council. All proposed amendments will be considered and voted on by the Faculty Council within the same academic year if submitted prior to April 1 of that year. All proposed amendments, their rationale, and the recommendations of the Faculty Council will then be sent by mail to full-time members of the faculty and may be discussed at a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty held at least four weeks after the mailing. During discussion of proposed amendments at a faculty meeting, non-substantive changes in the proposed amendments may be made by majority vote. The vote on any proposed amendment shall be by mail ballot of the full-time faculty. Approval shall require an affirmative vote by a majority of those faculty members returning ballots. At least three weeks shall be allowed between the mailing of ballots and the determination of election results. The Faculty Council shall review the bylaws at least once every five years and shall propose amendments as desired to the faculty.
The Bylaws committee advises/makes recommendations to the Faculty Council on matters concerning the Bylaws.
Proposed change to allow the Bylaws Committee to put forward amendments and conduct the five-year review

An amendment of the bylaws may be proposed by majority vote of the Faculty Council, by the dean, by written petition of 20 or more faculty members or by the Bylaws Committee. The amendment must be accompanied by a rationale for the proposed change. All proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Council, the Secretary of the Faculty of Medicine and the Chair of the Bylaws Committee. The Bylaws Committee shall review each proposed amendment and report its recommendation to Faculty Council. All proposed amendments will be considered and voted on by the Faculty Council within the same academic year if submitted prior to March 1 of that year. All proposed amendments, their rationale, and the recommendations of the Faculty Council will then be sent by mail to all-time members of the faculty and may be discussed at a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty held at least two weeks after notification. During discussion of proposed amendments at a faculty meeting, non-substantive changes in the proposed amendments may be made by majority vote. The vote on any proposed amendment shall be by electronic ballot of the full-time faculty. Approval shall require an affirmative vote by a majority of those faculty members returning ballots. Ballots shall remain open for three weeks. At least once every five years, the Bylaws Committee shall conduct a full review of these Bylaws and forward its recommendations to the Faculty Council for consideration by the procedures described above.

Also modifies the date of submission to FC for consideration in the same academic year and updates language regarding the use of snail mail to distribute ballots.
Request for topics from Faculty Council members for the Third Meeting of the SOM Faculty with the Dean in the Spring (Phoebe Stewart)

The School of Medicine Bylaws in section 2:4 Meetings of the Faculty, states “A third meeting will have an agenda approved by the Faculty Council with at least one-half of the meeting devoted to open forum items.”

I. Faculty Council vote on date/time for Dean’s Town Hall meeting

II. Request for Topics
I. Faculty Council vote on date/time for Dean’s Town Hall meeting

Dean Davis has offered two possibilities:

- Friday 4/6: 3pm - 4:30pm
- Tuesday 5/1: 8am - 9:30am

Last year the Town Hall meeting was on Tuesday 4/7 at 7:30am - 8:45am
II. Request for Topics

Last Year the Topics were:
1. CWRU SOM standing and sustaining reputation (cornerstone topic)
2. SOM Budget and Finances
3. SOM Faculty Salary
4. Shared governance in the SOM
5. Support for Basic Science Research in the SOM
6. SOM Diversity
7. Open forum items

With the goal of creating an agenda for this meeting, I am requesting that you solicit the faculty in your departments for their input and send the possible topics to me prior to February 5 (pls47@case.edu) to be collated and discussed at our February 19 Faculty Council meeting.
At the November Faculty Council meeting, Richard Zigmond made a motion that we should approach the President and Provost with our concerns regarding Faculty Compensation.

This motion was seconded and approved.

Richard Zigmond prepared a draft letter, which was reviewed and edited by the Steering Committee.

The current draft version of the letter was sent to Faculty Council representatives with the Meeting Materials.

Our task today is to edit and finalize the letter.
Dear President Snyder and Provost Baeslack,

During its November meeting, the Faculty Council of the School of Medicine discussed Faculty compensation, focusing particularly on annual merit raises to Faculty salaries. Over the past 6 years, Faculty salary merit raises at the School of Medicine have been limited to 2% by the Faculty Salary Increase Pool set by the University (Fiscal Years 2012-2017). According to Dean Davis, last year the School of Medicine faculty salary merit raises averaged 1.6% (excluding promotions). Faculty Council is concerned that the limited merit raises are demoralizing for existing faculty members who, in spite of years of service to the University working to establish and maintain the School of Medicine’s national reputation, may receive compensation that is comparable to less experienced recruits. The policy of limited merit raises also creates concerns regarding our School’s ability to hire competitive new faculty members.

We respectfully urge you to reevaluate your policy for the Faculty Salary Increased Pool limit for the next fiscal year. The Faculty Council would appreciate a presentation on this topic at one of our upcoming meetings. We would like to know how this limit is set and how the CWRU limit compares to that at other Schools of Medicine.

Sincerely,
School of Medicine Faculty Council
Term of “Compression”

Pay compression is the situation that occurs when there is only a small difference in pay between employees regardless of their skills or experience. ... Pay compression is the result of the market-rate for a given job outpacing the increases historically given by the organization to high tenure employees.
Faculty Senate Report

Jo Ann Wise
SOM senator on the Senate Executive Committee (Ex-Com)
New Business
Faculty Council Meeting
Draft Meeting Minutes
Monday, December 11, 2017
4:00pm–5:30pm – BRB 105

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00PM</td>
<td>Welcome and Chair’s Comments</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10PM</td>
<td>Approval of Faculty Council Draft Meeting Minutes for November 27, 2017 (attachment)</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15PM</td>
<td>Chair-Elect Report of Steering Committee Activities</td>
<td>Sudha Chakrapani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20PM</td>
<td>Presentation by CCLCM Faculty Council Representatives</td>
<td>Cynthia Kubu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35PM</td>
<td>Name Change for Department of Nutrition (attachment)</td>
<td>Hope Barkoukis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50PM</td>
<td>Discussion of Policy on Procedures for Establishment of New Academic Departments (attachment)</td>
<td>Phoebe Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05PM</td>
<td>Discussion of Faculty Council Representation Structure</td>
<td>Danny Manor, Maureen McEnery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20PM</td>
<td>Report by SOM Representative on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee</td>
<td>Jo Ann Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25PM</td>
<td>New Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30PM</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members Present
Eli Bar, Robert Kelly, Nischay Rege
Bryan Baskin, Kiranpreet Khurana, Rod Rezaee
Timothy Beddow, Jayme Knutson, Bradford Richmond
Tracey Bonfield, Cynthia Kubu, Aparna Roy
David Buchner, Michael Licina, Satya Sahoo
Sudha Chakrapani, Charles Malemud, Jochen Son-Hing
Shu Chen, Danny Manor, Phoebe Stewart
Gary Clark, Raed Bou Matar, Charles Sturgis
Justis Ehlers, Jennifer McBride, James Howard Swain
David Friel, Maureen McEnery, Melissa Times
Mahmoud Ghannoum, Jonathan Miller, Anna Valujskikh
Supriya Goyal, Kaine Onwuzulike, Jo Ann Wise
Hung-Ying Kao, Nimitt Patel, Richard Zigmond
Stathis Karathanasis, P. Ramakrishnan
**Welcome and Chair's Comments (Phoebe Stewart)**

Phoebe Stewart, Chair of Faculty Council, called the meeting to order at 4:00PM. She provided an overview of the agenda items that were to be discussed at the meeting. Last month, several questions were raised about Faculty Council’s use of Robert’s Rules of Order. Dr. Stewart reminded the council that after a member has been recognized by the Chair, all remarks must be directed to the Chair. No member can speak twice on the same issue until everyone else wishing to speak has spoken once. She also outlined how a motion is handled, and how the wording of a motion can be changed by the assembly.

At the November meeting, Faculty Council voted to approach the President and Provost regarding, faculty salary concerns. Richard Zigmond is currently working on a draft letter which will be discussed at an upcoming Faculty Council meeting.

Dean Davis’ Five-Year Review Committee membership includes eight faculty from the SOM, one faculty member from outside SOM, and one SOM staff member. The Provost had only included four of the SOM faculty from the original list of ten (which the Faculty Council Steering Committee had submitted) and the suggested staff member was also replaced. While the Dean’s review is going forward, faculty input is encouraged and must be received by December 29.

**Approval of Minutes from November 27, 2017 meeting (Phoebe Stewart)**

Phoebe Stewart suggested two changes. Page 2, Lines 21-22 are to be removed. Page 3, Line 31, should be changed from “SOM Departments of Urology currently exist at both UH and MHMC” to “A SOM Department of Urology currently exists at UH”. There being no further amendments to the minutes, a motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes with the changes as stated. A vote was taken, 30 were in favor, 1 was opposed, and no one abstained. The motion passes.

**Chair-Elect Report of Steering Committee Activities (Sudha Chakrapani)**

The Faculty Council Steering Committee met on December 4. The proposal requesting that the Department of Nutrition change their name to the Department of Nutrition and Biomedical Sciences was reviewed along with the draft presentation by CCLCM Faculty Council Representatives. SOM CAPT packets for promotion and tenure were reviewed for equity. The Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty report and survey results were discussed. It was recommended that the survey be presented at a future Faculty Council Meeting. An invitation will be extended to Kathleen Blazer, from the Cleveland Health Sciences Library, to give a presentation to the Faculty Council Steering Committee and Faculty Council on the satellite School of Medicine library at the Health Education Campus.
Presentation by CCLCM Faculty Council Representatives (Cynthia Kubu)

The CCLCM Faculty Council representatives introduced themselves to the assembly: Raed BouMatar, Justis Ehlers, Robert Kelly, Cynthia Kubu, Michael Licina, Jennifer McBride, Kaine Onwuzulike, Brad Richmond, Charles Sturgis and Anna Valujskikh. Cynthia Kubu then proceeded with the overview.

Dr. Kubu reviewed the teaching efforts at CCLCM. Nine hundred fifty faculty (includes clinicians and research scientists, but not including clerkship rotation attending physicians) are involved in teaching medical students, resulting in an estimated 91,000 hours of teaching/administrative time per year. Faculty members average 100 hours per year in medical student education. Some primarily, or exclusively, administrative roles are supported by CCLCM. Most teaching roles are not supported financially by the CCLCM.

Dr. Kubu presented information about the new Health Education Campus construction and shared that it is on schedule. The building is now enclosed and heated, and scheduled to be finished and activated in January 2019. The staged move begins in February 2019; classes will begin July 2019.

The campus will be very beautiful with an atrium and café, encouraging students and faculty to intermingle. In addition to a large auditorium, there will be a critical care transport simulation, team-based learning rooms, and small classrooms. The second floor will house a tremendous amount of small and medium rooms (faculty and nursing offices, and other simulation labs). The third floor will be left open to accommodate expansion. The administrative offices and student learning communities will provide a relaxed structure on the fourth floor.

Five hundred parking spaces have been allocated in the garage nearest the new building. Continuous shuttles will run between SOM and Cleveland Clinic as well.

Dr. Kubu discussed a potential issues raised by faculty at CCLCM. A CCLCM challenge to be addressed, with respect to the value of education, is the perception that teaching is not as valued as clinical and research efforts outside of the CCLCM. While it is highly respected within the CCLCM, CCLCM feels not everyone shares this sentiment. In addition, data from AAMC 2016 tables indicated there was gender disparity between faculty rankings of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor. We need to determine what measures can be taken to build better partnerships between our affiliates.

Name Change for the Department of Nutrition (Hope Barkoukis)

Dr. Barkoukis explained that the proposed name for the Department of Nutrition is the Department of Nutrition and Biomedical Sciences. Currently the Department of Nutrition has 24 faculty (9 registered dieticians at the PhD level), 9 secondary, 10 adjunct (all clinical).

The department name, as an umbrella concept, should appropriately reflect the diversity of different types of research, service, and professional activities. The name that has been chosen reflects the extraordinarily diverse portfolio of research in the department, spanning Proteomics, Basic Science, Epidemiology, Molecular, Genetic, Synchrotron, Clinical, Metabolism, and education-related research. No other department has that spread. The challenge was finding a name that would appropriately represent all of these different components.

The process, followed over a period of eighteen months, gave primary faculty the opportunity to submit two potential department names. These names were posted on whiteboards throughout the department for a number of weeks, and then brought to faculty meetings for discussion. After an anonymous vote, the top 10 names were identified. This process was then repeated identifying the top three names that scored the highest. From these three names, a final vote was taken and the
Department of Nutrition and Biomedical Sciences was selected and subsequently approved by Dean Davis.

The goal of the name change is to reflect the diversity of research and educational engagements of the faculty. Biomedical sciences is added to the name to reflect the set of applied sciences, applying portions of natural and formal sciences to develop knowledge, interventions, and technologies for use in health care and public health. You can look at the title and know what 24 people are doing.

Applicants to Nutrition’s PhD programs are admitted through the BSTP program. A meeting attendee expressed concern that the new name change would cause confusion, but the department feels that this would not be applicable. Department level marketing will be targeted to their MS programs. It was noted that the University of Michigan has two training programs and each uses the term “biomedical sciences” in their names. There is no other basic science department with as broad a scope of research activities as the Department of Nutrition.

The department is very robust in undergraduates, as well as master’s students. Within the past two weeks, national ranking was achieved at the undergraduate and master’s levels. The Department of Nutrition has two of the oldest programs, at the master’s level, in the entire country.

A concern was raised that any department name change should wait until the chair search for the Department of Nutrition is completed and a comparison was made to the Genetics Department name change to Genetics and Genome Sciences. In response, another attendee stated that Genetics carried out strategic planning and changed the department name first in order to attract a specific type of chair who would be interested in the name they projected and what it covered.

After additional discussion, Dr. Stewart summarized the conversation to identify two areas of concern: one is the overlap and potential confusion of the Department’s proposed name including “Biomedical Sciences” with the “Biomedical Sciences Training Program (BSTP)” for graduate education, and two that all faculty in SOM could arguably be in a department with “Biomedical Sciences” in its name.

Dr. Barkoukis stated that the value of every single faculty member is important. The Department of Nutrition is highly differentiated and has a very defined mission. While it was suggested that this change might be driven by the move of Proteomics to the Department of Nutrition, she clarified that one component does not drive the department. Proteomics is a very important piece and will be developed where that field needs to go.

Dr. Barkoukis reiterated that the new name captures the diversity and broadness of the department, and is the result of a very long, thoughtful process, which took into consideration many viewpoints. Twenty-four people in the department feel that this name is the only thing that connects them.

A motion was then made and seconded to recommend the acceptance of the new name for the Department of Nutrition to the Department of Nutrition and Biomedical Sciences, as proposed and presented by Hope Barkoukis. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken, 19 were in favor, 15 were opposed, and 2 abstained. The motion passes.

Discussion of Policy on Procedures for Establishment of New Academic Departments (Phoebe Stewart)

The CWRU SOM Procedures for Establishment of New Academic Departments policy was approved by Faculty Council in 2005. Proposals fall into two types: 1) Initial recognition of a discipline as an
academic department; or 2) Establishment of a second or subsequent department at a new location
e.g., hospital affiliate) in a discipline previously recognized by the University as having departmental
status. In general, establishment of a second or subsequent department in a previously recognized
discipline will be considered where separate hospital affiliates have separate clinical services in that
discipline. At the November Faculty Council meeting a motion was made, seconded and approved to
distribute the policy to Faculty Council Representatives for review to determine what materials must
be included in proposals that fall under #2 "New departments when the academic discipline has
already been recognized as having departmental status at another affiliate". The question that arose at
Faculty Council was how to interpret the final sentence of this policy which states "Proposals should
include supporting documentation as outlined above under requirements for new departments." An
email was sent to Faculty Council asking members to review the policy prior to today’s meeting to
discuss what supporting documentation are required. The current policy states the following
information should be submitted for establishing a second or subsequent department at a new
location:

1. The breadth and depth of the identified faculty's teaching and research productivity
2. Any additional factors that are relevant to the proposed new department
3. An analysis of the effect of establishment of the second department on existing
departments of the School of Medicine
4. A statement that research publications authored by faculty with appointments in the new
department will make note of the Case Western Reserve University appointment
5. A five-year business plan demonstrating how the second department will achieve and
maintain financial viability or, in the alternative and if appropriate, the proposal should
affirm that the new department will not require funding from the School of Medicine

The Steering Committee had asked for the following information after reviewing the initial proposal
to establish a Department of Urology at CCLCM of CWRU: CV of the chair, listing of current grants,
listing of recent publications (past three years), number of medical students trained (past three
years), and the number of graduate students trained (past three years). The floor was then opened
for discussion.

The comment was made that many of these faculty have already been vetted by CCLCM CAPT and
SOM CAPT. However, a member stated that when the documents are reviewed by the Steering
Committee and Faculty Council, the role that the CAPT has, in terms of this information, is a totally
different level of scrutiny and not transferrable. Many of the faculty that would be teaching in this
program may not have academic appointments at Case and they would not have gone through the
CAPT. However, given the medical teaching that occurs at the Clinic, everyone has a faculty
appointment. It may not be full time, but they will have gone through the process of having a faculty
appointment.

As the institutions evolve, standards must be maintained. We need to determine, going forward,
what supporting documentation we want to request.

A motion was made and seconded that for supporting documentation for proposals that fall under #2
the following supporting information will be requested:
1) CV of chair, 2) list of current grants, 3) list of recent publications (past three years), 4) number of
medical students trained (past three years), 5) number of graduate students (past three years), and 6)
number of residents and fellows trained (past three years).

This information will support “the breadth and depth of the identified faculty's teaching and research
productivity".
There being no further discussion, a vote was taken, 29 were in favor, 2 were opposed, and 4 abstained. The motion passes.

**Discussion of Faculty Council Representation Structure (Danny Manor and Maureen McEnery)**

Danny Manor gave this presentation. He explained that the SOM bylaws governs the way in which 3,000 academicians are represented in this body. Fifty-eight academic departments, ten at-large representatives, four institutional representatives, and one past chair equal the seventy-three faculty council members.

Some of the challenges associated with a large Faculty Council is that the entire faculty council is deemed the executive committee of the faculty (decision-making, attendance, scheduling). With such a large council, a quorum can be difficult to achieve.

In any committee setting, as the number of committee members increases, it becomes more complicated. We may want to think about how to make Faculty Council more manageable and agile. It may be time to rethink the present bylaws that do not allow telecommunications, proxies or alternates. We also need to consider adding members to represent part-time faculty, which we currently do not have.

A proposal was suggested to have Faculty Council charge an ad-hoc committee of the faculty to evaluate current Faculty Council structure and propose possible enhancements. This committee could be comprised of two Faculty Council representatives from each institution. This committee could elect a chair and have administrative support (Faculty Affairs) and provide recommendations to Faculty Council.

This year Faculty Council administration is following the SOM Bylaws recommendations on attendance. If a representative misses two meetings in an academic year, they get a warning letter; if they miss three meetings in an academic year, they will be asked to resign. Four people have stepped down, in addition to five people who had not been able to attend the first three Faculty Council meetings.

A member commented that 80-90% of what is discussed in Faculty Council is not relevant to Cleveland Clinic. A suggestion was made that a Case Western, or UH specific Faculty Council could be instituted with the quarterly meetings of the full faculty used for all voices to be heard and to address issues relevant to everyone.

The suggestion was also made that institutional representation, instead of department representation could be considered. This discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the formation of a small ad hoc committee to look into Faculty Council representation structure. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken, 30 were in favor, 4 were opposed, and 1 abstained. The motion passes.

**New Business**

There being no new business to address, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30PM

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Helton
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: Qualifications and Standards for Appointment, Promotion and the Award of Tenure for Faculty Members in the School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University
ARTICLE 5 - FACULTY COUNCIL

b. Non-voting Members. Non-voting members of the Faculty Council shall be the president of the university, a vice-president of the university responsible for medical school activities, the dean of the School of Medicine, the associate dean for medical education of the School of Medicine, the chair of the Committee on Medical Education, and student members who shall include not more than two undergraduate medical students, one M.D.-Ph.D. student, and one Ph.D. graduate student. The student members shall be chosen by their respective groups. If no member of the Bylaws Committee is a voting member of the Faculty Council, the Faculty Council Chair shall appoint one of the Bylaws Committee members to serve as a non-voting ad hoc member. If a representative to the University Faculty Senate is not included in the Faculty Council as a voting member, the Faculty Council Chair shall appoint one of the School of Medicine senators to be a non-voting ad hoc member of the Faculty Council. The chair of the Faculty Council may invite other persons to attend designated meetings. Faculty Council meetings shall be open to the faculty. Faculty members may at any time request hearings before Faculty Council, but a request by a faculty member for a hearing before the Faculty Council must be made to the chair prior to the meeting of the Faculty Council.

ARTICLE 6 - AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

An amendment of the bylaws may be proposed by majority vote of the Faculty Council, by the dean, by written petition of 20 or more faculty members or by the Bylaws Committee. The amendment must be accompanied by a rationale for the proposed change. All proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Council, the Secretary of the Faculty of Medicine and the Chair of the Bylaws Committee. The Bylaws Committee shall review each proposed amendment and report its recommendation to Faculty Council. All proposed amendments will be considered and voted on by the Faculty Council within the same academic year if submitted prior to March 1 of that year. All proposed amendments, their rationale, and the recommendations of the Faculty Council will then be sent by mail to full-time members of the faculty and may be discussed at a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty held at least two weeks after notification. During discussion of proposed amendments at a faculty meeting, non-substantive changes in the proposed amendments may be made by majority vote. The vote on any proposed amendment shall be by electronic ballot of the full-time faculty. Approval shall require an affirmative vote by a majority of those faculty members returning ballots. Ballots shall
remain open for three weeks. At least once every five years, the Bylaws Committee shall conduct a full review of these Bylaws and forward its recommendations to the Faculty Council for consideration by the procedures described above.
This document contains the following portions of the School of Medicine Bylaws

- The cover indicating 1) the dates of Faculty Senate approval for all amendments through 2016 (the most recent version is highlighted in yellow); 2) the dates when amendments now pending before the Senate were approved by the Faculty of Medicine (highlighted in gray); and 3) the amendments being proposed by the Bylaws Committee to be voted on by the Faculty Council at its January 22 meeting (highlighted in cyan). The highlighting on this page is reiterated in the header and footer and throughout the body of the document to indicate the source of each block of text.

- The Table of Contents to place the sections in which amendments are being proposed in the context of the Bylaws as a whole.

- Two versions of Article 3.2b: the first is taken from the document approved by the Faculty Senate on January 22, 2016 and the second (in tracked changes mode) contains the proposed amendments that will be put to a vote of the Faculty Council on January 22, 2018. (Note that Article 3.2b was not modified in the version of the SOM Bylaws now pending before the Faculty Senate.)

- Three versions of Article 6: the first is taken from the document approved by the Faculty Senate on January 22, 2016; the second (in tracked changes mode) contains the proposed amendments that are currently pending before the Faculty Senate; and the third (in tracked changes mode) contains the proposed amendments that will be put to a vote of the Faculty Council on January 22, 2018.
Pending before the Faculty Senate

To make SOM Bylaws compatible with the Bylaws Committee charge
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ARTICLE 3 – THE FACULTY COUNCIL

3.2: Membership of the Faculty Council

b. Non-voting Members. Non-voting members of the Faculty Council shall be the president of the university, a vice-president of the university responsible for medical school activities, the dean of the School of Medicine, the associate dean for medical education of the School of Medicine, the chair of the Committee on Medical Education, and student members who shall include not more than two undergraduate medical students, one M.D.-Ph.D. student, and one Ph.D. graduate student. The student members shall be chosen by their respective groups.

In addition, if a senator to the university Faculty Senate is not included in the Faculty Council as a voting member, the chair of the Faculty Council shall appoint one of the School of Medicine senators to be an ad hoc member of the Faculty Council. The chair of the Faculty Council may invite other persons to attend designated meetings. Faculty Council meetings shall be open to the faculty. Faculty members may at any time request hearings before Faculty Council, but a request by a faculty member for a hearing before the Faculty Council must be made to the chair prior to the meeting of the Faculty Council.

ARTICLE 3 – THE FACULTY COUNCIL

3.2: Membership of the Faculty Council

b. Non-voting Members. Non-voting members of the Faculty Council shall be the president of the university, a vice-president of the university responsible for medical school activities, the dean of the School of Medicine, the chair of the Committee on Medical Education, and student members who shall include not more than two undergraduate medical students, one M.D.-Ph.D. student, and one Ph.D. graduate student. The student members shall be chosen by their respective groups.

If no member of the Bylaws Committee is a voting member of the Faculty Council, the Faculty Council Chair shall appoint one of the Bylaws Committee members to serve as a non-voting ad hoc member. If a representative to the University Faculty Senate is not included in the Faculty Council as a voting member, the Faculty Council Chair shall appoint one of the School of Medicine senators to be a non-voting ad hoc member of the Faculty Council. The chair of the Faculty Council may invite other persons to attend designated meetings. Faculty Council meetings shall be open to the faculty. Faculty members may at any time request hearings before Faculty Council, but a request by a faculty member for a hearing before the Faculty Council must be made to the chair prior to the meeting of the Faculty Council.
requesting a sabbatical leave is tenured. A sabbatical leave may be requested by a faculty member and, based upon all factors including the specific study proposal and subsequent recommendations by the department chair, the Faculty Council Steering Committee, and the dean, may be granted by the president. In cases of tenure track and non-tenure track or special faculty, special sabbatical leaves may be recommended as well, at the discretion of the dean. However, such leaves may not necessarily incur the obligation of university or School of Medicine financial support. For faculty with tenure track, non-tenure-track and special appointments, the provost shall specify whether the leave period is to be counted as part of the pretenure or pre-promotion period, as the case may be.

ARTICLE 6 - AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

An amendment of the bylaws may be proposed by majority vote of the Faculty Council, by the dean, or by written petition of 20 or more faculty members. Proposed amendments will be submitted to the secretary of the Faculty Council and ordinarily will be considered by the Faculty Council within the same academic year if submitted prior to April 1 of that year. The proposed amendments and the recommendations of the Faculty Council will then be sent by mail to full-time members of the faculty and may be discussed at a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty held at least four weeks after the mailing. During discussion of proposed amendments at a faculty meeting, non-substantive changes in the proposed amendments may be made by majority vote. The vote on any proposed amendment shall be by mail ballot of the full-time faculty. Approval shall require an affirmative vote by a majority of those faculty members returning ballots. At least three weeks shall be allowed between the mailing of ballots and the determination of election results. The Faculty Council shall review the bylaws at least once every five years and shall propose amendments as desired to the faculty.
ARTICLE 6 - AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

An amendment of the bylaws may be proposed by majority vote of the Faculty Council, by the dean, or by written petition of 20 or more faculty members. The amendment must be accompanied by a rationale for the proposed change. All proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Chair and secretary of the Faculty Council, who shall forward all proposed amendments to the Standing Committee on Bylaws. The Bylaws Committee shall review each proposed amendment and report its recommendation to Faculty Council. All proposed amendments will be considered and voted on by the Faculty Council within the same academic year if submitted prior to April 1 of that year. All proposed amendments, their rationale, and the recommendations of the Faculty Council will then be sent by mail to full-time members of the faculty and may be discussed at a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty held at least four weeks after the mailing. During discussion of proposed amendments at a faculty meeting, non-substantive changes in the proposed amendments may be made by majority vote. The vote on any proposed amendment shall be by mail ballot of the full-time faculty. Approval shall require an affirmative vote by a majority of those faculty members returning ballots. At least three weeks shall be allowed between the mailing of ballots and the determination of election results. The Faculty Council shall review the bylaws at least once every five years and shall propose amendments as desired to the faculty.
ARTICLE 6 - AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

An amendment of the bylaws may be proposed by majority vote of the Faculty Council, by the dean, by written petition of 20 or more faculty members or by the Bylaws Committee. The amendment must be accompanied by a rationale for the proposed change. All proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Council, the Secretary of the Faculty of Medicine and the Chair of the Bylaws Committee. The Bylaws Committee shall review each proposed amendment and report its recommendation to Faculty Council. All proposed amendments will be considered and voted on by the Faculty Council within the same academic year if submitted prior to March 1 of that year. All proposed amendments, their rationale, and the recommendations of the Faculty Council will then be sent by mail to full-time members of the faculty and may be discussed at a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty held at least two weeks after notification. During discussion of proposed amendments at a faculty meeting, non-substantive changes in the proposed amendments may be made by majority vote. The vote on any proposed amendment shall be by electronic ballot of the full-time faculty. Approval shall require an affirmative vote by a majority of those faculty members returning ballots. Ballots shall remain open for three weeks. At least once every five years, the Bylaws Committee shall conduct a full review of these Bylaws and forward its recommendations to the Faculty Council for consideration by the procedures described above.
Re: Faculty Compensation Concerns

Dear President Snyder and Provost Baeslack,

During its November meeting, the Faculty Council of the School of Medicine discussed Faculty compensation, focusing particularly on annual merit raises to Faculty salaries. Over the past 6 years, Faculty salary merit raises at the School of Medicine have been limited to 2% by the Faculty Salary Increase Pool set by the University (Fiscal Years 2012-2017). According to Dean Davis, last year the School of Medicine faculty salary merit raises averaged 1.6% (excluding promotions). Faculty Council is concerned that the limited merit raises are demoralizing for existing faculty members who, in spite of years of service to the University working to establish and maintain the School of Medicine’s national reputation, may receive compensation that is comparable to less experienced recruits. The policy of limited merit raises also creates concerns regarding our School’s ability to hire competitive new faculty members.

We respectfully urge you to reevaluate your policy for the Faculty Salary Increased Pool limit for the next fiscal year. The Faculty Council would appreciate a presentation on this topic at one of our upcoming meetings. We would like to know how this limit is set and how the CWRU limit compares to that at other Schools of Medicine.

Sincerely,
School of Medicine Faculty Council