

**Faculty Council Meeting  
Meeting Minutes**  
Monday, September 23, 2019  
4:00-5:30PM – BRB 105

4:00-4:10PM	Welcome and Chair Announcements	Gary Clark
4:10-4:12PM	Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the June 17, 2019 Meeting	Gary Clark
4:12- 4:15PM	Faculty Council Steering Committee Activities Report	Jennifer McBride
4:15-4:30PM	Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the HEC	Maureen McEnergy
4:30-4:55PM	Review of June Presentation and Vote on Creation of Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Awards	Sudha Iyengar
4:55-5:10PM	Report from SOM Faculty Senator on Faculty Senate Executive Committee	Ahmad Khalil
5:10-5:15PM	New Business	
5:15PM	Adjourn	

**Members Present**

Robert Bonomo  
Sudha Chakrapani  
Shu Chen  
Gary Clark  
Travis Cleland  
Piet de Boer  
Pamela Davis  
Philipp Dines  
William Dupps  
Todd Emch  
Judith French  
Monica Gerrek  
Anna Maria Hibbs

Alex Huang  
Beata Jasztrzebska  
David Katz  
Allyson Kozak  
Vinod Labhassetwar  
Suet Kam Lam  
Maria Cecilia Lansang  
Charles Malemud  
Jennifer McBride  
Maureen McEnergy  
Vincent Monnier  
George Ochenjele  
Anand Ramamurthi

Ben Roitberg  
Satya Sahoo  
Ashleigh Schaffer  
Daniel Sweeney  
Patricia Taylor  
Krystal Tomei  
Carlos Trombetta  
Satish Viswanath  
Susan Wang  
Nicole Ward  
Jo Ann Wise  
Jamie Wood  
Thomas Gerken

**Members Absent**

Corinne Bazella	Hannah Hill	Clifford Packer
Tracey Bonfield	Darrell Hulisz	Nimitt Patel
Matthias Buck	Irina Jaeger	Barbara Snyder
Cathleen Carlin	Ankur Kalra	Patricia Thomas
Jae-Sung Cho	Laura Kreiner	Heather Vallier
Brian D'Anza	Ameya Nayate	Allison Vidimos
Jennifer Dorth	Vicki Noble	Richard Zigmond

**Others Present**

Alicia Aguilar	Nicole Deming	Joyce Helton
----------------	---------------	--------------

**Welcome and Chair Announcements**

Gary Clark, the Chair of Faculty Council, welcomed the Faculty Council representatives to the first meeting of the new academic year. He then introduced Jennifer McBride, the Chair-elect of Faculty Council, and expressed his appreciation to Sudha Chakrapani, the past Chair of Faculty Council, for all her efforts last year on behalf of Faculty Council. Dr. Clark then gave a brief overview of the agenda items that would be addressed at the meeting.

He reminded everyone that Faculty Council is considered the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Medicine. While it is a rather large group for an executive committee, that is how it is structured. The Faculty Council Steering Committee sets the agenda for the Faculty Council meetings; it does not make decisions on behalf of faculty. Faculty Council makes the decisions that impact the Faculty of Medicine. In order to ensure that comments are constructive, Faculty Council follows the guidelines set down in Roberts Rules of Order. When issues are controversial, only the member with the microphone is allowed to speak. Once someone has spoken, others are then given the chance to speak before it can revert back to the original speaker, thus allowing everyone the opportunity to participate. Dr. Clark has invited Mark Chance to act as parliamentarian in settling disputes about the order of business, motions and sub-motions, with the intent of having a robust discussion with decorum and control.

At the end of last year, an amendment had been proposed to the bylaws to add additional Faculty Council representatives from the VA. Darin Croft, who chairs the Bylaws Committee, stated that they are still in the process of working on this. Since he was out of town for today's meeting, this topic will be placed on the agenda for the October Faculty Council meeting. Currently, Dr. Robert Bonomo is the sole faculty representative for the VA. Dr. Clark also congratulated Dr. Bonomo for the distinguished university professorship that he was recently awarded.

Annual reports will be forthcoming in October from the NEC and the CAPT; the CBR report will be presented in December. Two votes are ending for the Faculty of Medicine. The first supplements the elections for the standing committees as the elections held last spring did not fill all of the open positions. There will be a call for additional nominees and faculty should have already received an e-mail regarding this topic. Maureen McEnery, Chair of the NEC, will meet in the near future to review those candidates and send out a ballot for faculty elections. While

the ballot is ready to go, some technical problems have surfaced in getting a valid ballot to all facilities. The second vote concerned a number of proposed bylaws amendments.

The bylaws are reviewed on a five-year cycle. After an extensive discussion and revision of those amendments, they are almost ready to go out. Once the endorsement/approval of the Bylaws Committee is received, it then goes to the Faculty of Medicine for approval, followed by the Dean, Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and lastly the Faculty Senate before it can become operational. This change should occur during this academic year.

There are three open slots on the NEC for Faculty Council representatives which will run concurrent with their term on Faculty Council -- two for basic science and one for clinical. Faculty may nominate each other or self-nominate if they are willing to serve on the NEC. In October, it will be put on the floor to vote and hopefully these spots will be filled. At this point, the committee membership is very diverse consisting of faculty members from MHMC, UH, CCF, and Case.

#### **Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the June 17, 2019 Meeting**

Dr. Clark stated that there were no submissions of edits or corrections to the June 17, 2019 Faculty Council meeting minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as presented. When asked if there was any other discussion, the question was posed as to why we were no longer using the electronic voting devices. The owner of these devices has moved to the HEC and at this time we no longer have access to them. While we will continue to pursue the electronic voting situation, today's votes will be manual.

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

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

The June 3 Faculty Council Steering Committee meeting minutes were reviewed and approved. Dr. Clark provided an overview of the responsibilities of the Steering Committee, and the committee discussed the Dean's Search Committee meeting that was held with Faculty Council representatives on July 1. Other topics of discussion were an update of the status of the bylaws amendment adding Faculty Council representatives located at the VA; NEC, CAPT, and CBR annual reports that will be presented to Faculty Council, supplemental voting for SOM Committees, and discussion of possible Faculty Council meeting locations to increase participation of faculty members.

The update on the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on the HEC was on the agenda last June and will be placed on the September Faculty Council agenda. Since we did not have a quorum for a vote in June, the proposal to create an Awards Committee will be presented (for the benefit of new Faculty Council representatives who did not hear the original presentation) at the September Faculty Council meeting for a vote. The ad hoc Committee on Professional Conduct was discussed, and the agenda for Faculty Council will be approved via e-mail.

#### **Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the HEC (Maureen McEnergy)**

This committee was formed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate with the intent of convening with three senators from each of the schools that are housed at the HEC. Members consist of Mark Hans (Chair – SODM), Allison Webel (SON), Chris Winkelman (SON), Evelyn Duffy (SON), Laura Voith (MSASS), Maureen McEnergy (SOM), Renato Roperto (SODM),

Theresa Jasinevicius (SODM), Thomas Kelley (SOM), Darin Croft (SOM), Andrew Reimer, (Faculty Senate Personnel Committee), and Mendel Singer (Faculty Senate Budget Committee).

The purpose of this committee is to gather information from among the different faculties and make recommendations on behalf of faculty. To date, they have held six meetings – one organizational, and the second to discuss faculty response to the announcement of the creation of the committee, and three with other groups involved in the HEC transition (IPE committee chairs, Ellen Lubbers and Kathy Cole-Kelly, and HEC building manager, Kevin Malinowski, from CBRE).

No overlap was discovered, as this committee will focus specifically on the issues of faculty. The committee (at the Provost's request) met with the Provost and the various deans of the schools at the HEC at the end of July. They felt that the overall message was that it was in our hands as faculty to contribute to the success of the HEC whether we be educators or clinicians. It will take all of us to make it a success.

Sitting with representatives from Nursing and Dentistry, concerns were shared on many points. The SOM faculty is the largest at the university. Signage is a huge issue because it is linked with clarifying the academic relationship of CWRU and some of the affiliate hospitals and the feeling that the value of our academic affiliation with CWRU is being diminished. While in a certain sense it was customary for us to have our research, teaching and clinical service separated spatially; this is a big change for Dentistry and Nursing. Their entire educational effort is at the HEC. In addition, a persistent confusion and concern over the ownership of the land and buildings still exists.

Of great importance to this committee is the concept that everyone be very sensitive to the concerns in the other constituencies. How will the people in Nursing and Dentistry, and a number of faculty members coming from SOM, be welcomed and how will they be transitioned. Our faculty are one time contributors, lecture and then not show up again. It was suggested that the establishment of a temporary "landing area support kiosk" for faculty traveling from the CWRU campus to the HEC campus, could serve to welcome and orient them, making them feel that they were a part of the HEC faculty, with a unified effort across all of the schools and inclusive across categories of faculty.

A suggested action item was to use the [hec@case.edu](mailto:hec@case.edu) web page as the main information portal for anything related to the HEC as a way to disseminate information. This would be a place to get feedback to the people who are at the HEC looking at more technical aspects of the building. Immediate attention should be given to the fact that there is no coverage for faculty waiting for buses and this issue will intensify, as the weather gets colder. There is no place to wait and there is a considerable distance between the front of the building and where you get off the buses.

The issue of coverage at all bus sites has already been raised. The Dean explained that this request had been made before the HEC opened, while it was under construction, and since it has been opened. She also informed the Council that there is a wonderful app available that tells you where the bus is waiting so you can stay within the vestibule on inclement days until the bus is turning the corner. Multiple requests have been made to have the bus stop on E. 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.

There are issues that are hampering faculty's ability to deliver their lectures e.g. pointers have not been provided and interactive lectures are replacing turning point but it is not working.

There is no chalkboard in the lecture hall, and review sessions have not gone smoothly. An I-Pad was provided but the surface is too tiny to use as a replacement for a chalkboard.

The Dean stated that some efforts have already been made to welcome faculty from block 2 (two sessions that had two breakfasts organized to welcome faculty). They were well attended and seemed to be popular. Amy Wilson-Delfosse welcomed the attendees thanking them for their efforts. Unfortunately, this could not be done with Nursing and Dental due to calendar difficulties, and we will try to schedule these sessions at the beginning of the block. More are planned in the future.

The signage looks good but it has all of the four schools. The large outside sign is not yet in place. The Dean has not seen the final version. Our recommendations were put in fairly strongly and they were absolutely supported by Cleveland Clinic.

A question was asked as to who owns the Samson Pavilion and the Dental Clinic. Cleveland Clinic donated the land. It was explained that there is a new holding company that holds the land 50/50 university and Cleveland Clinic -- jointly owned. It was not known if this also applies to the Dental Clinic. Any other questions can be sent to Maureen McEnery, Kevin Malinowski, or Mark Hans.

The comment was made that at the HEC there is no testimony to the fact that this great school and university has contributed significantly in the historical past. The School of Nursing has fantastic pictures that show the nursing profession. It is extraordinarily important, that before Cleveland Clinic puts only artwork on the wall, that we have a plan to showcase all these testimonies of the past, which should include a gallery of former deans, Nobel Prize laureates, and other distinguished people. It was encouraged that this be brought up to the Clinic.

The discussion continued with suggestions to decorate the wall and space of the HEC with testimonies of graphic relevance to the histories of all three schools; documentation of significant accomplishments, and recognition of our historical past. The Faculty of the SOM encourages the HEC to undertake discussions with whoever is in charge of decorating the building to consider working with the appropriate people to put these testimonies of the past of the SOM, School of Nursing and the Dental School.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend to the ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee on the HEC to consider decorating the HEC with documentation of significant historical landmarks, individuals and accomplishments. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. All were in favor, no one opposed, and no one abstained. The motion passes.

### **Review of June Presentation and Vote on Creation of Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Awards (Sudha Iyengar)**

Dr. Iyengar explained to the members that this presentation was a carryover from the proposal made in June when Faculty Council lacked a quorum for a vote.

Dr. Iyengar, and her Chair, Jonathan Haines, feel that there is not a sufficient number of young people from Case being nominated for awards. A small poll was taken to provide an assessment. In general, awards are very specific to the societies to which they each belong. These processes are fairly similar and they can determine what is available at the SOM. Upon

learning that we do not have an awards committee, it was suggested that an ad hoc committee be created to enable us to have a more uniform process.

The purpose of the proposal is to identify new and existing opportunities for faculty at every rank, and increase the number of faculty members at CWRU-SOM who receive awards and honors. This committee would create a nomination process and assist faculty in determining if and when they should apply for various honors/awards, and recommend procedures for crafting materials, including producing templates for some very important awards/honors.

Basically, people are novices when preparing the package. With a more uniform process in place, and an ad hoc committee to assist faculty members, more people could be put through. The committee would create a searchable listing, and solicit nominations in conjunction with departments and center chairs. The committee would review materials submitted and suggest edits based on the description of the opportunity or general knowledge of the field. They would also create a databank of these materials for faculty to utilize as samples. An annual honor role would be created that could be submitted to the Dean, Provost or the President.

The committee would consist of 4-6 members at different career stages from across the SOM (Associate Professor or higher), with no more than one member from any department or center in order to ensure the broadest representation. As these procedures are created and initially set in place, the first year would be most intensive. Some resources would be needed to create a database. Having a point of contact and a database with lists and information will help the process. The committee will still be working in conjunction with chair and center directors.

In order to be nominated for an award in most societies, membership in that society is required. There are other societies where the awards do not go through the committee. Instead, a scientific planning committee assigns the awards, and has their own nominating and election process. There is a tool that already exists within the school, which makes it possible to do matches. The committee would use the knowledge of individual faculty members who are members of certain societies, and various chairs and center directors who can help identify candidates and the places where they could be matched with an award.

This committee would be more of an advisory committee to assist people who are interested in applying. The committee is interested in identifying those who deserve an award who are not already known. Other institutions already have committees like this (Harvard, Penn State, Stanford, etc.). It was suggested that the committee could ask to see if these other institutions already have databases, and if they could be made available to us.

A motion was made and seconded to create an ad hoc awards committee (4-6 members which would include some Faculty Council members and some SOM faculty who are not Faculty Council members). The floor was then opened for discussion. Is there a timeline (sunset clause), and should this be a standing committee? Dr. Iyengar stated that she envisions that this will eventually become a standing committee. She would want the ad hoc committee to sunset, and then at the end of that period it could be brought to Faculty Council for a vote to make it a standing committee.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal for an ad hoc Awards Committee with a three-year term with membership to include both Faculty Council representatives as well as non-Faculty Council Faculty of Medicine representatives. There being no further discussion, a

vote was taken. All were in favor, no one was opposed, and there were 5 abstentions. The motion passes.

### **Report from SOM Faculty Senator on Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Ahmad Khalil)**

Dr. Khalil gave an update on the recent Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting. He stated that the Associate Provost for Interprofessional Education was hired on July 24 and has already started. Members of the SOM Dean Search Committee plan to go to universities (e.g. Columbia) this week and next week, in order to secure more information on the search process.

President Snyder was very clear in her support of a new policy, which will help to maintain freedom of expression on campus. There has been considerable discussion on how to balance our strong values and beliefs while allowing someone to come on campus to give a speech contradictory to our values. It was decided that while we would allow someone to come and express his or her view, we would not endorse it and would issue a statement affirming that.

It was decided to allot the Provost a budget to start new initiatives that would be discussed at upcoming Faculty Senate meetings as well. The amount provided was not clear and would also be discussed at future meetings. Funds would be allocated to strategic planning or initiatives that the Provost feels would be valuable on campus. Points like where the money will come from and how it would be handled in the future would be updated to the Dean.

Some changes in the Faculty Handbook (moving some policies from Chapter 3 to Chapter 2) were also discussed at the Faculty Senate meeting and will be pursued at the October meeting. It was decided that the Faculty Climate Survey should be done once every four years as it takes time to accumulate and sort data. If done too frequently there is a tendency to miss important things.

There is a report from Duke University concerning tenure track and non-tenure track changes. This could be used as a basis to do our own analysis. We will be able to request this report and see if it would be something that we might be interested in doing at a future time.

It was not known where the new Provost will have his primary appointment, but Dr. Khalil said he would ask this question at the next meeting.

New programs that might be in demand in the future are currently a very active portion of our curriculum. For example, there is a foundational course that includes 600-700 students (nursing, dental, nutrition, speech pathology) who are learning what other disciplines do and focus on patient-based problems. There is a Saturday morning student-run health clinic where nursing, dental and medical students work together to take care of patients who do not have the means to pay for their care. If Faculty Council has little knowledge of these programs and would like more information, Ellen Luebbers or Tyler Reimschisel could provide a ten-minute talk. Most people in medicine today believe that a great deal of medicine will be practiced in teams.

There seems to be no team approach among doctors. It is entirely in the hands of one single doctor who looks at your case and treats you. What should be the priority is to achieve teams of doctors looking at the patient before it expands into multi-dimensions. The Dean stated that this comment could certainly be sent back to the crew, and she suggested that if this is something

requiring more information 10-15 minutes from one of the experts would be helpful. The Faculty Council Steering Committee will explore this further.

### **New Business**

The bylaws amendments that were approved last year by Faculty Council are ready to go out to the faculty for a vote. There have been firewall issues at MHMC and the VA and the IT people at the various sites are working together to overcome these issues. The goal is to make sure that every faculty member has the opportunity to vote. When the ballot goes out we have, and will continue, to notify the IT personnel at the affiliates. If you experience an issue, please contact Nicole Deming and she will send you a paper ballot. Voting will be open for a three-week period.

The representatives were asked to look at the format of the general bulletin and supply their feedback. The SOM faculty are portrayed differently from other schools. They are first listed by organization, department, alphabetically, and then part time faculty. While the SOM faculty are listed alphabetically, primary appointment affiliate is not listed. All faculty at CWRU are listed by department and then all of the different affiliates are listed. One option would be to go back to the old format.

Dr. Clark noted that the first Faculty Council meeting of the year had a light agenda due to the availability of the standing committee reports.

As there was no further business to be addressed, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. A vote was taken. All were in favor, no one was opposed, and no one abstained. The motion passes.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Helton

# Meeting of the School of Medicine Faculty Council

September 23, 2019  
BRB 105 4:00 p.m.

Gary Clark, MD, (MetroHealth), Chair

Jennifer McBride, PhD, (CCLCM), Chair-Elect

Sudha Chakrapani, PhD, (Physiology and Biophysics), Past-Chair

Nicole Deming, JD, MA, Assistant Dean For Faculty Affairs and Human Resources

Secretary of Faculty of Medicine



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

# Faculty Council Agenda

1. Welcome and Chair's Announcements
2. Approval of Minutes from June
3. Steering Committee report
4. Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on the HEC (Maureen McEnery)
5. Review of June presentation and vote on creation of ad hoc committee on Faculty Awards (Sudha Iyengar)
6. Standing Agenda Item: Report from SOM Faculty Senator on Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Ahmad Khalil)
7. New Business
8. Adjourn



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

# Chair Announcements

- Welcome
- Faculty Council's Role
- Robert's Rules of Order
- Bylaws Amendment adding Faculty Council representatives located at the VA
- Reports from the NEC (October), CAPT (October), and CBR (December)
- Supplemental Election for Standing Committees
- Vote on Bylaws Amendments
- Vacancies on Nomination and Elections Committee for Faculty Council members



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

# Approval of June Faculty Council minutes

- Motion to approve?



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

# Steering Committee Activities Report

## Meeting Date: September 9, 2019

Members Present: Gary Clark, Sudha Chakrapani, Jennifer McBride, Monica Gerrek, Robert Bonomo, Allyson Kozak, Maureen McEnery, Jo Ann Wise.

Also present: Nicole Deming, Joyce Helton

- Welcome and Introduction
- Approval of June minutes
- Review of the responsibilities of Steering Committee
- Discussion of Dean's Search Committee meeting with Faculty Council
- Update of status of Bylaws Amendment adding Faculty Council representatives located at the VA
- Reports from the NEC, CAPT, CBR
- Motion to request that the Bylaws Committee review definition of faculty
- Supplemental voting for SOM Committees
- Discussion of Faculty Council meeting location
- Update on Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on the HEC
- Review of Proposal of Faculty Council ad hoc Awards Committee
- Discussion of ad hoc Committee on Professional Conduct
- Approved Faculty Council agenda (email)



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

# Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on the HEC



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

# **Motion to recommend to the ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee on the HEC to consider decorating the HEC with documentation of significant historical landmarks, individuals and accomplishments.**

- Motion to approve?



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

# Review of Proposal of Faculty Council ad hoc Awards Committee

- Motion to approve proposal for an ad hoc Awards Committee with a three year term, with membership to include both Faculty Council representatives as well as non-FC Faculty of Medicine representatives?



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

# Faculty Senate Report from Executive Committee



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

# New Business

Info on IPE activities  
University Bulletin



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

**Faculty Council Meeting**  
**Draft Meeting Minutes**  
Monday, June 17, 2019  
4:00-5:30PM – BRB 105

4:00-4:10PM	Chair Announcements	Sudha Chakrapani
4:10-4:12PM	Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the May 20, 2019 Meeting	Sudha Chakrapani
4:12- 4:15PM	Faculty Council Steering Committee Activities Report	Gary Clark
4:15-4:25PM	New Academic Departments CCLCM (Plastic Surgery, Emergency Medicine, and Neurology)	Gene Barnett
4:25-4:55PM	Discussion on Faculty Council Structure and Representation	Jennifer McBride
4:55-5:00PM	Vote on the Senate Model	
5:00-5:10PM	Remote Participation Amendment -- Bylaws Recommendation on the Language	Darin Croft
5:10-5:18PM	Proposal 3 of the Faculty Proposed Amendment Petition (and Bylaws Recommendation)	Danny Manor Darin Croft
5:18-5:20PM	Committee Reports (Bylaws)	
5:20-5:25PM	Proposal for the Awards Committee	Sudha Iyengar
5:25-5:30PM	Ad Hoc HEC Committee of the Faculty Senate	Maureen McEnergy
	New Business	
	Adjourn	

**Members Present**

Corinne Bazella  
Robert Bonomo  
Cathleen Carlin  
Sudha Chakrapani  
Shu Chen  
Gary Clark  
Travis Cleland

Anna Maria Hibbs  
Beata Jastrzebska  
Hung-Ying Kao  
David Katz  
Allyson Kozak  
Laura Kreiner  
Varun Kshetry

Vincent Monnier  
Ameya Nayate  
P. Ramakrishnan  
Anand Ramamurthi  
Ben Roitberg  
Satya Sahoo  
Jochen Son-Hing

**Members Present (cont.)**

Piet de Boer	Cynthia Kubu	Phoebe Stewart
Pamela Davis	Suet Kam Lam	Charles Sturgis
Philipp Dines	Maria Cecilia Lansang	Daniel Sweeney
William Dupps	Charles Malemud	Patricia Taylor
Judith French	Danny Manor	Krystal Tomei
Monica Gerrek	Jennifer McBride	Carlos Trombetta
Mahmoud Ghannoum	Maureen McEnery	Kristin Voos

**Members Absent**

Tracey Bonfield	Darrell Hulisz	Barbara Snyder
David Buchner	Irina Jaeger	James Howard Swain
Brian D'Anza	Stathis Karathanasis	Patricia Thomas
Nicole Deming	Rekha Mody	Melissa Times
Jennifer Dorth	Vicki Noble	Anna Valujskikh
Sherine Ghafoori	Clifford Packer	Jo Ann Wise
Zachary Grimmett	Nimitt Patel	Richard Zigmond
Hannah Hill	Scott Simpson	

**Others Present**

Todd Emch	Karen Horowitz	Kerry Levin
Joyce Helton	Sudha Iyengar	Usha Stiefel

1

2 **Chair Announcements**

3 Sudha Chakrapani, Chair of Faculty Council, called the meeting to order at 4:00PM. She  
4 proceeded to summarize the agenda items that would be addressed at today’s meeting.  
5 Recapping the accomplishments of the past year, Dr. Chakrapani noted that during the ten times  
6 Faculty Council met they approved a new minor program application in Nutrition, a proposal on  
7 Experimental Biotechnology Track, Biochemistry; a new charge for the Committee on  
8 Biomedical Research, and new academic departments in CCLCM for Otolaryngology-Head and  
9 Neck Surgery, Dermatology, and BME.

10

11 Discussions were held on the Bylaws Amendment to Articles 3 and the faculty proposed petition  
12 on amendments to Article 3, and the amendment to the Bylaws on VA representation.  
13 Standing committee reports were presented and approved; and a presentation of the Ad Hoc  
14 Committee to study Faculty Council Structure and Representation was given. The possibility of  
15 remote participation in Faculty Council meetings was discussed, as well as a proposal to support  
16 the creation of day care at CWRU.

17

18 Matthew Lester gave a presentation on the HEC and CWRU’s financial commitment to the  
19 campus. Dean Davis gave a presentation on the amendment to the UH affiliation agreement,  
20 discussed the SOM structure, and addressed faculty teaching and rewards. Sana Loue provided  
21 an update on diversity related issues in the SOM, and Molly Watkins elaborated on the inter-  
22 national ranking initiatives of medical schools and their importance to Case.

1 Dr. Chakrapani gave special thanks to the Faculty Council Representatives who served in 2018-  
2 2019, and especially to those who are rotating off their service. Special thanks to Phoebe  
3 Stewart, Past Chair, and Gary Clark, Chair Elect, and to the Faculty Council Steering Committee  
4 members who have completed their term: Cynthia Kubu, Danny Manor, Shu Chen, Vincent  
5 Monnier, and Charles Malemud. Dr. Chakrapani thanked Faculty Council for the opportunity  
6 given to her to chair this body.  
7

8 It was noted that David Buchner has given his acceptance to serve as the Chair of the  
9 Nomination and Elections Committee through June.  
10

### 11 **Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the May 20, 2019 Meeting**

12 A motion was made and seconded to accept the meeting minutes from the May 20, 2019, Faculty  
13 Council meeting. When the floor was opened for discussion, a correction was suggested on Page  
14 4, lines 42-44, to end the text after “child care”. There being no further changes to the text, a  
15 vote was taken to accept the minutes with this correction. 27 were in favor, 1 was opposed, and  
16 3 abstained. The motion passes.  
17

### 18 **Faculty Council Steering Committee Activities Report (Gary Clark)**

19 Dr. Clark stated that the Faculty Council Steering Committee had met on June 3 where they  
20 discussed the Bylaws Committee annual report, and reviewed proposals for new academic  
21 departments at CCLCM (Plastic Surgery, Emergency Medicine, and Neurology). The Bylaws  
22 Committee recommendation on the remote participation amendment was reviewed, as well as a  
23 proposal for the creation of an Awards Committee. A brief overview was presented on the new  
24 ad hoc HEC Committee of the Faculty Senate.  
25

### 26 **New Academic Departments CCLCM (Plastic Surgery, Emergency Medicine, and 27 Neurology) (Gene Barnett)**

28 Dr. Barnett stated that they were presenting three departments today. Emergency Medicine,  
29 which is already established at UHCMC as well as MHMC, would be under the academic  
30 department of Medicine, with Stephen W. Meldon, MD, being proposed as academic chair. Dr.  
31 Meldon is the Senior Vice-Chair of the Emergency Services Institute. He was a previous editor-  
32 in-chief of *Geriatric Emergency Medicine*, with 32 peer-reviewed publications, 25 book  
33 chapters, and 61 presentations to his credit.  
34

35 The breadth and depth of the identified faculty’s teaching and research productivity numbers 100  
36 physicians throughout the institution. They teach medical students and have 410 house officers  
37 complete their clinical rotations each year. The residency program sponsored by CWRU,  
38 MetroHealth, and Cleveland Clinic has 13 residents per year. Research projects include PETAL  
39 and SIREN emergency research network. There are robust grants in adult, geriatric and pediatric  
40 topics e.g. Emergency Airway, Knowledge of Home Medications, Reducing Chest Imaging, and  
41 Safety of Oral Anticoagulants Registry (SOAR).  
42

43 Additional factors relevant to all of the proposed new departments are that they were requested  
44 by Dean Davis, they are significantly robust and warrant being recognized, and they offer the  
45 SOM department alignment with other institutions. Results from an analysis of the effect of the  
46 establishment of these second departments on existing departments of the School of Medicine

1 prove that there were no adverse effects, that this alignment was preferred, and that it would  
2 allow for better showcasing of unique accomplishments. These new departments will better  
3 reflect the academic diversity of CCLCM of CWRU. Research publications authored by faculty  
4 with appointments in the new departments will make note of the CWRU faculty appointment.  
5 All CCLCM research will continue to note the CCLCM of CWRU appointment. These new  
6 departments will not require funding from the School of Medicine, and this will be affirmed by a  
7 five-year business plan. The new departments will have no financial impact on CWRU and/or  
8 SOM. The visibility of these new departments may also spur further pursuits and encourage  
9 engagement at HEC.

10  
11 The Department of Neurology is an already established SOM department at UHCMC and  
12 MHMC. It was originally placed under the Department of Medicine when CCLCM began.  
13 Kerry H. Levin, MD, is being proposed as the academic chair. He has held various committee  
14 positions for the American Board of Psychiatry & Neurology, from 1997 to the present. He has  
15 41 peer-reviewed publications, 33 book chapters, and more than 100+ CME teaching and  
16 presentations to his credit.

17  
18 The breadth and depth of the identified faculty's teaching and research productivity consists of  
19 120 professional staff in many subspecialties, who teach medical students from CCLCM in year  
20 1 and 2, and CCLCM & CWRU students in year 3. The residency program has 40 trainees per  
21 year. Twelve different fellowship programs (accredited and non-accredited) are offered.

22  
23 Research projects exist in all subspecialties with grants covering many topics (adult and  
24 pediatrics) including epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, movement disorders, headaches, sleep  
25 medicine and dementia.

26  
27 The Department of Plastic Surgery is already established as a SOM department at UHCMC and  
28 MHMC. James E. Zins, MD, is proposed for the academic chair of the department. Dr. Zins  
29 was a founding member of the American Society of Craniofacial Surgery in 1992, and Director  
30 of the American Board of Plastic Surgery from 2016-2022. He has authored 204 peer-reviewed  
31 publications, 20 book chapters, and given 269 presentations and abstracts.

32  
33 The breadth and depth of the identified faculty's teaching and research productivity includes 21  
34 physicians, 4 fellows, and 13 residents. They teach medical students, residents, and fellows from  
35 CCLCM, CWRU and other institutions. They are in the process to receive ACGME approval for  
36 a new integrated residency program. There are research projects for faculty and trainees as well  
37 as writing book chapters. Grants cover many topics (adult and pediatrics): face transplant,  
38 nerves, holographic surgical planning, breast reconstruction, and limb perfusion.

39  
40 When the department starts off, we will meet with the individuals to address questions about  
41 their actual roles as part of the application process, and their expectations. These new  
42 departments exactly mirror the departments at the other institutions (MHMC or UHCMC) and  
43 are in line with the other centers. The interfaces between the academic departments at CCLCM  
44 and the SOM are substantiated by a seat at Faculty Council and a seat at chair meetings. The  
45 interface between academic department chairs and the leadership at CCLCM works directly with  
46 the SOM. Not much contact exists between academic chairs and the Dean; an intermediary

1 participates in both activities. To address students who wish to apply for various positions at  
2 Cleveland Clinic, each clinical department has an academic coordinator that serves that purpose,  
3 and this will not change under the new system.

4  
5 The question was asked that if the primary driver is alignment with the other institutions, other  
6 than internal processes, and since we have functioned all these years without department entities,  
7 why is this changing now? Dr. Barnett replied that, there has been a yearning among faculty for  
8 an appropriate academic identity. Now that the program has matured, these departments can  
9 clearly stand on their own as academic identities, with alignment through the SOM as the  
10 secondary reason.

11  
12 Dean Davis explained that when we do education in the third year clerkships and electives in the  
13 4<sup>th</sup> year, the LCME states that no matter where you do those, you should receive the same  
14 clinical experience and be evaluated in the same manner. Representatives of all of these groups  
15 decide on the examinations, criteria, what proportion of students get honors and commendable,  
16 and objectives and requirements in each discipline. Third year required clerkships -- 32 from  
17 CCLCM, with a great deal of commingling in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, and 4<sup>th</sup> year (plastic surgery, face  
18 transplants and holographic imaging) is under Medical Education. This makes for a better  
19 alignment when there are national programs and national research that want multiple sites; this is  
20 the mechanism of getting to those sites.

21  
22 When asked about yearly evaluations, Dr. Barnett clarified that if you are UHCMC faculty, your  
23 yearly evaluation comes through the SOM. The understanding is that there is to be an internal  
24 review at CCLCM, just as it is at MHMC, through the respective department chair.

25  
26 A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal to create a new academic department  
27 of Plastic Surgery at CCLCM. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 29 were in  
28 favor, 5 were opposed, and 4 abstained. The motion passes.

29  
30 A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal to create a new academic department  
31 of Emergency Medicine at CCLCM. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 28  
32 were in favor, 3 were opposed, and 4 abstained. The motion passes.

33  
34 A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal to create a new academic Department  
35 of Neurology at CCLCM. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 31 were in favor,  
36 5 were opposed, and 3 abstained. The motion passes.

37  
38 **Discussion on Faculty Council Structure and Representation (Jennifer McBride)**

39 Jennifer McBride, Chair-Elect of Faculty Council, proceeded to give a brief overview of the  
40 Senate model option for Faculty Council structure and representation.

41  
42 Faculty Council serves as the executive body representing all SOM faculty. In February 2018,  
43 Faculty Council tasked an ad hoc group of peers to explore, meet several times, and come back  
44 with data. Key points indicated that the size of Faculty Council, as an executive body, is too  
45 large at 70+ representatives and will continue to grow with the addition of the new CCLCM  
46 departments. It was noted that there seems to be a lack of faculty engagement.

1 Some points for consideration are that the senate model would provide a more efficient process  
2 without discussions at these council meetings. The senate model proposes 3-4 elected members  
3 from these entities: VA, CCLCM, UH, MHMC, and Basic Sciences. It would also engage more  
4 faculty members by encouraging faculty to be more involved in the voting process by choosing  
5 someone to represent them. It will alternate discussion with people with diverse opinions.  
6

7 The primary concern of those against the Senate model is that it is faculty governance and not  
8 institutional governance. It is not beneficial to drop the ratio of representatives to faculty so  
9 significantly. Faculty members participate in faculty governance. It is better to err on the side of  
10 representation. Quorums or outcomes would be better in this group. We will lose some of the  
11 diversity of the faculty in terms of what their jobs look like. It was felt that the senate model is  
12 going to disenfranchise small departments. Engagement for departments needs to be improved  
13 rather than restricting it.  
14

15 The comment was made that this is the Faculty Council and faculty are in departments. The  
16 problem with having the senate model type of representation is that it excludes a lot of faculty  
17 representation. What we need to remember is that this is unfinished business. We need to ensure  
18 that there is departmental and increasing engagement with Faculty Council. Currently, the VA  
19 has only one representative at Faculty Council. The Chair reminded the council that the  
20 VA representation was voted upon two meetings ago and is currently with the Bylaws  
21 Committee.  
22

23 Members of departments with over 200 faculty report to the Chair of the department. That is the  
24 communication conduit for how we get the word out to all the people. It has been difficult for  
25 MHMC faculty to nominate or elect a member for some of their departments. On the other hand,  
26 having 3-4 representatives for the entire basic science group would not be fair. Their chairs  
27 would not have time to discuss what goes on here. When the founding fathers put the Senate  
28 together, the House of Representatives was based on geography and the number of people.  
29 A comment was made that if this model passes we will no longer have a Faculty Council. If  
30 there is a need for an institutional council that comes together for institutional issues, that would  
31 still not be a Faculty Council. The suggestion was made that perhaps there should be an  
32 additional body to address issues not addressed here. Monthly faculty meeting issues coming  
33 before Faculty Council are discussed. A representative stated that the result of a vote in their  
34 department on the senate model was a unanimous rejection. Another remarked that they have yet  
35 to hear how 3-4-5 people, can take that kind of time, meet with faculty and represent all of those  
36 diverse views at Faculty Council as we do now. Three to four people cannot represent 1,000  
37 clinical faculty such as at UHCMC. If we want to abolish Faculty Council this is one way to do  
38 it.  
39

40 While there are advantages to this, not sure if it is the perfect solution. The comment was made  
41 that our concept of Faculty Council is what you know it to be from being here at Case for all  
42 these years. It is not true to say that we are not going to have a Faculty Council with the senate  
43 model. We will. It just will not be the Faculty Council that you currently think of. Discussion  
44 and comments continued. You should have a group that just meets here at Case and then have  
45 this. There are those who do not want to come here and listen to discussion only pertinent to

1 Case, when it does not impact all of the people coming here. That involvement is needed for all  
2 of the sites, research money, and academic ranking.

3  
4 There are many Cleveland Clinic posters and not a single sign that says CWRU. There are very  
5 enthusiastic people who do see the value of having a strong council that is very integrated. We  
6 still have this huge mass of people who are disconnected from the spirit of having a Faculty  
7 Council that will work for all institutions. Nobody understands the relationship between SOM  
8 and Cleveland Clinic. We are currently without a primary affiliate. Too many questions are still  
9 unresolved before we make a change in the current model.

10  
11 If we are a council of faculty (3,000) by definition of the bylaws, what is the proper way of  
12 representing them? To keep things the way they are because we like it, or are more comfortable  
13 with it, is never a good reason. Over the past year, we have been adding two departments a  
14 month. All faculty members are viewed as the same and deserve representation that is the same.

15  
16 At the request of Dr. Jo Ann Wise, who could not attend today's meeting, Dr. Darin Croft read  
17 the following text:

18  
19 "In advance of the May 20 FC meeting, for which a discussion and vote on the senate model was  
20 included on the agenda, Jo Ann Wise polled DGMS faculty via e-mail; 8/29 (28%) of faculty  
21 members responded.

22  
23 All members who responded were OPPOSED to adoption of the Senate Model. Some of the  
24 more salient comments are reiterated below, with light editing for clarity.

25  
26 1) From a Faculty member appointed in the PA Program: "I would support the weighted model  
27 or the current model. I have only been at CWRU for 4 years but it was surprising to see the  
28 significant input and representation of our clinical faculty in our faculty council. I personally  
29 feel that the basic scientists do the heavy lifting in educating the medical students (university)  
30 as well as the PA students and thus, should have more representation on the faculty council  
31 than the clinical faculty."

32  
33 Other DGMS Faculty members with appointments in the Cancer Center, the RNA Center and the  
34 Center for Medical Education opposed the senate model and supported either Model 1 (current)  
35 or 4 (weighted); one of these faculty members pointed out that Models 1 and 4 are similar in the  
36 sense that they incorporate departmentally based representation.

37  
38 Jo Ann Wise's comment: The list of potential models is not exhaustive and in particular does  
39 not include the possibility of having two separate bodies, one representing basic and another  
40 representing clinical scientists. This would ensure that members vote only on issues that affect  
41 them and at the same time address the frequent refrain heard during FC meetings over the past  
42 several years that much of what is discussed is not relevant to clinical faculty.

43  
44 2) Faculty member from the Cancer Center: "I'm strongly in favor of model 4 and would  
45 strongly suggest that if the senate plan moves forward that SOM basic faculty "strike" and  
46 ignore their expected duties to demonstrate how misled this process has run."

1  
2 Jo Ann Wise's comment: The proposed response to adoption of the Senate Model seems  
3 extreme at first glance. However, it is worth noting that a boycott of the new HEC by basic  
4 science faculty who participate in the University Curriculum has also been advocated as a way to  
5 protest the lack of CWRU-related signage.”  
6

7 Dr. Bonomo stated that currently the VA is only allowed one vote representing many diverse  
8 faculty. The VA is not represented fully and completely through our connection at this point with  
9 the opportunity to participate and contribute.  
10

11 Dr. David Katz read comments from Dr. Richard Zigmond, who could not attend today's  
12 meeting. "Today's vote will be hanging over our heads forever. How can we vote on a model  
13 that is supposed to be a solution but exists in the absence of a problem, with no substance to it.  
14 Liaisons between faculty and administration -- now how will representatives be chosen. I urge  
15 you to vote against and retain the current well-functioning faculty model.”  
16

17 The comment was made that there is a problem when the VA has only one seat as an institutional  
18 representative. In terms of weight, the website shows where faculty are based and it is not  
19 correct. The numbers are higher than listed here. The status quo is not acceptable, that one  
20 hospital has nothing to say on this body. Dr. Chakrapani reminded the members that the VA  
21 issue has been addressed and the resolution is in process.  
22

23 The discussion continued from the floor. It is important to remember that this was based on a  
24 response to a survey to which only 16% responded. This led to the conclusion that the senate  
25 model is the preferred model. Virtually all of the people that voted for the weighted model were  
26 from basic science departments. The preferred model is only preferred if you consider the  
27 mechanism by which the choices were solicited. The conclusion is that we need to go to  
28 institutional representation. Seems to me like a non-sequitur – on one hand saying all are equal  
29 and asked to assume self-evident why institutional representation is more fair and equal. We  
30 represent faculty from every department and institution and made an asterisk to the VA problem  
31 that we are dealing with.  
32

33 Faculty Council represents departments irrespective of from what institution they come.  
34 Representation by institution seems self-evident as it reflects divisiveness because they compete  
35 for patients, and it will bleed into the academic area as well. For the first time we are  
36 considering 3-4 representatives. For people who are arguing for more representation, we are  
37 going in the opposite direction instead of as in the case of the VA who are adding more. This  
38 representation of faculty, the values we are optimizing, this is old, not modern, and needs to be  
39 updated. Those are different kinds of values, managerial.  
40

41 Dean Davis remarked that we might have our solutions out of sequence. We have a proposal to  
42 enfranchise the VA and to also bring forward the option of remote voting, both with the goal of  
43 increasing participation for people who have difficulty making it to Faculty Council to have a  
44 voice. Any restructuring might be appropriately delayed. Seventy-six people at executive  
45 committee is a lot. First, you do the things for the VA and remote voting, and then consider what

1 kind of structure would be most useful given those changes. The Dean reiterated that she is  
2 neither for nor against the senate model, she just thinks that the sequence is out of whack.

3  
4 Discussion from the floor continued. A motion was made to postpone and a point of order was  
5 raised. The vote that was put forward for this meeting was to vote specifically for the senate  
6 model and does not dissuade Faculty Council to discuss it if voted down. The only vote to be  
7 postponed is the vote on the senate model.

8  
9 Dr. Chakrapani clarified that when making a motion to postpone and seconded you must give a  
10 specific date or postpone indefinitely; it cannot be tabled. I want to postpone indefinitely the  
11 vote on the senate model. The postponing was superior to the motion. The end debate is  
12 superior to the postponement. We cannot debate that, we have to vote. If get 2/3 then we end  
13 the debate and go to vote.

14  
15 A motion was made and seconded to end the debate. There being no further discussion, a vote  
16 was taken. 33 were in favor, 4 were opposed, and 0 abstained. The motion passes.

17  
18 The Chair stated that someone would have to be recognized to unpostpone it, to bring the issue  
19 before the committee, and then back to it again. If it is moved to postpone it is postponed until it  
20 is brought back. If this motion passes, the vote on the senate model is postponed indefinitely. If  
21 it does not pass we go back to the main motion. If someone wants to discuss, they move to  
22 postpone the vote on the senate model indefinitely.

23  
24 A motion was made and seconded to postpone discussion on the senate model indefinitely.  
25 There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 21 were in favor, 20 were opposed, and 0  
26 abstained. The motion passes.

27  
28 **Remote Participation Amendment -- Bylaws Recommendation on the Language (Darin**  
29 **Croft)**

30 Darin Croft presented the Bylaws recommendations to the language on the remote participation  
31 amendment.

32  
33 3.1 Purpose and Functions of Faculty Council -- voted to insert the text below beginning with  
34 when members cannot attend:

35  
36 “When members cannot attend the Faculty Council meeting at the physical location specified in  
37 person, Faculty Council shall allow for electronic attendance and voting as long as: 1) the  
38 quorum will be determined at the beginning of the meeting by posting the roll call (i.e.names of  
39 those in attendance in the room and attending remotely), and will be monitored throughout the  
40 meeting; 2) a majority of the votes cast, or a greater proportion as indicated by the adopted  
41 Parliamentary Authority, shall be necessary for the adoption of motions; and 3) the technology  
42 used for electronic meetings shall allow the members full access to and full participation in all  
43 meeting transactions in real time. The Dean is requested to provide administrative support for  
44 this purpose.”  
45

1 The Bylaws Committee was not unanimous in supporting this language. Bylaws notes in the  
2 margin of things that they discussed or did not agree with unanimously, but did not include in the  
3 text.

4  
5 As far as taking attendance for remote people, one option could be to have a representative in the  
6 conference room or Zoom as software. With Zoom, when people log in with their own accounts  
7 you can see who is attending, or in a remote location using a conference room the it could be  
8 stated that the following 5 or 10 people are here and then go back to the secretary. From a  
9 technology perspective, this is acceptable.

10  
11 One Faculty Council representative stated that they cannot support voting remotely because  
12 meeting in person is an integral part of the democratic process. It was then clarified that we are  
13 not voting on the main motion but only on the language that the Bylaws Committee has put into  
14 the text.

15  
16 It was suggested that a location (conference room) could be designated at each site where people  
17 could gather. It would be easy to record if they are there, and they would be able to interact with  
18 each other. This would not exclude members e.g. clinicians from participating from their office  
19 computer or laptop. A designated location is just another option.

20  
21 The members were reminded that the motion for the concept to allow remote voting has already  
22 been approved. We fully anticipate, however, that it will have to be revisited for some tweaking.

23  
24 A motion was made and seconded to approve the remote participation amendment of the bylaws.  
25 There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 32 were in favor, 3 were opposed, and 0  
26 abstained. The motion passes.

27  
28 **Proposal 3 of the Faculty Proposed Amendment Petition (and Bylaws Recommendation)**  
29 **(Danny Manor – Darin Croft)**

30 Proposal 3 deals with the composition of the Nomination and Elections Committee. NEC  
31 currently is composed of eleven members: the Dean; 2 clinical and 2 pre-clinical Faculty  
32 Council members; 2 clinical and 2 pre-clinical faculty who are not Faculty Council members, the  
33 Faculty Council Chair, and Faculty Council Vice-Chair.

34  
35 We are trying to keep the number of committee members at 11. The NEC finds candidates to  
36 serve on committees, casting the widest net possible. The NEC composition of Proposal 3 is  
37 comprised of the Dean, five Faculty Council members (one from each institution), and five  
38 faculty who are not Faculty Council members (one from each institution). The Faculty Council  
39 Chair and Faculty Council Vice-Chair are not included. The Bylaws proposal includes the Dean,  
40 3 Faculty Council members (at least 2 from basic science departments), five faculty who are not  
41 Faculty Council members (one from each institution), the Faculty Council Chair and Vice-Chair.

42  
43 When asked what data substantiates that the people who served from institutions on the NEC are  
44 primarily clinicians, it was stated that the data was not readily available. We would hope to  
45 increase the number of hospital faculty on NEC. This would get closest to what we already  
46 have. In general, clinical faculty spend time with other clinicians, basic science with basic

1 science. If there is that openness, three representatives from Faculty Council in general. With  
2 regard to Faculty Council members, there are 18 representatives from UHCCMC, 16 from  
3 MHMC, 12+ from Cleveland Clinic, and 13 from basic sciences. In the distribution of people on  
4 the roster, clinicians outnumber the basic sciences.

5  
6 We did not have a strong notion one way or the other if it is important for the chair or vice chair  
7 to be on NEC. There is a great deal of importance to establish those relationships down the road.

8  
9 A motion was made and seconded that we accept the Bylaws recommendations with the  
10 exception that we strike at least two members from the basic science departments. The floor was  
11 then opened to discussion. The single most important thing about this committee is that many  
12 slots on these committees are filled for a good part of the year. Since our sole job is to appoint  
13 people to put up for election, it is important to have many contacts. That is the reason for the  
14 way that the proposal is crafted.

15  
16 If you want the amendment as is, you should cast your vote against this and then we can move to  
17 amend the motion. We want to keep our eye on the original text -- 4 basic science to 4 clinical.  
18 We have actually moved a far bit over by the clinical scientists.

19  
20 The motion was made and seconded to approve the subsidiary motion to approve the Bylaws  
21 recommendation to proposal 3. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 21 were in  
22 favor, 9 were opposed, and 4 abstained. The motion passes.

23  
24 A motion was made to end the discussion, but was not seconded.

25  
26 A motion was then made and seconded that in discussing the amended motion, do you approve  
27 the Bylaws recommendation to proposal 3. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken.  
28 25 were in favor, 7 opposed, and 2 abstained. The motion passes.

29  
30 **Annual Report from the Bylaws Committee**

31 A motion was made and seconded to accept the annual report from the Committee on Bylaws.  
32 There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 29 were in favor, 3 were opposed, and 1  
33 abstained. The motion passes.

34  
35 **Proposal for the Awards Committee**

36 To increase the number of faculty who are nominated for awards and honors nationally and  
37 internationally, we propose creating an Awards sub-committee, appointed by Faculty Council.  
38 This committee will work hand-in-hand with Chairs of Departments and Centers to identify new  
39 and existing opportunities for CWRU faculty at every rank, and increase the number of faculty  
40 members at CWRU who receive awards/honors. We would be working with the department  
41 chairs, as well as center directors, to create a nomination process and assist faculty in  
42 determining if and when they should apply for various honors/awards. We have come up with a  
43 mechanism for crafting materials, and a template to move this forward. The committee would  
44 consist of 4-6 members at different career stages from across the SOM, who will initially meet  
45 monthly, and then quarterly.

1 A motion was made and seconded to accept this proposal to create an ad hoc Awards Committee  
2 of Faculty Council. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 22 were in favor, 2  
3 were opposed, and 2 abstained. It was noted that at this time we no longer have a quorum.  
4 Faculty Council will revisit this topic at a future meeting.

5  
6 There being no further business to be addressed, the meeting was adjourned at 5:42PM.

7  
8 Respectfully submitted,

9  
10 Joyce Helton

# Summary of ad hoc Committee HEC

## Report to David Miller, Chair of the FS

This committee is an *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Senate convened at the April FS ExCom meeting. The members of this committee are:

- Mark Hans, Chair, SODM
- Allison Webel SON  
Chris Winkelman SON  
Evelyn Duffy SON  
Laura Voith MSASS  
Maureen McEnery SOM  
Renato Roperto SODM  
Theresa Jasinevicius SODM  
Thomas Kelley SOM  
Darin Croft SOM
- Andrew Reimer, FS Personnel Committee
- Mendel Singer, FS Budget Committee

**Purpose of the ad hoc committee: "To gather information from faculty, share this information with faculty and the Faculty Senate, and make recommendations on behalf of faculty."**

Meetings- There have been six meetings. One organizational, the second to discuss faculty response to the announcement of the creation of our committee, and three with other groups involved in the HEC transition IPE committee chairs, Ellen Lubbers and Kathy Cole-Kelly, and HEC building manager- Kevin Malinowski, from CBRE.

- We determined there is no overlap with our charge and the IPE committees' goals and activities after meeting with E. Lubbers [IPE] and K. Cole Kelly [IPE transition]. The IPE committees are concerned with IPE education curriculum and faculty team building--not the communication between administration and faculty regarding the HEC transition.
- We met with the Deans of the HEC schools at the Provost's request (our sixth meeting on 7/19).

# Recurrent issues identified by faculty include:

- Signage is a hot button issue with faculty who feel that the value of our academic affiliation with CWRU is being diminished.
- Persistent confusion and concern over the ownership of the land and buildings exists.
- A feeling of being undervalued during the transition process.
- Although attention was paid to the "hardware" upgrades that would occur with the new buildings at the HEC, little effort was expended to insure "software" compatibility.
- The physical separation of clinical and teaching activities from research activities.
- Does this signal a decline in the importance of scholarship as part of the classic academic triad of research, teaching and service?

# Action Items suggested by the HEC Transition Committee:

- Establish a temporary "landing area support kiosk " for faculty traveling from the CWRU campus to the HEC campus; we see this as an urgent strategy to meet the HEC goals of being both welcoming and committed to interprofessional education.
  - This is an urgent item as temporary/transient and new faculty will be arriving to this campus in the upcoming days and weeks.
- Identify strategies to welcome and orient faculty--particularly part-timers, guest lecturers, and intermittent speakers who provide essential content and value to our programs at the HEC. Make this unified across schools and inclusive across categories of faculty.

# Action Items suggested by the HEC Transition Committee (cont....)

- Publicize [hec.case.edu](http://hec.case.edu) as the main information portal for anything related to the HEC; should be used to:
  - Disseminate up-to-date information about topics noted above
  - Provide information/FAQ for faculty anticipating a visit to the HEC
  - Provide a mechanism for easy feedback about HEC issues that arise (e.g., web form that is appropriately routed for follow-up reply and response)
- Clarify the importance of scholarship as a primary faculty activity.
- Clarify the status of signage; discuss the anticipated/future changes to signage.
- Clarify the ownership of the Samson Pavilion and the Dental Clinic.
- Note: the ad hoc committee recommend that staff also have a committee or other avenue to voice concerns, find solutions, and strategize processes of work in the HEC.

## **Proposal for Creation of a School of Medicine Awards and Honors Committee**

Regionally, nationally and internationally a large number of ground-breaking and discipline-specific honors and awards are given to individuals who advance various biomedical fields, be it in research, service or teaching. Identification of opportunities and crafting of materials describing these extraordinary accomplishments is left to individual faculty, who may be unaware that they can and should apply for honors and awards, or may not be experienced in crafting materials. Many organizations send repeated requests for awards and honors applications because an insufficient number of individuals submit materials, or the applications received are not judged worthy because they are poorly constructed, not necessarily because they are not meritorious; junior faculty particularly underestimate the value of their work. To increase the number of faculty who are nominated to awards and honors nationally and internationally, we propose creating an Awards sub-committee, appointed by Faculty Council. This committee will work hand-in-hand with Chairs of Departments and Centers to identify opportunities for CWRU faculty to be nominated to various awards/honors.

### **Purpose:**

1. To identify new and existing opportunities for faculty at every rank, and increase the number of faculty members at CWRU-SOM who receive awards/honors
2. To create a nomination process and assist faculty in determining if and when they should apply for various honors/awards
3. To recommend procedures for crafting materials including producing templates for some very important awards/honors

### **Committee Member role:**

1. Develop a searchable listing of honors and awards, eligibility, frequency, deadlines (to the extent possible)
2. Solicit nominations in conjunction with Department and Center Chairs
3. Review materials submitted and suggest edits based on description of the opportunity or general knowledge of the field
4. Create a databank of materials for faculty to utilize as samples
5. Create an annual honor roll to submit to the Dean/Provost/President

### **Membership and size of the committee:**

1. 4-6 members at different career stages from across the SOM; no more than one member from any department or center to have the broadest representation
2. Chair should be at least Associate Professor or above with general knowledge of meritorious awards/honors such as the Nobel Prize, National Academies, AAAS Fellows program, and at least one discipline-specific award/honor

### **Time Commitment and Resources:**

1. The first year will probably be the most intense as uniform procedures and guides do not exist, and the committee may need to meet monthly to advance the agenda. Once a regular agenda is established quarterly meetings (or less, if work can be done online, or via Zoom) may suffice.
2. IT support to develop the database and centralize materials