

#### Faculty Council Meeting Meeting Minutes Monday, March 18, 2019 4:00-5:30PM – BRB 105

| 4:00-4:05PM  | Welcome and Chair's Comments  | Sudha Chakrapani |
|--|---|------------------|
| 4:05-4:07PM  | Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the<br>February 18, 2019 Meeting     | Sudha Chakrapani |
| 4:07-4:10PM  | Steering Committee Activities Report  | Gary Clark       |
| 4:10-4:20PM  | Presentation on the Proposal to use Dental and<br>Nursing School Buildings as Daycare | Bill Merrick     |
| 4:20-4:40PM  | Bylaws Presentation   | Darin Croft      |
| 4:40-4:50PM  | Report on Faculty Senate Activities   | Danny Manor      |
| 4:50-5:10PM  | Update on Diversity Related Issues in the SOM   | Sana Loue        |
| 5:10-5:15PM  | International Ranking Initiatives   | Molly Watkins    |
| 5:15-5:30PM Discussion of Faculty Petition on Bylaws Amendment |   | Danny Manor      |
|  | New Business  |                  |
|  | Adjourn   |                  |

#### **Members Present**

Corinne Bazella Robert Bonomo David Buchner Cathleen Carlin Sudha Chakrapani Shu Chen Gary Clark Travis Cleland Brian D'Anza Piet de Boer Philipp Dines Jennifer Dorth Judith French Anna Maria Hibbs Beata Jasztrzebska Hung-Ying Kao David Katz Allyson Kozak Laura Kreiner Varun Kshettry Cynthia Kubu Suet Kam Lam Maria Cecilia Lansang Charles Malemud Danny Manor Maureen McEnery Clifford Packer Nimitt Patel P. Ramakrishnan Satya Sahoo Scott Simpson Jochen Son-Hing Phoebe Stewart Charles Sturgis James Howard Swain Daniel Sweeney Melissa Times Patricia Taylor Krystal Tomei

| <u>Members Present</u> |                      |                        |
|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| (Continued)            |                      |                        |
| Monica Gerrek          | Rekha Mody           | Carlos Trombetta       |
| Sherine Ghafoori       | Vincent Monnier      | Anna Valujskikh        |
| Zachary Grimmett       | Vicki Noble          | <b>Richard Zigmond</b> |
|                        |                      |                        |
| <u>Members Absent</u>  |                      |                        |
| Tracey Bonfield        | Irina Jaeger         | Ben Roitberg           |
| Pamela Davis           | Stathis Karathanasis | Barbara Snyder         |
| William Dupps          | Jennifer McBride     | Patricia Thomas        |
| Mahmoud Ghannoum       | Clifford Packer      | Kristin Voos           |
| Hannah Hill            | Hilary Petersen      |                        |
|                        |                      |                        |
| <u>Others Present</u>  |                      |                        |
| Nicole Deming          | Joyce Helton         | Jae-Sung Cho           |
| Todd Emch              | -                    | ÷                      |
|                        |                      |                        |

## Chair Announcements (Sudha Chakrapani)

Sudha Chakrapani called the meeting to order at 4:00PM and presented a brief summary of the agenda items that would be addressed at the meeting. Dr. Darin Croft's Bylaws presentation will be postponed to the April 15 Faculty Council Meeting. The third meeting of the SOM faculty with Dean Davis is scheduled for Wednesday, May 29, from 4-5:30PM in Room E401 in the Robbins Building. The deadline to submit topics for this meeting was March 11. Faculty Council will vote on these topics during the April 15 meeting.

Dr. Chakrapani provided an update on the draft letter to the UH leadership. As the result of a survey sent out to faculty last year, a letter had been drafted by Anna Maria Hibbs highlighting the concerns of faculty. Discussion on the letter was postponed at the June Faculty Council meeting last year when Dean Davis informed the council changes would be forthcoming, subsequent to the UH affiliation agreement, that could affect the content of the letter. Recently, Nicole Deming reached out to the UH representatives to determine the status of the letter and what steps were to be taken next. Jennifer Dorth volunteered to take the lead, and, after a discussion with Ana Maria Hibbs, concluded that with all of the changes that took place over the last year, if a letter were to be crafted, it should be started from scratch with new input solicited from faculty, and see how things shaped up with the new changes at UH.

#### Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the February 18, 2019 Meeting

Prior to today's meeting, some changes had been suggested and incorporated into the meeting minutes. These edited minutes were presented to the council for their review. A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes from the February 18 Faculty Council meeting with the changes that were made. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 28 were in favor, 1 was opposed, and 1 abstained. The motion passes.

#### Steering Committee Activities Report (Gary Clark)

Gary Clark, Chair-Elect of Faculty Council, provided a summary of items discussed at the February 25 Faculty Council Steering Committee meeting. The committee reviewed the draft presentation on CWRU's international rankings and discussed the status of the bylaws amendment petition. They reviewed the SOM

CAPT's recommendations for equity, which included faculty packets for promotion and tenure. They also provided advice to Dean Davis on emeritus and chair appointments.

## <u>Presentation on the Proposal to use Dental and Nursing School Buildings as Daycare (Bill</u> <u>Merrick)</u>

When polled in the past, salaries and daycare have been two primary topics of concern. Since that time, while there have been a number of discussions about possible daycare facilities, to date there is no plan for a daycare on this campus.

As occupants of the Dental and Nursing School buildings transition to the HEC, the mothballing of these buildings presents an opportunity to utilize this space and create a daycare center on campus. Both of those buildings have easy access to parking and are centrally located. When asked why the SOM should get involved, it was noted that basically half of the Case-based faculty, and half of the staff, reside in the SOM. Half of the 6,000 employees are representatives of the SOM. Assuming some are older and would not have children of daycare age, the remaining one-third of faculty and staff could still total 1,000 individuals.

Dr. Merrick's presentation commented that local daycare facilities usually have no more than 50 children at their facility. He stated that financially, there would be enough utilization of the daycare to justify the expense. Dr. Merrick acknowledged that the cost of renovating one of the buildings making it suitable for daycare has yet to be explored, but that there was space and parking availability, making it a viable consideration.

Dr. Merrick stated that there is uncertainty regarding space needs and utilization in the Dental School, based on the potential UH acquisition of half of the Wolstein Building. The Dental School may, in fact, continue to be occupied for an extended period of time, or they may move to the HEC. He also noted that among the Dental and Nursing Schools, the medical school, and Cleveland Clinic, \$600 Million was dedicated to the HEC; to date no money has been allocated for a daycare facility.

Dr. Merrick is seeking Faculty Council's endorsement of the resolution to ask the Dean of the School of Medicine to support the establishment of a daycare center as the SOM represents roughly half of the population of CWRU faculty and staff. A survey may be required to obtain a more accurate number to secure the Dean's approval. This proposal was sent to the Faculty Senate Chair and the past Faculty Senate Chair who both felt the idea had merit. The proposal was also sent to President Snyder and the Provost with no response to date.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the motion to have Faculty Council endorse the proposal from Bill Merrick then send to the Dean for her support. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 31 were in favor, 2 were opposed, and 3 abstained. The motion passes.

Dr. Merrick will prepare a draft letter and submit to the Faculty Council Steering Committee for review and then presented to Faculty Council for a vote.

Dr. Chakrapani informed the council that since Dr. Croft is out of town, the Bylaws presentation has been postponed to the next Faculty Council meeting scheduled for April 15.

## Faculty Senate Report (Danny Manor)

A presentation was given by the Vice-Provost regarding the numbers for SOM faculty. The Thinkers is a new group created by the Vice-Provost to identify and assess strategic choices for Case Western Reserve's future.

The data was released in response to concerns regarding undergrad teaching. It included a presentation about the number of faculty appointments in the school and the university from 2004-5 to last year. It was noted that there was a drop in the total number of faculty. If the SOM is excluded, that number starts to increase which implies that the number of faculty of the SOM has dropped since then.

The data related to the numbers begins in 2005 with 375 tenured faculty, and then drops. The values in the y-axis indicate that the number of faculty is about 300; this number does not seem to be accurate. The issue here is that the manner in which the Provost's Office counts us is based on payroll (specifically payroll data presented to the federal government) which presents a number of complications.

The question is not how they do analyses, but what can be concluded from those analyses. The Offices of Finance and Faculty Affairs were asked to count the total School of Medicine full time faculty appointments. Based on that number, the trend for faculty in the SOM is going up, with an increase in tenured faculty in the basic sciences, and an increase in non-tenure track faculty across departments.

In contrast, if we look at political science faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, tenured faculty as well as tenure track faculty, the total number has gone up. The numbers are based upon payroll, which works very well for schools where every paycheck is a full time position. In the SOM, many faculty are not paid by Case. It is unclear how the Provost counted faculty that are partially paid by Case? There have also been a number of administrative changes in how faculty payroll has been handled over the past two decades. If a faculty member comes off the Case payroll and goes to the hospital, they drop off the Provost's list even though there has been no change in faculty activities or contributions to CWRU. They are still full time but the faculty paymaster has changed.

This is an opportunity to analyze trends and numbers for our school. One option would be to invite the Dean, Matthew Lester, or Nicole Deming to analyze the data and present it to us. It is premature to be worrying about conclusions based on these numbers.

There was a perception that tenured and tenure track positions are no longer offered in clinical department, but this applies only those appointments at CCLCM. The definition of full-time faculty appointments is defined and approved by the Board of Trustees. No analysis was done for part time faculty. There is also a difference between CWRU employee rights and CWRU Faculty rights.

All hospital affiliates, other than Cleveland Clinic, have tenure track and tenured faculty. All tenure track and tenured offers must be approved by the Dean and Provost. The last time the SOM faculty approved and changed criteria for appointments, promotions and award of tenure was 2006, this impacted the number of faculty receiving tenure and those that were eligible for the tenure track.

## **Provost's Thinkers Group:**

According to the strategic plan for Provost Vinson and his office, part of the selected team of Thinkers that will guide that process are Kurt Stange, Paul Tesar, Joan Schenkel, and Eileen Anderson-Fye.

Kurt Stange stated to the members that it is a bottom up process. The strategic plan, which will roll things out, covers a 3-5 period. The starting point revolves around a common vision to determine where we need to invest resources. The goal is to have a document (approximately 2-5 pages long) which will serve as a starting point for further things. Every Thursday the Case Daily will detail ways in which one can become involved. If you google CWRU Thinkbig (one word) you will be taken to a webpage to enter your Case ID. You will be taken to various forms allowing input to be submitted. Small groups on research education and structure are in the middle of a process right now.

Joan Schenkel is currently leading an initiative called "I Grow" to help young investigators in their grant writing. Doing good science also depends on how you propose to do research. Another initiative on a self-reflection process will begin on March 22; the Thinkers will receive feedback from that meeting. We want to look at how we support what we do and make structures more supportive of the work we are doing.

Currently, information is being gathered in three buckets: 1) North Star – a 2-5 page strategic plan; 2) operations and things that we need to do to support faculty and staff to get research and teaching done while making the university more efficient; and 3) teaching and research and the need to support that.

## Update on Diversity Related Issues in the SOM – Sana Loue

The initial vision for the Office of Faculty Development & Diversity was to develop a welcoming, energized and collaborative climate for the faculty, staff and student body, and establish CWRU School of Medicine as a leader in diversity initiatives and faculty development.

The Diversity Strategic Action Plan was developed in 2013 and was up and running in January of 2015. A fairly diverse group of volunteers was solicited to serve (faculty, staff and students from SOM and the four clinical affiliates, including graduate students and a number of staff from other entities such as OIDEO and the LGBT Center). The incorporated feedback was brought back to the Faculty Council Steering Committee and also to leadership.

Goals to increase the numbers of women and diverse faculty, maximize pipeline support, foster diversity of thought and creativity, and maintain diversity as a high-profile issue were outlined.

The faculty search procedures were revamped. It was noted that our standards for search procedures exceeds that developed by the university. Everyone on the search committee must have gone through diversity training specifically for the search committee. There must be a female, or someone identified as an under-represented minority, appointed to serve on each search committee, similar to the Rooney Role adopted by the NFL.

A number of faculty development programs were launched e.g., FLEX, and monthly faculty toolkit sessions were instituted with a similar series for staff. FRAME (Faculty Reaching for Medical Excellence) was developed with a focus to equip faculty members with the kinds of

skills necessary to achieve success in the academic medical center. The annual LGBT Committee dialogue series was launched, as well as the Safe Zone Professional series. A monthly holiday calendar was disseminated starting last year. Diversity 360 training was provided to more than 1,000 SOM faculty, staff, and students.

The number of scholarships for URM increased under Carol Moss and \$1.58 Million has been raised since January 1, 2015. Diversity among graduate and medical students has increased. This year's class included 23% URM students. Collaboration with student groups was enhanced by establishing an annual minority faculty-student meet and greet, mentoring through QGrad, and creating a minority faculty directory.

Some gaps still remain under LCME monitoring for lack of adequate faculty diversity. The results of the diversity needs assessment survey requires serious attention. The survey was disseminated in 2017 to faculty, staff and students (total n=5918). The 774 respondents (13.1% response rate) were divided almost equally among groups (female, not heterosexually identified, nonwhite identified, millennials). Greater than 92% of all groups believe the SOM creates a climate of respect for everyone, with the same percentage believing that faculty, staff, and students are treated with respect.

In the past two years, the survey showed that respondents have been verbally harassed at the SOM because of race-15%, ethnicity-14.8%, sex-15.7%, gender identity-7.5%, sexual orientation-8.4%, religion-13.6%, disability-6.0%, immigration status-7.7% and primary language 11.1%. This is a sizable number that are reporting verbal harassment and micro-aggression.

Electronic harassment, while almost like electronic stalking, can consist of excessive posting on Facebook and social media. Electronic harassment seemed to target the Muslim and Jewish religions. In the past two years, respondents indicated that they were threatened or harassed via e-mail, text messages, or other social media by others at SOM because of their race 5.4%, ethnicity 5.9%, sex 6.1%, gender identity 4.3%, sexual orientation 4.6%, religion 6.5%, disability 3.1%, immigration status 3.7% and primary language 4.4%.

Physical harassment can be anything from being pushed and shoved to sexual assault or battery. In the past two years, respondents have been physically harassed or threatened while at the SOM because of their race 4.3%, ethnicity 4.4%, sex 6.0%, gender identify 3.8%, sexual orientation 3.6%, religion 4.3%, disability 3.1%, immigration status 3.6% and primary language 3.6%. What is important to know is that the verbal, physical, and electronic harassment and /or threats were experienced at all levels (faculty, staff and students), and were effectuated by people at all levels. All suggestions for moving forward all welcome.

Almost 50 faculty, staff and students have volunteered to be on the committee to develop the next 5-year Diversity Strategic Action Plan 2020-2024, to be presented to Faculty Council and leadership by the end of this year for a January 1, 2020 launch.

In response to a question as to how professionalism can be promoted at all levels of the SOM, Dr. Loue responded that there are some mechanisms in place. The complaint information can be given to OIDEO who will follow up with an investigation, to call the integrity hotline or the Sexual Harassment Title IX Officer. If someone reports sexual harassment to you, you are legally required to report the incident to the Title IX Officer. Failure to report opens the university to huge liability issues.

Dr. Loue is in the process of e-mailing the department chairs and their assistants to request a date to meet with faculty (and perhaps staff) to discuss some Title IX issues. There have been a number of incidents over the last few years where either faculty did not know the acceptable limits of behavior, or chose to ignore it.

Given that 2017 was not that long ago, we will probably wait a couple years to send out another survey. It is hoped that a shortened survey will increase the response rate while still providing comparable data to what we have now.

The Pipeline consists of a number of programs existing within the SOM that are geared for students, and particularly for women and underrepresented minorities, with the goal of maximizing their chances of upward trajectory.

While we are not tracking retention specifically, we are looking at information that comes to us through the exit interviews. Unfortunately, we cannot do much about what is occurring on a clinical site. It is a little different with the basic science departments. We can look at what we can do better, what changes should we make, and if patterns are noted within certain departments. The frequency of data occurrences is posted on the Case website, but is not broken down by school.

Any suggestions or comments can be directed to Dr. Loue at (216) 368-3743 or by e-mail at sana.loue@case.edu.

## International Ranking Initiatives – International Affairs – Molly Watkins

While there are 23 international rankings, Case's concern is with the top three. They are used to predict whether a university will be judged as a global research university or a regional one. While rankings should not be the only criteria for rating a university, they are being used as a measure by students and research collaborators.

The rankings first came out in 2003 and since then CWRU's ranking has consistently dropped. This is not related to how good, strong or weak CWRU is. Universities around the world are now looking at scholarship, how they communicate and collaborate. This is a zero sum game. They go up we go down. It is not a reflection of how good or bad we are. In the past, unfortunately we did not count faculty the way international rankers ask us to count faculty. We have had to shift the way we report data to match what the rankers are looking for.

When we looked at the bibliometric databases, we learned that only about 200 variations of CWRU were being pulled. There are about 650 variations of CWRU. All the variations that were missed were excluded in the count for the rankings. We are in the process of doing a data clean up and faculty can help us to report information more accurately.

This is extremely important because it affects collaborations and partnerships, student recruitment and scholarships, faculty recruitment, and certainly influences international reputation and funding. We have been told that we cannot work with you because you are not ranked in the top 100.

Last year we created a rankings initiative (International Rankings Working Group) and divided the tasks into a clean-up of data, with the goal of looking beyond that to see what we can do to make the university better.

The current emphasis is on data clean up. CWRU faculty members must make sure that CWRU is listed as the primary affiliation. We are already rolling out and setting up the ORCID Ids. An Id that is designated specifically to you for your research.

If you are involved in collaborations, try to bring those conferences to Case. In our initiative, we are working very diligently on finding funding and the personnel to help support bringing people from other countries to our campus. Faculty who have an opportunity to do this should contact Molly Watkins Mxw352@case.edu to determine what assistance is available. It was suggested that when travelling, talk to people about CWRU. With a little extra effort, we can improve the reputation of the university, and obtain more funding, more students, and more collaboration.

It is a requirement of a faculty appointment that the faculty affiliation is indicated. We are currently working with IT from each area and individuals from our library. Dean Davis brought this issue up with Jim Young, CCLCM of CWRU. If we can correctly count faculty we should be able to be ranked within the top 50 schools.

## Discussion of Faculty Petition on the Bylaws Amendments (Danny Manor)

It was noted that this issue would be discussed, but not voted upon, today. A point of order was raised. The Bylaws Committee has requested an advocate for these amendments to meet with the Bylaws Committee. They felt the language was not clear and conflicted with the structure currently in bylaws regarding the Nominations & Election Committee.

The Bylaws Committee anticipated that this meeting would happen prior to being presented to Faculty Council. The question was posed as to how this is an item on the agenda.

Discussion at the Faculty Council Steering Committee meeting focused on introducing this to Faculty Council with the hope that the representatives would take this information back to their respective departments for their input, and then be ready for discussion when the Bylaws Committee came to Faculty Council. A point of order raised stated that it should not be on the agenda because it is going to the Bylaws Committee on Friday. Dr. Chakrapani stated that the point is not well taken, that this is not out of order, but the decision of the Chair can be challenged.

A motion was made and seconded to appeal her decision, and the floor was opened for discussion.

A decision was made, based on a Faculty Council Steering Committee vote, to add this to the Faculty Council meeting agenda. Danny Manor will meet with the Bylaws Committee next week. It was proposed that it is going to be constructive for people here not to move on any actions right now, but to take this back to their constituents and be prepared for discussion when the Bylaws committee addresses it in May.

The motion is that the decision of the Faculty Council Steering Committee to put this presentation on the agenda has been challenged. If it is the Chair's decision to call that it is not a

point of order, and if this motion passes, it will be taken out of the agenda for today's meeting. If the motion does not pass, we will continue.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the motion to appeal the Chair's decision to keep this presentation on the agenda. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 14 were in favor, 16 were opposed, and 4 abstained. The motion does not pass.

There were a total of 59 signatures on the faculty-sponsored petition to amend the SOM bylaws, and 41 signatures on the clarification petition. The petition by faculty is one mechanism to propose an amendment to the bylaws of the SOM. The language and spirit of the petition came through the ad hoc presentation, with the goal of ensuring fair and adequate representation for all faculty members.

The change for Article 3.5 Officers of the Faculty Council suggested that the chairperson be rotated throughout the five institutions. The purpose is to ensure a way of going forward. The overall responsibilities fall to the Executive Committee. It would make more sense if there had to be at least one representative from each of the five institutions on the Faculty Council Steering Committee. Then there would be no need to worry about term limits; one recipe to ensure diversity. Nothing in the current bylaws precludes anyone from any institution from putting their name forward. A fairer way to do this might be to look at the structure of the Faculty Council Steering Committee rather than alternating, since the institutions are not the same size.

Right now, there are seven units at the VA and only one representative. It is time we start to address that and maybe have a formal task force at the VA to address increasing their representation. There are 304 faculty members at the VA and the academic landscape has changed. Historically, the representation of the VA faculty has been through UH. It was noted that many times people who are representing the VA are not familiar with the issues. It was suggested that specific language regarding the VA could be added to the amendment.

For quite some time, the only ones eligible for the Chair-Elect position are those people in their first year on Faculty Council. It has been very difficult recruiting candidates who were willing to run. Restricting the schools further could be making the problem worse. One option would be to expand the entire Faculty Council.

The Bylaws Committee has the petition and it will be addressed next month. Content will once again come up for discussion.

## **New Business**

Dr. Kubu would like to put a motion on the floor to add Dr. Bonomo and his colleagues at the VA to the next agenda to discuss how to increase VA faculty representation to Faculty Council. The motion was then seconded and the floor was opened for discussion.

It was suggested that Dr. Bonomo could have a discussion with his colleagues at the VA and determine if the departments can be created at the VA to allow for direct representation. The VA could begin with creating a few academic departments and expand from there similar to the approach taken by CCLCM. The Dean's support and approval is required. Dr. Bonomo will initiate a conversation with the Dean that has the support of the different services at the VA.

A motion was made and seconded that Dr. Robert Bonomo will present the outcome of his conversation with Dean Davis regarding increasing faculty representation for the VA, to Faculty Council at the April meeting. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 28 were in favor, 2 were opposed, and 2 abstained. The motion passes.

There being no further agenda items to be addressed, Dr. Chakrapani adjourned the meeting at 5:47PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Helton

## **Meeting of the School of Medicine Faculty Council**

March 18, 2019 BRB 105 4:00 p.m.

Sudha Chakrapani, PhD, (Physiology and Biophysics), Chair Gary Clark, MD, (MetroHealth), Chair-Elect Phoebe Stewart, PhD (Pharmacology), Past-Chair Nicole Deming, JD, MA, Assistant Dean For Faculty Affairs and Human Resources Secretary of Faculty of Medicine



## **Faculty Council Meeting Agenda**

- 4:00 Chair Announcements
- 4:05 Approval of Minutes from February 18, 2019
- 4:07 Steering Committee Activities Report (Gary Clark)
- 4:10 Presentation on the Proposal to use Dental and Nursing School Buildings as Daycare (Bill Merrick)
- 4:20 Continuation of Bylaws Presentation on Article 4 amendments (Darin Croft)
- 4:40 Report on Faculty Senate Activities (Danny Manor)
- 4:50 Update on Diversity Related Issues in the SOM (Sana Loue)
- 5:10 International Ranking Initiatives (Molly Watkins)
- 5:15 Discussion of Faculty Petition on Bylaws Amendments (Danny Manor)

New Business Adjourn



## **Chair Announcements**

Third meeting of the SOM Faculty with Dean Davis is scheduled for Wednesday May 29<sup>th</sup> at 4.00-5.30 PM in Room E401, Robbins Bldg.

Deadline to receive the topics was March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2019. The FC will vote on the topics during the April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

<u>From SOM Bylaws Article 2.4</u>: 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.



## **Chair Announcements**

• Update on the draft letter to the UH



Approval of February 18<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes.



# Do you approve Minutes from the February 18<sup>th</sup> meeting?



## Steering Committee Activities Report Meeting Date: February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**Members Present:** Sudha Chakrapani (Chair), Gary Clark (Chair-Elect), Phoebe Stewart (Past-Chair), Shu Chen, Cynthia Kubu, Danny Manor, Vincent Monnier, and Charles Malemud

- Reviewed the draft presentation on CWRU international ranking.
- Discussed the status of the Bylaws amendment petition.
- Reviewed SOM CAPT recommendations for equity. These included faculty packets for promotion and tenure.
- Provided advice to the Dean on Emeritus appointments and Chair appointments.



## Presentation on the Proposal to use Dental and Nursing School Buildings as

**Daycare (Bill Merrick)** 



# Do you approve the motion to have FC endorse the proposal from Bill merrick to be sent to the Dean?

31 A. Yes B. No C. Abstain 2



Bylaws presentation on amendments to Article 4 (Darin Croft)



Report on Faculty Senate activities (Danny Manor)



Update on Diversity Related Issues in the SOM (Sana Loue)



International Ranking Initiatives (Molly Watkins)



**Discussion of Faculty Petition on Bylaws Amendments** (Danny Manor)



Do you approve the motion to appeal chair's decision to keep this presentation on the agenda





**New Business** 





**Faculty Council Meeting Draft Meeting Minutes** Monday, February 18, 2018 4:00-5:30PM – BRB 105

| 4:00-4:05PM | Welcome and Chair's Comments  | Sudha Chakrapani |
|-------------|---|------------------|
| 4:05-4:07PM | Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the<br>December 17, 2018 and January 28, 2019 Meetings | Sudha Chakrapani |
| 4:07-4:10PM | Steering Committee Activities Report  | Gary Clark       |
| 4:10-4:20PM | Faculty Teaching and Rewards  | Dean Davis       |
| 4:20-4:30PM | Report on Faculty Senate Activities   | Danny Manor      |
| 4:30-4:50PM | Bylaws Presentation   | Piet de Boer     |
| 4:50-5:20PM | Discussion of the SOM   | Dean Davis       |
| 5:20-5:30PM | Presentation on the Proposal to use Dental and Nursing<br>School Buildings as a Daycare Center          | Bill Merrick     |
| 5:30PM      | New Business  |                  |
|             | Adjourn   |                  |

#### Members Present

Corinne Bazella Cathleen Carlin Sudha Chakrapani Shu Chen Travis Cleland Brian D'Anza Pamela Davis Piet de Boer Philipp Dines Jennifer Dorth Judith French Sherine Ghafoori Beata Jastrzebska Hung-Ying Kao Stathis Karathanasis Allyson Kozak Laura Kreiner Varun Kshettry Cynthia Kubu Maria Cecilia Lansang Charles Malemud Danny Manor Jennifer McBride Maureen McEnery P. Ramakrishnan Ben Roitberg Satya Sahoo Scott Simpson Jochen Son-Hing Phoebe Stewart Charles Sturgis James Howard Swain Daniel Sweeney Melissa Times Krystal Tomei Anna Valujskikh

|          | Anna Maria Hibbs<br>Hannah Hill  | Clifford Packer<br>Hilary Petersen  | Richard Zigmond            |  |  |  |
|----------|--|---|----------------------------|--|--|--|
|          |  | Thiary retersen   |                            |  |  |  |
|          | Members Absent   |   |                            |  |  |  |
|          | Tracey Bonfield  | Zachary Grimmett  | Nimitt Patel               |  |  |  |
|          | Robert Bonomo  | David Katz  | Barbara Snyder             |  |  |  |
|          | David Buchner  | Suet Kam Lam  | Patricia Taylor            |  |  |  |
|          | Gary Clark   | Rekha Mody  | Patricia Thomas            |  |  |  |
|          | William Dupps  | Vincent Monnier   | Carlos Trombetta           |  |  |  |
|          | Monica Gerrek  | Vicki Noble   | Kristin Voos               |  |  |  |
|          | Mahmoud Ghannoum   |   |                            |  |  |  |
|          |  |   |                            |  |  |  |
|          | Others Present   | T TT 1.   |                            |  |  |  |
| 1        | Nicole Deming  | Joyce Helton  | Darrell Hulisz             |  |  |  |
| 1<br>2   |  |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 2        | Chair Announcements (Sudha   | Chakranani)   |                            |  |  |  |
| 4        |  | lty Council, called the meeting to o                                      | rder at 4:00PM and briefly |  |  |  |
| 5        | outlined the agenda items that wo  |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 6        |  |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 7        |  | ould like to remind faculty and staff                                     |                            |  |  |  |
| 8        |  | at bring distinguished speakers to ca                                     |                            |  |  |  |
| 9        |  | l information, please contact Halle l                                     | Lewis in the SOM Office of |  |  |  |
| 10       | Finance and Administration.  |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 11<br>12 | The SOM Bylaws Article 2.4 stat  | es "A third meeting will have an a  | genda approved by the      |  |  |  |
| 13       | The SOM Bylaws Article 2.4 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". Please         |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 14       |  | g of the SOM Faculty with the Dea   |                            |  |  |  |
| 15       |  | deadline to receive the topics is Ma                                      |                            |  |  |  |
| 16       | Council voting on the topics during  |   | · · · ·                    |  |  |  |
| 17       |  |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 10       | Approval of Faculty Council M  | acting Minutos from the December  | w 17 2018 Monting          |  |  |  |
| 18<br>19 |  | eeting Minutes from the December<br>d to approve the meeting minutes fr   |                            |  |  |  |
| 20       | A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes from the December 17, 2018<br>Faculty Council meeting. Dr. Chakrapani noted that the minutes e-mailed to Faculty Council for |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 21       | review had already been updated with the edits suggested at the January Faculty Council  |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 22       | Meeting. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 27 were in favor, 2 were   |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 23       | opposed, and 1 abstained. The m  |   | ,                          |  |  |  |
| 24       |  | -   |                            |  |  |  |
| 25       | Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes from the January 28, 2019 Meeting  |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 26       | A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes from the January 28, 2019  |   |                            |  |  |  |
| 27       | Faculty Council meeting as edited  | d. The floor was then opened for di                                       | scussion.                  |  |  |  |
| 28       |  | 1. ". 1 C   |                            |  |  |  |
| 29<br>30 |  | d to remove "A number of represen<br>at respondents indicated support (i. |                            |  |  |  |
| 50       | research. Conclusions showed th  | ai respondents mulcated support (1.                                       | e. greater man ~4070 very  |  |  |  |
|          |  |   |                            |  |  |  |
|          |  | 2   |                            |  |  |  |
|          |  |   |                            |  |  |  |

- 1 important or extremely important) or the following". There being no further discussion, a vote
- 2 was taken. 14 were in favor, 14 were opposed, and 4 abstained. The motion does not pass.
- 3

4 There being no further discussion on the original motion to approve the minutes, a vote was

- 5 taken. 26 were in favor, 2 were opposed, and 2 abstained. The motion passes.
- 6

## 7 <u>Steering Committee Activities Report</u>

8 The Faculty Council Steering Committee met on February 4. Sana Loue, Vice Dean, Faculty

9 Development and Diversity, gave a presentation to the FCSC in January on diversity and

10 recruitment initiatives at the SOM. The FCSC has voted in favor to request that Dr. Loue make

11 this presentation to Faculty Council; she has been added to the agenda for the March 18 Faculty

- 12 Council meeting.
- 13

14 The draft presentation of the Bylaws Committee was reviewed. Dr. Bill Merrick discussed his

15 proposal to use the Dental and Nursing School buildings for daycare with the committee. The

16 SOM CAPT recommendations were reviewed for equity (these included faculty packets for

17 promotion and tenure). The FCSC also provided advice to the Dean on Chair appointments.

18

## 19 **Faculty Teaching and Rewards (Dean Pamela Davis)**

20 Dean Davis thanked Faculty Council for inviting her to address the question of the value of

teaching in the medical school. She stated that based on the faculty handbook (1:F1-6), every

- 22 faculty member is expected to have: (i) an expert knowledge of his or her academic field and a
- commitment to continuing development of this competence; (ii) a dedication to effective

teaching; (iii) a commitment to a continuing program of research or other advanced creative

activity, including production of art or artistic performance, or, where more appropriate to the

26 particular academic context, professional service activities; and (iv) a willingness to assume a

- 27 fair share of university administrative and service tasks.
- 28

29 Everyone who holds a faculty appointment in the university and at the SOM is expected to have

a dedication to effective teaching. CWRU values all kinds of teaching from continuing medical

education, residents and fellows, to medical students, physician assistant students, MSA students,

32 Anesthesiology PhD students, Master's students and graduate students. During the summer,

there are a number of high school students that come through Case and receive teaching. We

also go to the John Hay School of Science and Medicine, and have people come here from there.

35 We value the education process; the husbandry of knowledge values all of these activities.

36

37 In the last year, we have reviewed more than 140 packets for promotion and tenure. They have a

38 whole spectrum of teaching activities in their portfolio and this year, as last year and the year

before, people have been promoted for teaching in all of these categories. The SOM values

40 faculty teaching and recognizes teaching excellence through promotions. We value everything

41 that our faculty do, are proud of what they do in the community, and are incredibly proud of the

- 42 student product released from our school at all levels.
- 43

44 Teaching is rewarded and recognized, by MHMC or Cleveland Clinic, and is discussed with the

- department chair at the beginning of each year. This falls under the CARTS analysis and faculty
- 46 expectations and responsibilities change based on the needs of the department and programs and

- 1 skill and availability of the faculty. At UH there is an additional reward if you spend more than
- 2 15 hours in contact with residents a week, 780 hours a year contact with residents. \$11,700 of
- your salary comes from a specific teaching pool and releases for you some of your expectations.
  There is an up-front reward for that.
- 4 The 5
- 6 For faculty employed by CWRU, departments created a set of expectations for merit raises.
- 7 These plan vary by department and were created by the faculty and chair for the department. If
- 8 the department wants to include teaching in a Master's program, undergrad program, medical
- 9 school, running a clerkship, or other, this expectation is included in the metric plan for the
- 10 department and is the accepted criteria for a salary increase. As these metrics evolve, and are
- implemented by the chair every year, the faculty are assessed based on their activities and alignment with the metrics. Rewards are determined at the chair level, and whether something is
- rewarded or not is determined by faculty who determine the criteria for the raise.
- 14
- 15 The SOM, as a whole, values all kinds of teaching. The clinical side can be incorporated into
- 16 your expectations or separately rewarded as release time. In departments, with individuals
- 17 employed by the SOM, criteria for merit raises is discussed by the department, decided by the
- 18 department, and implemented by the chair. Teaching is eminently a valued component, a core
- 19 expectation of what it takes to be a faculty member.
- 20
- 21 The comment was made that in the past chairs have stated that the Dean expects a certain
- number of hours of teaching to medical students. The Dean explained that each department has
- the opportunity to set the criteria for what teaching is included in the department metrics. The
- 24 accountability for medical school teaching is at the level of the chairperson for the whole
- 25 department. The chair accounts for teaching medical students and for running terrific graduate
- 26 programs. Nutrition and Biochemistry turn in dynamite results on the undergraduate programs
- 27 year after year. The chairs are accountable for the participation of their department in the medical
- 28 school teaching.
- 29

## 30 Bylaws Presentation – Piet de Boer

- Dr. de Boer explained that Darin Croft, the chair of the Bylaws Committee was not available to
   present to Faculty Council today.
- 33
- A slide depicting the Bylaws Committee 5-Year Review showed that Articles 1, 2 and 3 have already been presented to Faculty Council. Article 4 Title and 4.1, Article 4.2a (Part 1), Article
- 4.2a-c, and Article 4.2d will be addressed today. The remaining articles and appendix will be
- 37 discussed at a later date.
- 38
- The Division of General Medical Sciences is basically a large department, which is chaired by
- 40 the Dean. To avoid confusion, the heading on Article 4 was changed to Departments, dropping
- "and Division of General Medical Sciences (DGMS)". 4.1 "and Division of General Medical
  Sciences (DGMS) was removed. 4.1a -- Remove "and Division of General Medical Sciences
- 42 (DGMS) and add "Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2 (Organization and...)
- 44
- 45 The bylaws cannot conflict with the Faculty Handbook. A concern was raised that we could be
- 46 deleting something that was added to make the department status more inclusive by adding

- Division of General Medical Sciences. Dean Davis explained that the real difference in the 1 2 Division of General Medical Sciences and a department is that the department is clustered around information while GMS includes centers such as the RNA Center, the Cancer Center, and 3 4 the Center for Community Health Integration. 5 6 The Division of General Medical Sciences creates an opportunity for promotion and tenure 7 without being in a defined academic discipline that is a requirement for the creation of a department. We have seen in Faculty Council the creation of new departments, and one of the 8 factors that has to be satisfied in that demonstration is a clear, distinct body of knowledge that 9 10 represents that discipline. 11 The Division of General Medical Sciences as it is presently constituted takes on the character of 12 the department as it shares the ability to appoint and promote faculty and tenured faculty. 13 The Faculty Handbook defines a department as faculty whose work revolves around a given 14 discipline. DGMS does not meet the Faculty Handbook's definition of a department. The 1986 15 Board of Trustees declared DGMS a department with a different internal structure. For purposes 16 of the bylaws, it does not merit distinction. 17 18 Article 4.2a -- delete "and DGMS", add "to support its", add the word "and" between research 19 and scholarly activities. Add Article VII after Chapter 2, and delete "and full freedom of 20 scholarly investigation and publication of his or her findings (Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2, 21 Section D)." 22 23 24 A motion was made and seconded to approve the amendments proposed to Article 4 Title and 4.1. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 17 were in favor, 9 were opposed, and 25 5 abstained. The motion passes. 26 27 It was commented that in Article 3.2, DGMS was specified as a department and any reference 28 29 after to departments includes therefore making it to include DGMS in later text. 30 31 32 33 A motion was made and seconded to delete "and DGMS" from the first line in Article 4.2. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 24 were in favor, 4 were opposed, and 2 34 abstained. The motion passes. 35 36 37 A motion was made and seconded to approve the changes as noted to Article 4, There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. 14 were in favor, 10 were opposed, and 6 38 39 abstained. The motion passes. 40 Dr. Chakrapani noted that the time allotted for this presentation had concluded and discussion 41 will continue at the March Faculty Council meeting. 42 43 **Discussion of the SOM (Dean Pamela Davis)** 44 Dean Davis compared the parable of the elephant and the blind men to the School of Medicine. 45
- 46 With the elephant representing a large and complex organization, encountering only one piece

makes it difficult to see the whole. Six blind men, when confronted with an elephant, thought it 1 2 to be a tree, a rope, a wall. We are a community asset, we are an educational institution, we train health professionals, we train scientists, we work in the community, we count research, and we 3 4 conduct research in social sciences and very detailed molecular science. We are a composite and a unification that makes us a mighty organization. Separately those things might not be as 5 6 impressive as the whole. It is important to think of all these things as together. 7 8 Clinical programs depend on basic science and clinical components and we would not be able to secure the quality of medical students if we did not have the four clinical affiliates that we have. 9 10 When asked what attracted you to Case, one of the highest ranked items of importance was having the different options for their clinical education. 11 12 13 We have a hospital system that is international and has many programs that are ranked very highly in US News & World Report. UH is a component that is highly regarded and has many 14 people who are known for their academic excellence. Each component brings something special 15 to the picture and is required for our reputation. 16 17 We need all of the research funding that the institutions bring in to compete in the US News 18 rankings. We need the ability in our research programs to seek collaborators who are going to be 19 the best. At Metro, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation has the second highest funding in the 20 21 country. 22 23 The membership in the National Academy matters for the AAU. Five members of the National Academy are from Cleveland Clinic. Contributions from every one of the affiliates assist in 24 making our program strong in education and research. We do better in rankings when combined 25 than any one of us could do alone. We would not have the Comprehensive Cancer Center if we 26 did not have UH and Cleveland Clinic. Investigators that sit at MHMC and the VA participate as 27 well. Funding is dependent on the total research funding brought in. There are many 28 29 collaborative efforts across the institutions including the reinvention of residency education 30 across all of the affiliated hospitals. 31 32 CTSC and the Cancer Center are about to fund a pilot program in Alzheimer's. While it will be led by someone from Cleveland Clinic, much of the clinic activity will be from UH, all 33 integrated and knit together. 34 35 The elephant can be a powerful force for good in the community. The medical school is a 36

- unifying force. It would not be as effective if the medical school were broken into its constituent
   parts. The elephant does not work with only the trunk.
- 39
- 40 While not all affiliates bring the same thing, each is important and unique. We work with all of
- 41 them in educational, research, and community efforts. Kurt Stange recently carried out an
- 42 evaluation of community needs in order to coordinate services among Cleveland Clinic and UH.
- 43 Because MHMC is a public hospital, they are not required to do the community health needs
- 44 assessment, but they still came to the table to assess needs. We are a fighting force when we
- 45 come together.

46

- 1 The units by themselves are relatively modest, but when they come together, they can
- accomplish great things like the Cancer Center, the Digestive Disease Center, and the residencyprogram.
- 4
- 5 We have great PhD programs that pull advisors not only from the basic sciences, but faculty
- 6 based in affiliated hospitals. It is important to think about the strength we have if we stick
- 7 together. It must be made clear that the elephant needs all of his components parts to be the
- 8 powerful organization he can be.
- 9

The comment was made from the audience that there were some concerns when looking at dropping the departmental model. As a department representative, you can attend a meeting or walk the halls and hear the concerns of faculty. The more representation there is in a model, who can speak directly to constituent faculty as representatives, the better the model will be.

- 14
- 15 Other members commented that while coming to Faculty Council is a privilege, the majority of
- 16 what is discussed here is not relevant, and it was felt that the agenda, itself, is not representative
- 17 of the whole faculty.
- 18
- 19 The Dean responded that there are topics that are all encompassing such as commitment to
- 20 community, developing Cleveland, and a commitment to education and research. Those are the
- 21 grist for the mill. Medical education is another topic that impacts all faculty. We can talk about
- the strength of the students. Holistic admissions not versus but in balance with high academic
- achievement admissions. This really is a faculty body trying to make the case that we are oneschool.
- 25

26 Dean Davis gave the example of a situation that occurred a few years ago, right before

- 27 graduation. A young woman was diagnosed with cancer. She planned to attend graduation
- separately by wheelchair, but she was too ill to even do that. It was decided that they would take
- the graduation to her, and two buses were secured to take those students and deans, in full
- 30 academic regalia, who wanted to go. They packed the room. The comment was made that
- maybe we truly are one medical school; they put the students above all.
- 32

The comment was made that it would be very good information for Faculty Council to see the data points in a hard copy. The Dean stated that the teaching proportions shift around from year to year and where the students go for clerkships changes. It is not symmetrical. MHMC does not have the same proportions as Cleveland Clinic or as UH. The blend is the important thing. Data shown by department would really change from year-to-year. The point is that everybody contributes and we need to recognize that everybody contributes.

39

40 The comment was made that we could reserve half an hour in Faculty Council meetings for

- 41 issues that are important and touch us all. We are so diverse it makes it difficult for all agenda
- 42 items to be relevant. We need to determine what our existential point for being here is. The
- 43 underlying theme is that we all matter.
- 44

- A motion was made and seconded that in order to ensure greater engagement with faculty at the 1
- 2 affiliate hospitals, the option for remote participation should be amended in the Bylaws. The motion was seconded and the floor was opened for discussion. 3
- 4
- 5 The Dean stated that remote participation is an important attribute to have in the 21st century.
- External advisory boards meet electronically. We have and will challenge our IT people to make 6
- 7 it a reasonable connection. It was suggested that electronic participation could be limited to
- 8 three meetings. Face-to-Face meetings do provide advantages that remote participation cannot.
- 9
- 10 Off-campus participants have to allow for travel time to the Faculty Council meetings, and
- parking is not readily available mid-afternoon. The bylaws of the university were recently 11
- amended to accommodate the possibility of electronic meetings. A member stated that Robert's 12
- Rules does allow for electronic meetings. 13
- 14
- The discussion continued as to whether the allowability of remote meetings has to be written as a 15
- statement in the bylaws. Robert's Rules of Order does permit us to pass a bylaw that would 16
- allow electronic voting separate from the university. A guest attending stated that the handbook 17
- allows schools to create bylaws that are not in conflict with the handbook, but have a more 18
- detailed or different spin on them. 19
- 20
- Another member stated that faculty representatives participating remotely in the meeting should 21 do so in real time, simultaneously participating in the meeting, and voting with the rest of the 22 23 members when a vote is taken - not delayed. It was suggested that E-mail voting should be used
- for only those issues that do not require extensive discussion. If there is a discussion, whether 24 substantive or procedural, it can go to e-mail for a vote. 25
- 26
- 27 Another member stated that face-to-face meetings allow for discussion and the opportunity to have your mind changed by your colleagues. The member suggested incentives could be offered 28
- 29 to encourage in-person attendance e.g. you may use the privilege of distant participation x
- number of times, or can just skype into from their office. 30
- 31
- 32 After additional debate, a motion was made and seconded to end the debate. The motion is not debatable and a vote was taken: 25 were in favor, 4 were opposed, and 1 abstained. The motion 33 34 passes.
- 35
- The motion was made and seconded to approve Article 3.1 as follows: 36
- 37
- 3.1 The Faculty of Medicine delegates all powers not reserved to the Faculty of Medicine itself 38
- (see Article 2) to a Faculty Council. When members cannot attend in person, Faculty Council 39
- shall allow for electronic attendance and voting according to rules set forth for Special Meetings 40
- in the Bylaws of the CWRU Faculty Senate (Bylaw III, Item b). 41
- 42
- Here is the relevant section from the Faculty Senate Bylaws for reference: 43
- Special meetings of the Faculty Senate may, at the discretion of the Executive 44
- Committee, allow for electronic attendance and voting. The following rules shall apply. 45

A quorum will be determined at the beginning of the meeting by counting the
 Senators present in the room as well as the Senators attending remotely. A majority of

- the votes cast, or a greater proportion as indicated by the adopted Parliamentary
   Authority, shall be necessary for the adoption of motions.
- 5 2. The technology used for the electronic meetings shall allow the members full access

*to and full participation in all meeting transactions either continuously or intermittently* 

- 7 throughout the specified time of the meeting.
- 8 3. Procedural rules related to the conduct of electronic meetings shall be established
- 9 and promulgated by the Executive Committee, subject to review by the Senate, and
- 10 held by the Secretary of the Faculty Senate.
- 11
- 12 At this time a motion to amend the motion was made and seconded to approve that remote voting
- 13 should be used for issues that do not require extensive discussions (i.e. non-substantive matters).
- 14 A reference was made to the Faculty Senate Bylaws section on the use of email voting for the
- 15 Faculty Senate Committees. The relevant passage is as follows:

16 Senate Bylaws on voting by emails for the FS Committees?

- 17
- 18 5) In lieu of an in-person meeting, e-mail voting is permitted for standing committees on
- 19 certain issues. E-mail voting should be used for issues that do not require extensive
- 20 discussion (i.e, nonsubstantive matters), or in extraordinary circumstances requiring a
- 21 *time-critical vote. Any member of a standing committee may move to submit a matter for*
- e-mail voting by emailing all members of the committee and the Secretary of the
- 23 University Faculty. The motion for e-mail voting requires the unanimous consent of all
- standing committee members. Any member wishing to veto the e-mail voting motion
- 25 must do so within seven calendar days from the date of the motion. If the motion to
- 26 proceed with e-mail voting is accepted, an e-mail vote requires a special quorum. The
- issue under consideration is approved only if a majority of the total members of the
- standing committee vote in favor of the issue within fourteen calendar days of the
- original motion for e-mail voting. If the issue does not receive a majority vote within
- 30 fourteen days, the motion expires.
- 31
- A motion was made and seconded to end the debate on the subsidiary motion to amend the main
- motion. The motion is not debatable and a vote was taken 28 were in favor, 2 were opposed, and
- 34 0 abstained. The motion passes and debate ended.
- 35
- A vote on whether to adopt the amended motion (subsidiary motion) was then taken. 5 were in favor, 24 were opposed, and 1 abstained. The subsidiary motion did not pass.
- 38
- 39 The Faculty Council then voted on the main motion to adopt the following language to the
- 40 Bylaws: "3.1 The Faculty of Medicine delegates all powers not reserved to the Faculty of
- 41 Medicine itself (see Article 2) to a Faculty Council. When members cannot attend in person,
- 42 Faculty Council shall allow for electronic attendance and voting according to rules set forth for
- 43 Special Meetings in the Bylaws of the CWRU Faculty Senate (Bylaw III, Item b)."
- 44
- 1 The vote was taken: 26 were in favor, 5 were opposed, and 0 abstained. The motion passes. The
- 2 amendment to the Bylaws will now be sent to the Bylaws Committee for their review of
- 3 compliance with the Faculty Handbook.
- 4
- 5 There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 5:39PM.
- 6
- 7 Respectfully submitted,
- 8
- 9 Joyce Helton

The specific asks as relates to the issue of CWRU day care.

- 1. That the Faculty Council endorse a resolution asking for the Dean of the School of Medicine to support the establishment of a day care center as the School of Medicine represents roughly half the population of CWRU faculty and staff.
- 2. As part of this resolution, establish the necessary committee to review cost and feasibility of using either the School of Dentistry or the School of Nursing, buildings that the President has indicated would be mothballed. These buildings are centrally located, have access to parking for pick up and drop off and are anticipated to be large enough to offer the space necessary.
- 3. If deemed necessary, develop a survey for possible use to be sent to faculty and staff at University Hospitals, The Cleveland Clinic, The VA Hospital as well as the School of Medicine and the CWRU community for possible utilization.
- 4. As such a facility would serve the entire University community, the Dean is urged to request that the Provost and President also consider this proposal for a day care center on campus in the very near future.
- 5. In lieu of support for this proposal, the Dean (and Provost and President) should provide a sound time table to the CWRU faculty and staff for the independent establishment of a day care facility on campus.

### **5-Year Review**



### Article 4 title and 4.1

### **Original:**

ARTICLE 4 – DEPARTMENTS AND DIVISION OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES (DGMS)

4.1 Organization of Faculty into Departments and Division of General Medical Sciences (DGMS)

a. The Faculty of Medicine shall be organized into departments and DGMS... representing academic disciplines as specified in the Constitution of the University Faculty, Article VII, Sec. B.

### **Proposal (deletions and corrections):**

ARTICLE 4 – DEPARTMENTS AND DIVISION OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES (DGMS)

<u>4.1 Organization of Faculty into Departments and Division of General Medical</u> <u>Sciences (DGMS)</u>

a. The Faculty of Medicine shall be organized into departments and DGMS... representing academic disciplines as specified in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2 (Organization and Constitution of the University Faculty), Article VII, Sec. B.

## Article 4.2a (part 1)

### 4.2 Functions of Departments

a. Each department and DGMS shall provide a central administration for its academic disciplines. Each department and DGMS shall be responsible for the teaching in its discipline in the School of Medicine, through the core academic program's committee structure and the other units of the undergraduate medical curriculum and in the affiliated hospitals. Each department shall also allocate resources to execute powers and responsibilities concerning the faculty's educational, research, scholarly activities (Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2, Section B), and full freedom of scholarly investigation and publication of his or her findings (Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2, Section D).

### Proposal:

**Original:** 

### 4.2 Functions of Departments

a. Each department and DGMS shall provide a central administration for its academic disciplines. Each department and DGMS shall be responsible for the teaching in its discipline in the School of Medicine, through the core academic program's committee structure and the other units of the undergraduate medical curriculum and in the affiliated hospitals. Each department shall also allocate resources to support its educational, research and scholarly activities (Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2, Article VII, Section B), and full freedom of scholarly investigation and publication of his or her findings (Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2, Section D).

- First deletion makes department reference parallel with others
- Second deletion is redundant with Article 5.3: Academic Freedom.

### Article 4.2a-c

### **Original:**

**4.2 Functions of Departments** 

a. ...Each department shall plan and execute programs of research and of professional activity and shall train medical students, undergraduate students, and graduate students in its disciplines.

b. ... "DCAPT"s ...

c. ... paragraph 4.2(c)... Alternatively, department chairs may nominate a committee of at least three faculty members from among the primary full- time faculty (and other faculty) to serve as the committee.

### **Proposal:**

### **4.2 Functions of Departments**

a. ...Each department shall plan and execute programs of research and of professional activity and shall train medical students, graduate students and, in some cases, undergraduate students in its disciplines

b. ... "DCAPTs" ...

c. ... paragraph 4.2(d)... Alternatively, department chairs may nominate a committee of at least three faculty members from among the primary full- time faculty (and other faculty) to serve as the committee.

### **Original:**

### Article 4.2d

d. ...Department chairs shall not be present for DCAPT voting. Should a faculty member take advantage of the self-initiation process, the DCAPT chair shall invite the department chair as well as an advocate, selected by the candidate from among the CWRU faculty, to the meeting at which the self-initiated promotion or tenure award is discussed to provide the department chair and advocate with the opportunity to offer his or her perspectives. The advocate and department chair shall present separately and neither shall be present for the vote.

... whom she or he initiated for appointment, promotion, or tenure.

### **Proposal (insertions, corrections):**

• Improper use of self-initiate

d. ...Department chairs shall not be present for DCAPT voting. If a department chair does not support a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member may self-nominate. Should a faculty member take advantage of the self-nomination process, the DCAPT chair shall invite the department chair as well as an advocate, selected by the candidate from among the CWRU faculty, to the meeting at which the self-nomination for promotion or tenure award is discussed to provide the department chair and advocate with the opportunity to offer his or her perspectives. The advocate and department chair shall present separately and neither shall be present for the vote. If the DCAPT does not recommend in favor of the promotion, a faculty member may self-initiate, as described in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 3, Article I, Section I, Initiation of Recommendations). ... whom she or he nominated for appointment, promotion, or tenure.

School of Medicine Diversity Update Presentation to Faculty Council March 18, 2019

Sana Loue, J.D., Ph.D., M.P.H., M.S.S.A., M.A. Vice Dean, Faculty Development and Diversity

# **Our Vision**

- Promotion of a welcoming, energized and collaborative climate for diverse faculty, staff, and student body
- Enhancement of current environment to:
  - Facilitate faculty growth and development along chosen career path
  - Enhance Chairs' ability to lead and manage
  - Support School of Medicine's strategic plan
- Establish CWRU School of Medicine as a leader in faculty development and diversity initiatives and program

# The DSAP Vision 2015-2019

 To increase diversity at all levels of the School of Medicine

 To develop a climate in SOM that welcomes and celebrates diversity, broadly defined

# DSAP Goals 2015-2019

- Increase the numbers of women, underrepresented minorities, and LGBT in faculty and leadership positions
- Develop a systematic approach for pipeline support for groups underrepresented in medicine with the goal of achieving a diverse SOM community
- Foster diversity of thought, approach, and creativity
- Establish and maintain diversity as a high profile issue across SOM

# We have made great progress at the faculty and staff levels ...

- Revamped faculty search procedures (2018)
- Launched faculty development programs for women and URiM (2015)
- Integrated diversity and inclusion into CREC programming (2014)
- Launched and sustained annual LGBT dialogue series (2016)
- Developed and launched Safe Zone Professional (2014)
- Disseminate a monthly holiday calendar (2018)
- Provided Diversity 360 training for >1000 SOM faculty, staff (& students) (2016)

### And for students as well ...

 Increased number of scholarships for URiM – \$1.58 million raised since 1/1/2015

- Increased diversity among graduate and medical school students
  - This year's class 23% URiM
- Developed collaborations with student groups:
  - Mentoring through QGrad
  - Minority Faculty Directory
  - Minority Faculty-Student Meet & Greet

# This could not have been achieved without you ...

- Gia Adeen
- Charles Angove
- Malana Bey
- Diana Bilamoria
- Farren Briggs
- Xem Bui
- Melissa Burrows
- Paul Cheng
- Britt Conroy
- Jane Daroff
- Robert Daroff
- Minoo Darvish
- Pamela B. Davis
- Donna Davis Reddix
- Mona Lisa Delva
- Christian Essman
- Doris A. Evans
- Robert Haynie
- Amy Hise
- Molly Howland
- Anthony James
- Uriel Kim
- Margaret Larkins-Pettigrew

- Keisha Matthews
- Paul McDonald
- Maureen McEnery
- Lina Mehta
- Carol Moss
- Louis Novak
- Dean Patterson
- Klara Papp
- Liz Roccoforte
- Tolulope Rosanwo
- Martha Sajatovic
- Abdus Sattar
- Phoebe Snow
- James Spilsbury
- Usha Stiefel
- Nick Szoko
- Darryl Thornton
- J. Van Etten
- Marla Rodriguez Vasquez
- Joseph Williams
- Tracy Wilson-Holden
- Jo Ann Wise
- Ruqaiijah Yearby

### And many more!!!

# But there is much that requires attention.

• We remain under LCME monitoring for lack of adequate faculty diversity.

 Diversity needs assessment survey results suggest issues at all levels of SOM.

### **Diversity Needs Assessment Survey**

- Disseminated in 2017 to faculty, staff, students (total n=5918)
- 774 respondents (13.1%), divided almost equally among groups
  - 57.2% female
  - 13.8% not heterosexually-identified
  - 30.2% nonwhite identified
  - 50.6% millennials

## The good: Respect

- >92% of all groups believe SOM creates a climate of respect for everyone
- >92% of all groups believe that faculty, staff, and students are treated with respect

### The bad: Verbal harassment

- In the past TWO years, respondents have been verbally harassed at SOM because of
  - Race: 15%
  - Ethnicity: 14.8%
  - Sex: 15.7%
  - Gender identity: 7.5%
  - Sexual orientation: 8.4%
  - Religion: 13.6%
  - Disability: 6.0%
  - Immigration status: 7.7%
  - Primary language: 11.1%

## More bad: Electronic harassment

- In the past TWO years, respondents were threatened or harassed via e-mail, text messages, or other social media by others at SOM because of their
  - Race: 5.4%
  - Ethnicity: 5.9%
  - Sex: 6.1%
  - Gender identity: 4.3%
  - Sexual orientation: 4.6%
  - Religion: 6.5%
  - Disability: 3.1%
  - Immigration status: 3.7%
  - Primary language: 4.4%

# The ugly: Physical harassment

- In the past TWO years, respondents have been physically harassed or threatened while at SOM because of their
  - Race: 4.3%
  - Ethnicity: 4.4%
  - Sex: 6.0%
  - Gender identity: 3.8%
  - Sexual orientation: 3.6%
  - Religion: 4.3%
  - Disability: 3.1%
  - Immigration status: 3.6%
  - Primary language: 3.6%

The verbal, physical, and electronic harassment and/or threats were experienced by people at all levels (faculty, staff, students), and were effectuated by people at all levels.

## How can/should we move forward?

- How verbal messages are intended may not be how they are received.
- Diversity presentations do not appear to be sufficient.
- Multiple groups feel marginalized.
- Recognition and support of some groups has led others to believe that they are unheard/ unwelcome/ to be blamed.
- Some SOM members experience unpleasant and troublesome interactions.

### Diversity Strategic Action Plan 2020-2024

- Development and launching of next 5-year DSAP
  - Almost 50 faculty, staff, students have volunteered
  - Subcommittees
    - Education, diversity training, development, student recruitment, faculty recruitment and retention, overall climate, vision
  - To be completed by 12/31/2019 for launching 1/1/2020

# Additional possibilities

- Restorative justice circles
- Open forums/town halls

# What are your thoughts?

- What are the priorities?
- What kind of world would you like SOM to be?

We need your voice!!!!



### CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONAL RANKINGS INITIATIVE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) has been falling in the major international rankings. While the rankings should not be used as a direct indication of quality, global rankings can have direct and indirect impacts on many important sectors of the university, including partnerships, student and faculty recruitment, research, funding by foreign governments, and overall institutional reputation. CWRU is actively engaged in efforts to reverse this trend. To date, the Office of Institutional Research (IR) has begun submitting more complete and precise data to the ranking organizations, the Kelvin Smith Library (KSL) has worked extensively to clean up data on faculty citations and other related content to improve CWRU's bibliometric footprint, and the Center for International Affairs has created initiatives to improve the university's global reputation. (See pages 8-10 for a detailed description of activity to date.)

To build on the work that has been done, an International Rankings Working Group created a strategic rankings initiative with **five recommendations** detailed in pages 11 - 15 for continuing and expanding CWRU's efforts with the ultimate goal of moving CWRU into the top 100 in one or more of the three major international rankings. This initiative was endorsed by the International Affairs Advisory Council made up of faculty from across campus in September, 2018. It is important to note that while each of the recommendations was carefully chosen to impact a wide array of the ranking indicators, intentional thought was given to how these actions could improve the academic, research, and scholarship strengths of the institution.

#### Recommendations

- 1. Continue and Prioritize Existing Initiatives that positively affect rankings, including building the new Faculty Information System (FIS), utilizing bibliometric indexes, attracting and diversifying international students, and employing Illuminate Consulting Group.
- 2. Develop systems to collect accurate faculty data as it relates to international rankings indicators, making sure to cover necessary information in the Faculty Information System.
- 3. Capture existing faculty scholarship/patent information attributed to CWRU by requiring ORCID ID and profile for faculty and updating this information as part of the faculty activity report.
- 4. **Provide support and incentives for faculty to further their scholarship and increase their individual scholarship reputation in impactful ways**. Support faculty with both financial and non-financial resources to encourage international collaboration and high impact research endeavors
- 5. Create a comprehensive international communications strategy, targeting international alumni, faculty and institutions, together with both international and domestic employers, all which have connections to CWRU.

The full International Rankings Strategic Initiative provides much more detailin all of the areas summarized above. In addition to showing CWRU's trend in the rankings over the past few years (pp. 7-8), the full plan outlines the impact that global rankings have on higher education (pp. 1-3), provides an overview of the global rankings (pp. 4-6), and presents general actions that have been demonstrated effective in improving ranking scores (p. 7). Pages 15-16 show the impact the recommendations could have on CWRU's ranking scores. This initiative is meant to be a catalyst for a broad campus discussion about CWRU's engagement with international rankings.

#### Case Western Reserve University International Rankings Initiative

For the past several years, Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) has been steadily falling in several of the international rankings. In 2016, a committee of faculty and administrators, initiated by the faculty senate, began to explore the international ranking measures for the first time in an effort to understand and determine a path forward that would reverse the negative trend. This examination revealed that the trends are, overall, not the result in a decline in CWRU, but that other institutions, particularly those in countries other than the US, are actively engaged in optimizing data, improving scholarship, and creating university brands. These efforts have led to institutions rising in the rankings, causing CWRU to drop.

This rankings plan outlines an initial rankings initiative for CWRU to become more competitive in the international rankings world. Each recommendation was carefully chosen based on its potential impact on the rankings and its value in **advancing the overall academic and research excellence of CWRU**. The goal is to become a stronger, more competitive institution, focusing on quality—through research, partnerships, and faculty scholarship and reputation.

The Plan is divided into six sections. The first two sections provide a summary of the growing importance of international rankings in higher education and the number, indicators and methodology of the rankings. The third section outlines the types of efforts adopted by universities to improve their rankings. The remaining sections focus on Case Western Reserve University. Section IV details CWRU's current position in the rankings and Section V outlines efforts-to-date to improve the university's rank. Section VI, perhaps the most important portion of the plan, provides a set of recommendations that, if adopted, will, over time, position the university to reverse its fall and increase its place in the major international rankings, while at the same time advance its academic and research excellence.

#### I. Impact of Global Rankings on Higher Education

Rankings are important to university leaders, with many leaders developing strategic initiatives focused on improving their standing in the various rankings. A 2016 survey of higher education institutions around the world revealed that 83% percent of responding institutions were dissatisfied with their rankings placement and 84% of the institutions were actively engaged in strategies aimed at moving up in the rankings (Hazelkorn, 2016). A separate pan-European study showed that 86% of institutions monitored rankings and 60% had dedicated human resources focusing on rankings (Hazelkorn, Loukkola, & Zhang, 2014). There are 4 main areas that rankings impact institutions.

#### A. Partnerships and Funding

Standings in the rankings can negatively or positively impact the depth and breadth of partnership with top institutions (Hazelkorn et al., 2014). Governments and funding agencies have restricted resources to top universities in several countries based upon standings in rankings (Boulton, 2011; Rauhvargers, 2014). Because governments use benchmarking to compare higher education institutions and determine resource allocation, governments influence higher education institutions by financially supporting partnerships and

collaborations with other top institutions around the world (Liu & Cheng, 2011). The use of rankings to determine research partnerships and collaborations can put pressure on institutions to increase their international standing. In this sense, rankings can impact the relationship that governments and funding agencies have with universities.

### **B.** Student Recruitment

Parents and students use rankings to signal the quality of an institution, specifically when looking at more elite universities (Altbach, 2012; Avery, Glickman, Hoxby, & Metrick, 2004; Bowman & Bastedo, 2009; Monks & Ehrenberg, 1999). As universities move into the higher echelon of the rankings, studies show that their acceptance rate decreases, meaning more students apply but fewer are accepted (Bowman & Bastedo, 2009). Rankings, therefore, perpetuate a cycle where, as universities move higher in the rankings, they are perceived as more elite, their acceptance rate decreases, and they continue to move up the rankings. Rankings also positively impact student mobility, with students studying in other countries at highly ranked institutions in order to improve their job prospects (Findlay, King, Smith, Geddes, & Skeldon, 2012).

### C. Faculty Recruitment and Research

Rankings also impact faculty recruitment and research. Higher ranked institutions attract more prolific and renowned researchers and faculty (Kehm, 2014). Schools which are ranked higher have the opportunity to develop more partnerships and collaborations with other institutions improving the overall opportunities for faculty research (O'Connell, 2013). Competition for faculty between institutions of higher education have propelled rankings forward (Teichler, 2011).

### **D.** Reputation

Rankings have become the main vehicle for measuring the reputation of higher education institutions, causing some institutions to engage in behaviors specifically designed to increase rankings (Collins & Park, 2016). By measuring and ranking the reputation of institutions, rankings impact the reputation of universities (Bastedo & Bowman, 2010; Zha, 2009). Stakeholders in higher education, including parents, students, and other universities, look to rankings as a reputation measurement (Kehm, 2014; Marginson, 2014; Rauhvargers, 2014). Students value reputation and use the rankings to measure success (Hazelkorn, 2016). As a result, rankings can be seen as an investment in reputation rather than an investment in quality (Locke, 2011); however, there is a correlation between the factors that improve reputation—increased faculty scholarship, research collaborations, etc.—also improves the quality of the institution. Research shows that there is a direct correlation between national investment in higher education and position in the rankings (Hauptman, 2006).

#### II. International Rankings Overview

As the higher education landscape has become more competitive, various international ranking systems were developed to measure higher education on a more global scale. These international rankings have grown to be an important tool for measuring universities, placing higher education in an international framework, informing student choice, and influencing university funding models (Boulton, 2011; Hazelkorn, 2014; Locke, 2014). Twenty-one international rankings systems have developed since the initial international ranking, the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), was released in 2003. Three of these rankings systems have become the standard by which many governments and universities use to benchmark and make decisions: the ARWU, formerly known as the Shanghai Ranking; the Times Higher Education ranking (THE); and the QS World University Rankings (QS). Each of the three rankings has its own set of indicators and methodology. Figures 1-3 represent the indicators and the percentages of each indicator of the ARWU, THE, and QS ranking systems for comparison.



*Figure 1*. Representation of the ARWU indicators and their percentages (Academic Ranking of World Universities, 2017)



*Figure 2*. Representation of the THE indicators and their percentages (Times Higher Education, 2017)



Figure 3. Representation of the QS indicators and their percentages (QS Top Universities, 2018)

As can be seen in the figures, the indicators vary across the different ranking systems, but a few themes emerge. First, the rankings attempt to measure research productivity in some fashion, whether through citations, publications, or awards. The rankings also measure student/teaching outcomes, though in unique ways. Finally, all of the rankings measure reputation, with reputation indicators representing more than a third of THE and one half of the QS ranking (Morse, Brooks, & Mason, 2017; QS Top Universities, 2018). While the ARWU does not explicitly measure reputation, it does calculate awards and recognition of alumni, faculty, and staff, only including those awards that are highly publicized like Nobel Prizes (Academic Ranking of World Universities, 2017). These awards help to form the reputation of the institution.

There are several other ranking systems based upon specific metrics. The National Taiwanese University (NTU) ranking system, CWTS Leiden, and Nature Index all pull data from bibliometric databases to rank institutions on research productivity and citations.. The Trendence/Emerging system looks at graduate employability, and In4M pulls data from patents. Many of the ranking systems also include subject rankings and specific rankings of employability. For this first rankings initiative, however, the focus is on the major rankings and some specific rankings on which our efforts may have an impact. After CWRU has concentrated on rising (and hopefully has risen) in these major rankings, attention will turn to specific subject rankings. Table 1 outlines the 6 ranking systems that we intend to focus on during the initial stages of the rankings initiative, what they measure generally, and the level of engagement that CWRU can have with these ranking systems.

| Ranking   | Purpose  | Category        | Direct<br>Submit Data  | Indirect Data Used  |  |
|---|--|-----------------|--|---|--|
| Academic<br>Ranking of<br>World<br>Universities<br>(ARWU) /<br>Shanghai<br>Rankings | ARWU uses six objective indicators<br>to rank world universities. Its widely<br>cited and employed as a starting<br>point for identifying strengths and<br>weaknesses, facilitating reform, and<br>setting new initiatives.    | Big Three       | No   | Uses information from the<br>National Center for<br>Education Statistics'<br>Integrated Postsecondary<br>Education Data System<br>(IPEDS) and the Web of<br>Science (WoS)       |  |
| QS World<br>University<br>Rankings  | Comprises the global overall and<br>subject rankings (which name the<br>world's top universities for the study<br>of 48 different subjects and five<br>composite faculty areas), alongside<br>five independent regional tables | Big Three       | Yes—<br>faculty and<br>student<br>statistics;<br>academic<br>and industry<br>partners for<br>reputation<br>surveys | QS Reputation Survey is<br>sent out to faculty and<br>employers to gain feedback<br>on universities, Researcher<br>affiliation in SCOPUS –<br>abstract and citation<br>database |  |
| Times Higher<br>Education<br>World<br>University<br>Ranking                         | This ranking evaluates universities<br>across all of their core missions:<br>teaching, research, knowledge<br>transfer, and international outlook<br>using 13 performance indicators   | Big Three       | Yes—<br>faculty and<br>student<br>statistics   | Researcher affiliation in<br>SCOPUS – abstract and<br>citation database   |  |
| US News &<br>World Report<br>Rankings<br>(USNWR)                                    | Focuses specifically on academic<br>research and reputation, using 13<br>performance indicators of different<br>weights to evaluate universities   | High<br>Quality | No   | Clarivate Global<br>Institutional Profiles<br>Project (GIPP), IPEDS,<br>and Researcher affiliation<br>in Web of Science (WoS)   |  |
| NTU Ranking   | Evaluates scientific research using<br>bibliometric methods to analyze<br>research productivity, impact, and<br>excellence to rank universities'<br>scientific paper performance   | Bibliometric    | No   | Researcher affiliation in<br>Web of Science (WoS)   |  |
| CWTS<br>Leiden  | Ranking focuses on the scientific<br>impact of a university and on the<br>participation of a university in<br>scientific collaborations  | Bibliometric    | No   | Researcher affiliation in<br>Web of Science (WoS) –<br>Does not include<br>conference publications or<br>book publications  |  |

### Table 1

#### III. Efforts of Universities to Improve Their Rankings

Three main strategies have emerged as successful in improving a university's position in the rankings.

#### A. Supporting and Incentivizing Faculty Research and Collaborations

Because many of the rankings are biased towards schools with strong scientific research performance (Williams & de Rassenfosse, 2016), some elements that impact the rankings are competitive hiring of faculty and the number of senior faculty in the science, engineering, and medicine fields (Cantwell & Taylor, 2013; Ehrenberg, 2002; Hazelkorn, 2015). Aldieri, Kotsemir, and Vinci (2018) examined European universities in Germany, Russia, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom to determine if research collaborations impacted rankings. They found that an increase in the number of collaborations between institutions had a significant impact on the research performance indicators in rankings (Aldieri, Kotsemir, & Vinci, 2018). Tie (2012) looked at the efforts of the University of Malay to increase its standing in the rankings by emphasizing faculty publishing in specific high impact journals. The university doubled its position in the rankings by 2012 (Tie, 2012). As of 2018, the university had risen another 50 spots. Growing an endowment, receiving grants and other governmental resources, and raising alumni donations can also have a positive impact on rankings (Cantwell & Taylor, 2013; Daraio, Bonaccorsi, & Simar, 2015; Ehrenberg, 2002; Syed Gohar, Yousafzai, & Khattak, 2015).

#### **B.** Effective Data Reporting

Focusing on data reporting and strategically calculating data points can impact a university's rank. Daraio, Bonaccorsi, and Simar (2014) argue that investing in data integration systems to increase efficiency and accuracy of reporting can positively impact a university's standing in the rankings. Data optimization is becoming a common strategy to help institutions improve in rankings (Morphew & Swanson, 2011).

#### C. Marketing and Communication

Finally, creating effective marketing campaigns and narratives that promote current rankings standings and the university as a whole can have an impact on rankings, specifically on the reputation scores of rankings (Gnolek, Falciano, & Kuncl, 2014; Heffernan & Heffernan, 2018). Seventy-six percent of European higher education leaders report using rankings as a marketing tool (Hazelkorn et al., 2014), while half of universities world-wide used rankings for publicity purposes to enhance prestige (Hazelkorn, 2015).

#### IV. CWRU's Current Positions

CWRU has consistently fallen in the major rankings in the past several years, though some current efforts have resulted in small improvements. Table 2 shows CWRU's standing in some of the rankings since 2012. The highlighted rankings have come out this year. CWRU improved in the QS ranking—one of the big 3—and in the Leiden ranking—a bibliometric ranking. With the exception of the NTU ranking, CWRU improved, theoretically due to work done in the past year. While NTU came out this year, the data was collected prior to CWRU's work in this area Chart 1 shows this same data in trend lines. While improvements have been made, CWRU still has the opportunity to rise even further.

| Table 2 |
|---------|
|---------|

|                               | Last<br>Release<br>Date | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| ARWU                          | 8/2018                  | 99   | 99   | 101  | 116  | 111  | 124  | 123  |      |
| QS                            | 6/2018                  | 145  | 164  | 175  | 189  | 215  | 202  | 213  | 186  |
| THE                           | 9/2017                  | 93   | 104  | 88   | 116  | 133  | 126  | 158  | 132  |
| NTU                           | 8/2018                  | 88   | 103  | 116  | 117  | 117  | 116  | 124  |      |
| Leiden                        | 5/2018                  | 101  | 101  | 74   | 109  | 133  | 143  | 57   |      |
| US News<br>Global<br>Rankings | 9/2017                  |      |      |      | 137  | 142  | 131  | 146  | 152  |





#### V. CWRU's Initiatives to date

In the fall of 2016, a group of faculty members, the Vice Provost for International Affairs (the Vice Provost), and the Associate Provost and University Librarian (the University Librarian) began to examine CWRU's place in the international rankings arena and noticed with concern that CWRU was quickly falling in ranking. Upon presenting their findings to the Faculty Senate and the leadership of the university, the Illuminate Consulting Group, Inc. (ICG), led by Dr. Dan Guhr, was engaged to help guide CWRU to reverse the negative trend. Under a committee led by the Vice Provost, the University Librarian, and the Senior Associate Vice President for University Planning and Administration, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research, a small group began to take specific steps to optimize the data submitted to the rankers, examine how CWRU fared in the bibliometric arena, and begin communicating with alumni and employers to raise CWRU's profile. These efforts, taking place during the 2017-2018 academic

year, are explained in detail below. It is important to note, however, that most of the ranking agencies normalize the data over a multi-year process (3-5 years depending on the ranker), so results take time to be fully realized.

#### A. Data Clarification

Many of the international rankers define faculty and student data differently than typical US surveys. In order to effectively submit data to the ranking agencies, the Office of Institutional Research (IR) worked with the consultant, Dr. Guhr, to: (i) analyze our data submissions; (ii) find areas in which we had incomplete information or were interpreting data using US standards rather than international standards; and, (iii) determine how best to move forward when submitting data to these specific rankers. For the 2017-18 data submission cycle, the IR undertook a more precise count of international faculty members who previously were classified as domestic faculty (such as permanent residents who are not U.S. citizens). The reported number still constitutes an undercount of actual international faculty members due to currently incomplete available information. IR also made a more precise calculation of faculty FTE by looking at individual contract length rather than applying a standard rule to all faculty—a model supported by the rankings agencies.

For students, IR reported U.S. permanent residents as international; they had previously been counted with domestic students, in line with federal reporting conventions. IR made this change because most institutions abroad count dual citizens as international, as instructed by some rankings organizations. Therefore, CWRU also began reporting dual citizens of the US and another country as international, for international rankings purposes only. This allows CWRU to report data consistent with our international university counterparts.

Currently, we are still working to determine accurate counts of faculty/student citizenship, including students and faculty. Part of this process has involved reaching out to colleagues at other comparable institutions to benchmark recruiting and data collection strategies. The full effects of the data clarifications are still unknown, though initial evidence shows an improvement in faculty and student indicators in the QS ranking.

#### **B.** Bibliometrics

Underlying bibliometric data is crucial to the international ranking initiative as publication and citation indicators represent up to 40% of the major rankings and 100% of several notable bibliometric rankings. Over the past year Kelvin Smith Library (KSL) has completed clean up on the underlying data in Clarivate Analytics "Web of Science/InCites" and Elsevier's "Scopus/SciVal" which feed the faculty citation impact into the ranking systems. Paid subscriptions from Clarivate Analytics "Web of Science/InCites" and Elsevier's "Scopus/SciVal" are critical to complete this work as they have different information that helps complete the picture of the CWRU faculty and the CWRU affiliations. This work significantly contributed to CWRU's move from 213 to 186 in the QS ranking and from 143 to 57 in the Leiden ranking, a purely bibliometric measure.

KSL's first work in this area determined how CWRU was referenced in publications. Upon review, KSL found that the rankers associated approximately 200 variations of the CWRU name with citations. Staff at KSL examined the data and discovered that a considerable number of CWRU name variations are not reported—over 650 found so far. The variations were sent to all the major international ranking agencies to ensure that they are appropriately attributed to CWRU. The second part of this initiative is to accurately attribute CWRU faculty to the university. Each faculty member is in the process of being reviewed and updated in Clarivate Analytics and Elsevier. To make this process manageable, only faculty members who are identified through the Institutional Research Office have been reviewed at this time, totaling about 1,450 faculty located across all departments. To date over 150 faculty member profiles have been revised.

#### C. Academic and Employer Reputation

Academic and Employer Reputation accounts up to one half of the indicator scores on some of the most influential global rankings. For both QS and THE, these indicators are measured by way of a survey that is submitted to academics and employers around the world. Each institution has the ability to submit suggested names to QS surveys, in particular, but up until AY 2017/18, CWRU had never submitted. This lack of submission partially explains why CWRU has been steadily falling in the reputation indicator.

To help increase CWRU's performance in this area, in December of 2017, the Center for International Affairs (the Center) reached out to faculty across campus to request contact information about those with whom they work in academic institutions around the world. The Center received a tremendous response from the campus community, gathering close to 1000 collaborators. A selection of 400 names were then submitted to QS.

CWRU Advancement Services put together a similar list of employers affiliated with the university to submit to QS for the Employer Reputation Survey. These contacts included CWRU alumni, donors, and friends of the university. Once again, over 1000 names were provided, and 400 names were submitted on CWRU's behalf to receive the Employer Reputation Survey.

The Center also began a slow electronic communication strategy to connect with the academics and employers. The first outreach was an electronic New Year's greeting from the university. As a result of these efforts, CWRU increased it academic reputation raw score by 100 points.

#### **D.** International Rankings Structure

As referenced above, in 2017-18, the work on rankings was performed by a committee made up of faculty and administrators across campus. While the university is seeing results from these efforts, those involved agreed that CWRU needed a more permanent structure in order to effectively approach international rankings. After discussions among those who had been working on the rankings, and conversations with the President and Provost, the Executive Director for International Affairs (EDIA) assumed leadership of the international rankings initiative in the summer of 2018.

In one of her first actions, the EDIA formed a working group with representatives from the Center for International Affairs, Kelvin Smith Library, Office of Institutional Research, UTech, Human Resources, the Office of Research, and University Marketing and Communications to create a plan for CWRU's rankings efforts and to manage the day-to-day operations needed to improve in the rankings. The working group consults regularly with our consultant, ICG, whose contract has been extended for the 2018-2019 academic year, and other parties interested in the rankings efforts. The working group reports to the International Affairs Advisory Council/International Rankings Committee—made up of faculty (including Faculty Senate representatives), deans, and university administrators—who provide oversight and guidance.
#### VI. Recommendations

In order to fully realize CWRU's potential in the global rankings, the International Rankings Working Group have made the following 5 recommendations, each with a number of specific action items. Recognizing that the mission and vision of the university should guide actions, the recommendations center on actions that have the most substantial impact on the global rankings indicators and, at the same time, further the mission and goals of CWRU as a whole.

These recommendations represent ideas that could have widespread impact on the rankings. There are other actions that CWRU could consider that are outside of the specific recommendations listed here that would have an impact on the indicators, but the working group determined that these actions would require significant financial resources or would be challenging to the culture of the institution, with minimal return on investment. For example, the committee considered addressing CWRU's low scoring in the industry income category; however, this indicator represents only 2.5% of one ranking system. In the future, CWRU could address this issue by including faculty consultant fees in the industry income count and/or providing incentives for faculty to seek industry grants/funding. For the purposes of an initial strategy, though, the committee elected to not focus on industry income as a recommendation.

#### A. Recommendation 1: Continue and prioritize existing initiatives

Over the past year, CWRU has committed financial and personnel resources in specific areas in order to improve our standing in the rankings. A full explanation of efforts to date can be found in section V. These efforts and other initiatives in place before the rankings focus, specifically the ones detailed below, should be continued as they provide a strong foundation for future improvement in the rankings. Note that many of the efforts outlined below are designed to create an infrastructure that will support the university's efforts to improve its rankings in a seamless and cost-effective manner over many years.

#### **Action Items:**

- 1. Continue the substantial efforts to create a **centralized faculty information system** (FIS) to track and maintain the faculty lifecycle. By centralizing faculty information, we will be able to easily and accurately pull data to report to the rankings organizations such as the number of faculty (including calculating full time employment (FTE) as defined by the rankers) and faculty citizenship. In addition, a centralized FIS allows CWRU to more accurately track research publications, citations, and potentially patents by comparing faculty to bibliometric reports.
- 2. Continue to subscribe to **bibliometric indexes** that allow us to verify that all research by our faculty is accurately reported and that our data is optimized to reflect the current status of CWRU. While these tools are currently purchased out of the Kelvin Smith Library and Institutional Research budget, respectively, **funds to make these purchases sustainable** are necessary.
- 3. Continue university-wide efforts to attract and diversify our international student population, both at the undergraduate and graduate level.

- 4. Continue to enlist the full support of **Illuminate Consulting Group**, Inc., led by Dr. Dan Guhr, through the end of the 2018-2019 academic year, with a step-down retainer plan in place to continue this relationship for the next five years.
- 5. Continue to **invest in the current rankings personnel** to lead the rankings initiative.

#### **Required Resources:**

- Continued financial and personnel support to develop and maintain the FIS
- Sustainable investment in Elsevier and Clarivate Analytics databases
- Continued support for the Illuminate Consulting Group, Inc. consulting services

### **B.** Recommendation 2: Develop systems to collect accurate faculty data as it relates to international ranking indicators

Because the information on faculty is not centralized or clearly defined, it is challenging to determine how many faculty members are attributed to CWRU in the rankings, how many of these faculty are highly cited researchers, and how many of the faculty are international (as defined by and as an important component of some of the ranking systems). Having clear data on faculty will impact each of the ranking systems as faculty are measured across all of the systems. Having a precise count of faculty allows CWRU to identify a consistent denominator of faculty in order to accurately and impactfully determine faculty/student ratio, international faculty, publications per faculty member, and citations attributed to CWRU. For the purpose of global rankings, CWRU needs to be able to provide an accurate and comprehensive count of faculty, according to ranking standards.

#### **Action Items:**

- 1. Create a **common definition of faculty in line with accepted ranking** definitions. It is important to understand that international rankers define faculty in ways not always consistent with US standards. This action item means that we need to better define faculty particularly those with appointments at University Hospitals, Cleveland Clinic, and other auxiliary units in ways that properly reflect the international ranking definitions.
- 2. Determine what constitutes FTE, according to the rankers, in regards to faculty that have multiple appointments and in line with demands of various academic programs.
- 3. Identify **how many of our faculty would be characterized as international for the ranking definitions** (including those on visas, permanent residents, and dual citizens) in order to report an accurate number of international faculty.

#### **Required Resources:**

- Continued financial and personnel support to develop and maintain the FIS.
- Continued support for the Illuminate Consulting Group, Inc. consulting services.

### C. Recommendation 3: Capture existing faculty scholarship/patents attributed to CWRU

As outlined in section V, KSL has been working in the Elsevier and Clarivate Analytics bibliometric databases to capture accurate faculty publications and citations. The methods

used to date are not sustainable without a more systematic process for ensuring that name variations and faculty attributions are standard and accurate. Additionally, some of the rankings indicators measure faculty patents. Having a system in place to measure faculty patents for data analysis purposes can assist CWRU in understanding the indicator scores. The following action items will significantly increase the number of publications submitted by faculty and citations received that are correctly attributed to the university.

#### **Action Items:**

- 1. Require that new faculty hires **create an Orcid ID and profile linked to CWRU** upon hire and require that existing faculty members update their existing Orcid profiles with standard usage of CWRU's name; include the importance of using standard CWRU names in new faculty orientation.
- 2. Add updating (or creating if not already in place) the Orcid ID profile to yearly **faculty activity report requirements** for all faculty.
- 3. Continue to check the databases for variations of CWRU's name and send in updates to appropriate sources.
- 4. Continue and enhance the **library's faculty education campaign** to increase awareness of the importance of name standardization and Orcid IDs.
- 5. Encourage deans and other administrators to promote Orcid IDs among faculty.
- 6. Pull **faculty patent information** from the Technology Transfer Office (Wellspring Sophia) into the FIS.

#### **Required Resources:**

- Investment in and continued support for a **common faculty activity report** across all schools that includes submission of the faculty's Orcid ID.
- Current personnel in KSL to analyze citation data and faculty attributions.
- Sustainable investment in Elsevier and Clarivate Analytics databases.

### **D.** Recommendation 4: Provide support and incentives for faculty to further their scholarship and increase their individual scholarship reputation in impactful ways

Scholarship is a repeated theme in CWRU's mission, vision, and core values. Academic excellence and impact is a core value of the university, and this value can only be realized through engaged and supported faculty. In addition, the stronger the individual scholarship reputation of each faculty member, the more prestige is bestowed on CWRU.

While addressing concerns revealed in the faculty climate survey is not in the overall scope of the international rankings initiative, less than 1/2 of CWRU faculty report being satisfied with university support for their research and over 1/3 think about leaving CWRU so that they feel more supported. Providing more funding and support for faculty scholarship could benefit the university beyond rankings.

#### **Action Items:**

1. Encourage faculty to **collaborate and publish with researchers from other countries** by **targeting existing financial support and providing new financial support** to faculty travelling to meet with international collaborators and including international collaborations as an element on the faculty activity report. For the purpose of the

rankings, international collaborations are partnerships that result in co-authored publications.

- 2. Provide financial support for **faculty/researchers at institutions in other countries** to travel to CWRU
- 3. Provide both **financial and informational resources** to faculty to help them identify and fund travel to present at impactful international conferences.

#### **Required Resources:**

- Create funding for faculty meeting with international collaborators and presenting at international conferences.<sup>1</sup>
- Create funding to support researchers/faculty from other international institutions in travelling to CWRU to work with CWRU faculty.
- Continued support for the Illuminate Consulting Group, Inc. consulting services.

# E. Recommendation 5: Create a comprehensive international communications strategy, targeting audiences which will be important for rankings, including international alumni, faculty and institutions in other countries, and employers, both international and domestic, with connections to CWRU.

Having a strong reputation is essential for continued success in the international rankings, and reputation can also impact student recruitment, national rankings, and research funding. While efforts to date have largely focused on CWRU's reputation in the United States, having a solid brand in the international arena is becoming more important as higher education continues its global trend. Many different types of activities can positively, or negatively, impact a university's reputation, but without a comprehensive international communication plan, promoting the university's brand is challenging.

#### **Action Items:**

- 1. Develop an international communications plan that effectively utilizes technology and other mediums to create a **CWRU brand abroad**.
- 2. Create a **university-wide faculty activity report** that captures international activity. This will allow CWRU to systematically identify strong international collaborating partners and allow CWRU to identify interconnected interests among faculty to further interdisciplinary research.
- 3. **Coordinate university-wide materials** to send with faculty and staff visiting colleagues abroad to send a clear and consistent CWRU branded message.
- 4. Publish an **annual research showcase report** that is distributed as a part of the international communication strategy.
- 5. Coordinate University Marketing and Communications, alumni offices, development offices, advancement lists, industry lists, visiting committees, and collaborators to conduct a **social network analysis** to determine how to target the communications strategy.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Office of Research and Technology Transfer has already started a funding program to support faculty research. This recommendation aims to expand that concept with focus on international collaborations.

- 6. Engage faculty and the schools in providing **lists of strong international academic partners** for reporting to rankers and to include on communication lists.
- 7. Systematically **submit academic and employer names** to the rankers every year and track responses as able.
- 8. Purchase access to the **QS reputation data** after the QS 2020 rankings are released in the summer of 2019 to analyze responses and track reputation results.
- 9. Work with alumni, development, visiting committees, and government relations offices on campus to develop **strong employer lists** to report to rankings industries.
- 10. Engage and educate alumni on how they can promote and support CWRU's employer reputation measure.
- 11. Encourage and support faculty as they target more **industry funding**. Provide regularly updated resources to help faculty identify potential funding sources.

#### **Required Resources:**

- Investment in and continued support for a **common faculty activity report** across all schools that includes submission of the faculty's Orcid ID
- Purchase the QS reputation data in 2020
- Centralized publishing of marketing materials, including a yearly research showcase, targeted for an international audience
- Sustainable investment in Elsevier and Clarivate Analytics databases
- Continued support for the Illuminate Consulting Group, Inc. consulting services

#### VII. Impact on Rankings and Projections

Each of the recommendations affects multiple indicators across the rankings. For example, creating incentives for faculty to increase their scholarship reputation (recommendation 4) impacts not only the international collaboration and publication indicators in QS, but also can impact citations and the reputation indicators.

Improving rankings positions, however, takes time as many of the indicators are normalized over the course of several years. By the year 2022, and assuming the recommendations listed below are followed, CWRU should rise considerably in several of the international rankings with the ultimate goal of being in the top 100 of at least one of the big three rankings. These projections were derived from looking at the indicators scores of institutions in the target ranges and determining how we need to improve to move into those indicator ranges. We also consulted with Dr. Guhr based on his extensive experience and knowledge of the ranking methodologies.

| Ranking        | Historic<br>High | 2017/18 | <i>2022<sup>2</sup></i> | Drivers                           |
|----------------|------------------|---------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ARWU           | 51               | 124     | 90-100                  | Recommendations 1, 3, and 4       |
| QS             | 85               | 186     | 100-120                 | Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5  |
| THE            | $65(2010)^3$     | 158     | 90-120                  | Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 |
| NTU            | 67               | 116     | 90-100                  | Recommendations 1, 3, and 4       |
| Leiden         | 57               | 57      | 40-50                   | Recommendations 1, 3, and 4       |
| US News Global | 131              | 146     | 90-100                  | Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 |

#### Table 4: Ranking Projections

It is important to note, however, that while CWRU is increasing its efforts to improve, so are other institutions around the world. CWRU needs to move quickly and efficiently to become more competitive in the global arena.

#### VIII. Conclusion

As can be seen in the outlined plan, the rankings project is a major commitment by the university. Many institutional parts of the university (central administration including many units within the Offices of the President and the Provost), each school, many departments, as well individual administrators and faculty members, need to make improvement in the rankings a priority item. By making a focus on international rankings a university-wide commitment, not only should CWRU rise in the rankings, which is important for so many key elements that make the university a success (more grant funding, better students, top faculty, etc.), but CWRU will become an improved academic and research institution.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  The 2022 projections assume that all of the actions outlined are implemented. The Working Group cautions that improvement in rankings is not an exact science, so even with perfect implementation, the projected improvements are not guaranteed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> A change in the rankings methodology occurred after this year which impacted later rankings.

#### References

- Academic Ranking of World Universities. (2017). Methodology. Retrieved from http://www.shanghairanking.com/ARWU-Methodology-2017.html
- Aldieri, L., Kotsemir, M., & Vinci, C. P. (2018). The impact of research collaboration on academic performance: An empirical analysis for some European countries. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 62, 13-30. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2017.05.003
- Altbach, P. G. (2012). The globalization of college and university rankings. *Change*, 44(1), 26-31. doi:10.1080/00091383.2012.636001
- Avery, C., Glickman, M., Hoxby, C., & Metrick, A. (2004). A revealed preference ranking of U.S. colleges and universities (10803). Retrieved from <u>http://www.nber.org/papers/w10803</u>
- Bastedo, M. N., & Bowman, N. A. (2010). U.S. News & World Report college rankings: Modeling institutional effects on organizational reputation. *American Journal of Education, 116*(2), 163-183.
- Boulton, G. (2011). University rankings: Diversity, excellence and the European initiative. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 13*, 74-82. doi:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.006</u>
- Bowman, N., & Bastedo, M. (2009). Getting on the front page: Organizational reputation, status signals, and the impact of U.S. News and World Report on student decisions. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(5), 415-436. doi:10.1007/s11162-009-9129-8
- Cantwell, B., & Taylor, B. (2013). Global status, intra-institutional stratification and organizational segmentation: A time-dynamic tobit analysis of ARWU position among U.S. universities. *Minerva: A Review of Science, Learning & Policy*, 51(2), 195-223. doi:10.1007/s11024-013-9228-8
- Collins, F., & Park, G.-S. (2016). Ranking and the multiplication of reputation: Reflections from the frontier of globalizing higher education. *Higher Education*, 72(1), 115-129. doi:10.1007/s10734-015-9941-3
- Daraio, C., Bonaccorsi, A., & Simar, L. (2015). Rankings and university performance: A conditional multidimensional approach. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 244(3), 918-930. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2015.02.005
- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2002). Reaching for the brass ring: The U.S. News and World Report ranking and competition. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 17.
- Findlay, A. M., King, R., Smith, F. M., Geddes, A., & Skeldon, R. (2012). World class? An investigation of globalisation, difference and international student mobility. *Transactions* of the Institute of British Geographers, 37(1), 118-131. doi:10.1111/j.1475-5661.2011.00454.x
- Gnolek, S., Falciano, V., & Kuncl, R. (2014). Modeling change and variation in U.S. News & World Report college rankings: What would it really take to be in the top 20? *Research in Higher Education*, *55*(8), 761-779. doi:10.1007/s11162-014-9336-9
- Hauptman, A. M. (2006). Higher education finance: Trends and issues. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education part one: Global themes and contemporary challenges* (pp. 83-106). Netherlands: Springer.
- Hazelkorn, E. (2014). Reflections on a decade of global rankings: What we've learned and outstanding issues. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 12-28. doi:10.1111/ejed.12059

- Hazelkorn, E. (2015). *Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for worldclass excellence* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hazelkorn, E. (2016). Globalization and the continuing influence on rankings--positive and perverse--on higher education. In M. Yudekevich, P. G. Altbach, & L. E. Rumbley (Eds.), *The global academic rankings game: Changing institutional policy, practice, and academic life* (pp. 269-294). New York: Routledge, Taylor, & Frances.
- Hazelkorn, E., Loukkola, T., & Zhang, T. (2014). *Rankings in institutional strategies and* processes: Impact or illusion? Retrieved from the EAU website: <u>http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications-homepage-</u> list/EUA RISP Publication.pdf?sfvrsn=6
- Heffernan, T. A., & Heffernan, A. (2018). Language games: University responses to ranking metrics. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 72(1), 29-39. doi:10.1111/hequ.12139
- Kehm, B. M. (2014). Global university rankings: Impacts and unintended side effects. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 102-112. doi:10.1111/ejed.12064
- Liu, N. C., & Cheng, Y. (2011). Global university rankings and their impact. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *Leadership for world-class universities: Challenges for developing countries* (pp. 145-158). New York: Routledge, Taylor, and Frances.
- Locke, W. (2011). The institutionalization of rankings: Managing status anxiety in an increasingly marketized environment. In J. C. Shin, R. K. Toutkoushian, & U. Tiechler (Eds.), University rankings: Theoretical basis, methodology, and impacts on global higher education (pp. 201-228). London: Springer.
- Locke, W. (2014). The intensification of rankings logic in an increasingly marketised higher education environment. *European Journal of Education, 49*, 77-90. doi:10.1111/ejed.12060
- Marginson, S. (2014). University rankings and social science. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 45-59. doi:10.1111/ejed.12061
- Monks, J., & Ehrenberg, R. G. (1999). U.S. news & world report's college rankings. *Change*, 31(6), 42.
- Morphew, C. C., & Swanson, C. (2011). On the efficacy of raising your university's rankings. In J. C. Shin, R. K. Toutkoushian, & U. Tiechler (Eds.), University rankings: Theoretical basis, methodology, and impacts on global higher education (pp. 185-200). London: Springer.
- Morse, R., Brooks, E., & Mason, M. (2017). How U.S. News calculated the 2018 best college rankings. U.S. News and World Report. Retrieved from <u>https://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/articles/how-us-news-calculated-the-rankings</u>
- O'Connell, C. (2013). Research discourses surrounding global university rankings: exploring the relationship with policy and practice recommendations. *Higher Education (00181560)*, 65(6), 709-723. doi:10.1007/s10734-012-9572-x
- QS Top Universities. (2018). Methodoloty. Retrieved from <u>https://www.topuniversities.com/qs-world-university-rankings/methodology</u>
- Rauhvargers, A. (2014). Where are the global rankings leading us? An analysis of recent methodological changes and new developments. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 29-44. doi:10.1111/ejed.12066

- Syed Gohar, A., Yousafzai, M. T., & Khattak, A. (2015). Internationalization of universities: Challenges, threats and opportunities for third world countries. *Dialogue (1819-6462)*, *10*(4), 378-389.
- Teichler, U. (2011). The future of university rankings. In J. C. Shin, R. K. Toutkoushian, & U. Teichler (Eds.), University rankings: Theoretical basis, methodology, and impacts on global higher education (pp. 259-266). London: Springer.
- Tie, F. H. (2012). Research publication as a strategy to improve international academic ranking. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 15(4), 437-450. doi:10.1080/13603124.2012.696707
- Times Higher Education. (2017). World University Rankings 2018 methodology. Retrieved from <u>https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/methodology-world-university-rankings-2018</u>
- Williams, R., & de Rassenfosse, G. (2016). Pitfalls in aggregating performance measures in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(1), 51-62. doi:10.1080/03075079.2014.914912
- Zha, Q. (2009). Diversification or homogenization in higher education: A global allomorphism perspective. *Higher Education in Europe*, *34*(3/4), 459-479. doi:10.1080/03797720903356628

### International Rankings Initiative

March 18, 2019



### International Rankings Overview

- 23 International Ranking Systems Today
- 3 Rankings Most Important
- 3 Rankings to Follow





RANKINGS

NIVERSITY











#### Sustained slide since 2003 – positive reversal in 2018

Sources: ARWU, Leiden, NTU, QS, THE, USNWR. Graph courtesy of ICG.



### Impact of Rankings on Universities









Collaborations and Partnerships

## Student Recruitment and Scholarships

Faculty RecruitmentInternational Reputationand Retentionand Funding



### **Rankings Initiative Recommendations**

- 1. Prioritize existing initiatives
- 2. Clean up **data**
- 3. Clean up bibliometric information
- 4. Build **faculty scholarly reputation** and **international activities**
- 5. Execute a comprehensive international communications strategy



### **Opportunities for Faculty Impact**

•List Case Western Reserve University as primary affiliation

•Create ORDCID IDs for all faculty

•Bring international conferences to the CWRU campus

•Share international collaborators

•Take information about CWRU when travelling and share an impactful story: *"Did you hear what Case Western Reserve is doing?"* 



### **Questions or Comments**



Faculty-sponsored petition to amend SOM Bylaws

#### Signature data:

Total #: 57 signatures

40 PhDs; 15 MDs or MD/PhDs; 2 instructors

34 males; 23 females

Affiliation: CCLCM - 19; SOM - 24; VA - 6; UH - 7; Metro - 1

#### Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine

#### Faculty-sponsored petition for amending the SOM Bylaws

The undersigned below, full-time faculty at the CWRU-SOM, petition the Faculty Council of the CWRU SOM to amend the School of Medicine Bylaws as follows:

 Amend Article 3:5 describing the "Officers of the Faculty Council" to state "the chair-elect of the Faculty Council shall be elected from basic sciences, clinical sciences from UH, clinical sciences from the VA, clinical sciences from MetroHealth, and basic/clinical sciences from CC, on an annual rotating basis".

Rationale: Ensure fair and adequate representation for all faculty members, increase inclusiveness and diversity.

 Amend Article 3:6.b. describing the Nominating and Election Committee of faculty council to include equal representation from all CWRU SOM institutions (basic sciences from SOM, clinical sciences from UH, clinical sciences from the VA, clinical sciences from MetroHealth, and basic/clinical sciences from CC).

Rationale: Ensure fair and adequate representation for all faculty members, increase inclusiveness and diversity.

 Amend Article 3:6.a. to state "faculty shall have a two-term lifetime limit to serving on the faculty council steering committee, with the exception of faculty council chairs who shall have a 3-term lifetime limit".

Rationale: Increase diversity and infuse the Steering Committee with fresh perspectives.

 Amend Article 3:5 describing the "Officers of the Faculty Council" to state "the chair-elect of the Faculty Council shall be elected from basic sciences, clinical sciences from UH, clinical sciences from the VA, clinical sciences from MetroHealth, and basic/clinical sciences from CC, on an annual rotating basis".

Rationale: Ensure fair and adequate representation for all faculty members, increase inclusiveness and diversity.

3.5: Officers of the Faculty Council

Each year the Faculty Council shall elect a chair-elect from the SOM or its affiliated hospitals (CCLCM, UHCMC, MHMC, and VAMC) on a rotating basis determined alphabetically starting wherever the executive committee agrees upon. Constituencies may forfeit this opportunity and it will go to the next constituency in alphabetical order. Faculty shall remain eligible to be elected chair for up to three years after their term on Faculty Council has ended. The chair-elect shall serve as vice-chair of the Faculty Council during the first year following election and succeed to the chair the following year.

 Amend Article 3:6.b. describing the Nominating and Election Committee of faculty council to include equal representation from all CWRU SOM institutions (basic sciences from SOM, clinical sciences from UH, clinical sciences from the VA, clinical sciences from MetroHealth, and basic/clinical sciences from CC).

Rationale: Ensure fair and adequate representation for all faculty members, increase inclusiveness and diversity.

4. Amendment to change composition of nominating and elections committee (Article 3.6.b)

b. Nomination and Elections Committee. This committee shall consist of eleven members: the dean, five other Faculty Council members, one each from each constituency (e.g., CCLCM, UHCMC, MHMC, VAMC, and SOM), and five fulltime faculty members who are not members of the Faculty Council, one each from each constituency (e.g., CCLCM, UHCMC, MHMC, VAMC, and SOM). The five Faculty Council members of the Nomination and Elections Committee shall be elected at large by the Faculty Council and shall serve for the duration of their terms as Faculty Council members. The five non-members of the Faculty Council shall be elected by ballot by the Faculty of Medicine and shall serve three-year terms. The chair will be elected

from the members of the committee annually.

| Current                         | Representatives:       | proposed                  |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Dean                            | administration         | Dean                      |
| 2 clinical, 2 pre-clinical (=4) | FC members             | 1 from @ institution (=5) |
| 2 clinical, 2 pre-clinical (=4) | Faculty not FC members | 1 from @ institution (=5) |
| 1                               | FC chair               | 0                         |
| 1                               | FC vice-Chair          | 0                         |
| 11                              | Total                  | 11                        |

Amend Article 3:6.a. to state "faculty shall have a two-term lifetime limit to serving on the faculty council steering committee, with the exception of faculty council chairs who shall have a 3-term lifetime limit".

Rationale: Increase diversity and infuse the Steering Committee with fresh perspectives.

3.6: Committees of the Faculty Council

a. Steering Committee. The Steering Committee shall consist of eight members: the chair of the Faculty Council, the

vice-chair of the Faculty Council, the immediate past chair of the Faculty Council, and five other Faculty Council members

who shall be elected by the Faculty Council for one-year terms. These members may be reelected successively to the Steering

Committee for the duration of their terms as members of the Faculty Council and again after an absence of twelve (12) years

or four 3-year Faculty Council terms.

#### **Directions & Parking Information**

### Directions to the Health Science Parking Garage (#55 on the map) and into the Medical School First Floor

Driving East on Euclid Avenue; turn right on Adelbert Road, and take Adelbert Road to Circle Drive. Make a **left** at the 4-way stop sign. Turn left into the Health Science Parking garage, Lot 55 on attached map. Upon entering the visitor's entrance of the Medical School from the Health Sciences parking garage (brown **M** DOOR ACROSS FROM THE NURSING SCHOOL ENTRANCE) you will see that straight ahead is a glass door to the medical school, which requires card access. Please go down the hall on the **right**, take a slight **left** and then you will see the Security Desk. Go past the Security Desk and up the stairs. Conference Room BRB105 will be on the left side past the Dean's Office.

Parking is also available at the Veale Parking Lot #53 on the map. You would walk down Adelbert to the foot entrance to the medical school which opens to the staircase leading to the first floor of the BRB Building. We are only able to comp for parking at the Health Science Parking Garage and Veale Parking garage.

#### **Parking Lot Map**



Visitor's parking lots (Please remember to bring your parking ticket with you).

- Lot # 55 is Health Sciences Parking lot (Under Medical School)
- Lot #53 is Veale Parking Garage