

Faculty Senate Meeting September 7, 2011

In attendance: Paul Anderson, Sharon Andrews, Daniel Bourland, James Cotter, Carol Cramer, Mary DeShazer, Paul Escott, Jacquelyn Fetrow, Mary Friedman, Candelas Gala, Samuel Gladding, Michael Green, Sarah Jones, Kevin Jung, Judy Kem, Hank Kennedy, Greg Kucera, Dale Martin, Ken Middaugh, Ellen Miller, Lorna Moore, Gail O'Day, *Mark Miller (visitor from medical school)*, *Suzanne Reynolds (law school, filling in for Blake Morant)*, James Schirillo, Gale Sigal, Lynn Sutton, Ahmed Taha, Alan Townsend, Lynne Wagenknecht, Mark Welker, *Virginia F. Wright (not on list)*

Topic: Medical School Tenure Document
Issues, Concerns, Questions, Comments, Changes

Senate Executive Committee met yesterday. Senior Assoc. Dean Steve Block is here to answer questions.

Dean Block Opening Comment: In late 2010 faculty and administrators met to create a document. It went through approximately 17 drafts. Substantial faculty input was given by every department from the medical school as well as senators. This document was presented twice to the counsel. Meetings were held in late spring with concerns from the FRC.

We also received anonymous and open input from the Women's Forum, Medical School and Reynolda campus. There were individual concerns, two town hall meetings in late summer and the committee met again and submit now, hopefully, a final draft.

Goals: tenure that has a standard meaning and overall similar to those across the country.

- Substantial changes: faculty now has an opportunity to express issues raised and questions.
- Clarify a misconception (FRC did not formally approve document)
- Fundamental concerns: residual problems
 - Tenure – no compensation guarantee
 - Without guarantee, no academic freedom; fundamental flaw
- Important to reiterate in the agreement of running medical school.

Dean Block:

- Medical center working on compensation package
 - Model against funds flow
 - Finalized in spring
 - Close to commitment from McConnell
 - X component – base salary – didn't know yet

- Don't think we as faculty can responsibly agree –no guarantee of living wage?
- Dean Block: Vast majority don't have a guarantee
- Analysis in 2010 - 50% schools have tenure with salary guarantee
- Don't have to emulate
- When recent controversy started, salary cuts were the fundamental problem
- Without some sort of base salary guarantee this model will be for medical school
- Unethical to recruit people (tenure or not) with no guarantee on salary
- By pass – cut salaries – medical school problem
- Stay competitive with grants

- No money for raises for faculty in 2009, cut some faculty but admin got raises equal to what cut from faculty– not academic model; it's a Wall Street model

People penalized with salary reductions are still living with those reductions – needs restoration

Nobody will get a summary if there is a decrease at time of annual review, some per one year from October 1st; may give salary decrease

What approach to salary to bench level – could have cuts in the future – will become retroactive?
Dean Block: Cannot answer at this point.

Hear about academic freedom and research people are doing; where I work, if I stop producing, I could understand not doing the job and don't deserve tenure, so post tenure review; but is there any protection for those people?– need more assurance about this review process and protection.

Current draft of tenure and promotion document: On page 15, next to last paragraph; added clarity: an elected committee...not serving... Need to make a faculty driven committee to protect peers.

Post tenure review by department heads. If senior committee, 3 people including department head. Give more comfort; standardized every 5 years peer and institutional level. Chair review annually.

Going to anonymous review by peers to speak minds freely. What does annual review look like?
No consistency.

Someone not doing job; down to 7%. Document trying to keep financial metric; understand base living wage salary – economic protection – distinguishing – makes faculty factory workers.

Dean Abraham was very explicit yesterday– intention for faculty to receive continued bridge funding – concerned about economic climate – maintain faculty we've invested in.

No protections – attorney comment that this document “incomplete” w/out meaningful salary guarantee. If Medical School negotiates with Blue Cross Blue Shield, would they accept if BCBS said we'll tell you later how much we will reimburse you? Going to tell me you're going to do this?

Dean Block: No one knows details, conversations and consultants coming this fall to hold faculty forums to be more transparent.

Every FRC meeting faculty heard from committee that can't tell you what's happening because we were told not to (compensation commitment). McConnell and Abrams - \$25k – until we see document and know what we're talking about – we don't know.

Non-tenure track – 1 year contract? Not tenure track get initial 3 year appointment. Entirely Clinical (not academic) dependent on funding; 1 year reappointment letter.

At risk for non-reappointment; requires 90 day notice – will be changed to 1 year notice.

Initial appointment – involvement of faculty, formal search committees, at least small number of senior faculty colleagues. Faculty members and association and professors rank, review CV and supporting documents and vote (faculty) vote. More faculty engaged; policy implemented 1 month ago.

T&P Committee: Make sure representation by every department; easy if departments are large; some small departments might not be represented; concerned about diversity – major issue – not enough representatives by women and minorities.

Candidate – want more professors than associate professors – need larger number of tenure faculty – continue on an appointment basis. Committee is a 3 year appointment except chair (additional 1-2 years). Not done by field. Procedure not in document.

Nine plus years faculty – clinical 50% research been 10-12 years; will they have to apply annually – many choose clinician scientist.

Grievance Process (university function). Faculty turned down get feedback. Candidate gets review and copy to chair – solid feedback whether promoted or not.

Requirement: every department has to have critical mass – how best to create mass. Small department gets consultation from other departments, peer review and support (preview for promotion and help candidate refine); easier to read, etc.

Department Committee may not allow someone to come up for promotion and clock will run out. Dean Block: Grievance process comes in. Annual review and tenure and promotion review committee. Balance between too much process: may work well in one department but may be disastrous in another. Empower Chairs to do the right thing.

Not convinced mechanism actually represents salary is protected. Until in writing, impossible to endorse document.

The document is vastly improved from what it was. School granting tenure and medical school grants salary; legally not possible.

McConnell said FRC approved (not true). No objections raised in meeting but not formal.

In earlier draft, has right to cut salary. Reynolda campus has never had salary cut.

AAUP: tenure guarantees livable wage; compensation and tenure legally separated. Can have both documents side by side if can't incorporate. Then Senate can say whether will accept or not.

AAUP –tenure means permanent employment but its tenure statement does not mention salary – does not protect. A supplemental statement says can't cut salary so much person forced to quit.

2 Proposals:

- In Compensation document, ensure compensation appropriate to person's occupation
- Ask administration from medical school to provide compensation document with appropriate compensation before Senate signs off on the tenure document

Senate needs to see in writing before agreeing which leads to consequences.

- Needs assurance
- Reynolda campus – issue not addressed in its compensation document – no contract – employment with no term

Pay neurosurgeon for not doing research; chooses to do neither – stop working

Tenure policy for Reynolda – concern from medical school

University lawyers – courts ruled “firing” if salary reduced enough

Motion: provide compensation document; not numbers but sufficient assurance that commensurate w/ AAUP guidelines and in line with practices at medical schools that provide base salary guarantee 16 for, 4 opposed, 3 abstentions; motion **passed by substantial majority**)