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46 Present
I. Call to order (Tom Smith, President) @ 7:42AM

II. Consideration of Consent Agenda

   a) October 2014 Minutes
   b) Committee and Unit Reports
      i) College of Nursing Unit Report
      ii) College of Medicine – Clinical Sciences Report
      iii) Library Sciences and Information

The consent agenda is something new that we are trying to incorporate this year. A consent agenda is meant to help allow for more discussion by grouping items together for approval that do not need discussion. It requires upfront work on each senator’s behalf to read the consent agenda before the meeting. Please email the secretary, Julie Woolworth, with typographical errors or other changes that need to be made at any point before the meeting. Any item can be removed from the consent agenda with a motion to discuss during the meeting before the consent agenda is approved.

There was a move to accept the consent agenda and a second. The consent agenda is approved with no opposition.

III. Mark Sothmann, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (Presentation can be found as Appendix A)

   a) Faculty Evaluations

      • We have had a year of transition with the search for a new president and also with other transitions in leadership.

      • Faculty evaluations are used to inform the provost and president regarding the performance of those being evaluated as well as trends or hot topic items happening within a college. They are sometimes used as discussion points during evaluations.

      • It is left up to the individual whether they choose to share their evaluation because it is part of the employment record and as part of the record it has a certain amount of confidentiality applied to it. The faculty within a college or department/division can ask for their leadership to share their evaluation, but it is not required for the leadership to share.

      • There are confidential conversations that occasionally happen between the faculty senate president and the Provost, especially if there are concerns about leadership or a particular individual.

      • The evaluation includes 36 questions regarding decision making, leadership, communication, organization, budget, diversity and collaboration. They also includes an area for comments regarding strengths and areas for improvement. The surveys are evaluated for division/department directors, chairs, deans, and the provost. The evaluation is on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high). Around 35-40 individuals are rated each year and the rates this year were pretty high at 4.29 for department chairs/division directors and 4.25 for deans/provost.
range of scores from was 2.7 to 5.0. Six individuals scored below 4.0 and one individual scored 2.7.

- In some ways, leadership is an art form and at MUSC it is a balance of constituencies and the board of trustees (BoT). Employment decisions can be influenced by the evaluations, but not solely made on this information. The deans to have access to the department and division leadership evaluations for their college and each individual will have access to their evaluation.

- Suggestion that it would be useful to have a bullet summary regarding what sort of changes (initiative types of items) that result from the evaluations. Dr. Sothmann suggested talking with Tom Smith more about developing this list. Also, it was suggested that if there is a breakdown of evaluation response rates by department/division, that it might be possible in the future for faculty senate to encourage feedback from those areas.

- Another question asked was regarding the extent to which the Board of Trustees (BoT) are involved in the review of individuals with the Provost and President. The BoT does not see the evaluations, again they are part of the confidential employment record. The BoT responsibility is more regarding policy at MUSC, but there are conversations that happen about an individual because MUSC is a closed society compared to larger institutions and therefore a lot of conversations happen around campus. If there is an overwhelming opinion from the BoT regarding an individual, then it will be brought to the attention of the Provost/President.

- Part of leadership is taking on difficult decision making, so it is important to have individuals that can make those decisions. Try to keep in mind that we have individuals making difficult decisions and need those people, so it is a balancing act.

**b) Intellectual Property**

- The topic of IP bubbled up from discussions regarding online education. As an institution, decided to step back on the online education initiative to take a breather. Plan on building the market share for online education as an institution. Healthcare is an industry and we are not coming near out potential to creating online degree programs to encourage enrollment of additional students. Question raised that a packet of teaching materials that would get marketed for revenue. We should not jump into this head first and then find out way out. We have an IP policy in the handbook, but the University will spend some time looking deeper into this issue. Any creative act done by any staff/faculty is owned by MUSC, but the question really comes in with the decision of marketing and patent, copyright, licensing. There is a plan to engage the faculty senate in this discussion and the institution would like it to be an inviting discussion. If there is a decision to market any teaching materials developed while at MUSC, the relationship is a partnership with this institution. When we publish, we sign the rights to the journal. This is a common practice and that is okay by the institution. However, if it is a matter of making money from your IP, the university will need to be involved. What will be the governance structure for those individuals involved in the creation of the online courses? The faculty own the curriculum, so what has to happen when a new curriculum is developed it has to be approved by a curriculum committee (that is the oversight). They have had some conversations with the deans about what is a curriculum committee and their responsibilities. Our academic accrediting body, SACS, recognizes that faculty oversee the curriculum, so the institution has to respect the faculty oversight as well.

**c) Space**
• We went into Responsibility Centered Management (RCM, also known as funds flow). Funds flow gives colleges and departments the ability to get granular information regarding informed decisions. Space previously was a hidden cost, but now it is not. Sometimes space has been grabbed and pulled back by central administration, and, during other times space has been controlled by the department. The president owns the space, he cedes it to the provost, and then it is shared out to the colleges. The deans allocate the space that they pay for. You pay for good and bad space and sometimes deans will try to off-load the bad space. Some space is not used under the RCM, and it can be difficult to off-load it if no one else is willing to take it. We have more space than we thought we did. This has caused some sensitive issues to arise, some people who had space have been determined to be over-allocated. This needs to be an ongoing discussion. Oversight of space still resides with central management. What was the faculty input on the development with the RCM model at MUSC? A major question remains to be indirect costs and how that gets back to the faculty. Chris Davies as previous president was involved in giving input on the model, decision to RCM was made by the deans.

• Funds flow was not put to a vote, it was a management decision but management had to present this decision to a wide group of constituencies to explain the model and why the switch needed to happen. At the end of the day, the BoT also adopted the model. Indirect costs, are intended to pay for the infrastructure costs of the university. Previously it was not necessary to use indirect costs to fund infrastructure needs because we were getting funding from the state (20-30 years ago, indirect funds mostly went back to the college/investigator). We do not take anything at the administrative level from indirects. Exactly how indirect funds are used is a college-specific decision. Some colleges choose to use indirect funds to pay for infrastructure. The Provost is not in a position to tell the Deans what they have to do, but will raise the issue with the Deans that a given lab might need some indirect funds to purchase items for the lab (gloves, PPE, bleach - it must be accounted for). The indirect cost negotiated with the federal government for costs to cover these type of items (PPE, computers are anticipated in the indirect costs). Do not want labs to get into an issue of safety. Benchmark the space cost next to other institutions and do not feel that it is outside of reasonable. Not discounting argument, but will carry it to the Dean. May also want to have a discussion with procurement and also with the Deans. Should also have a conversation within the COM faculty.

• A question raised is about the existence of a list of space on campus? There is a master list and it describes how the space is assigned. List of student space comes out of Dr. Shaw's office. There is not a description of how each space is used (e.g. student, lab, office, etc.).

d) Update on New Hires

• COM Dean: The new President has been explicit that we need to evaluate our alignment as an institution. There is a lot of change on the clinical side with the affordable care act. We might consider partnering with other hospitals to position ourselves in this competitive market. There are questions about alignment and therefore the university is not rushing forward with the COM deanship until there is a decision on alignment and what our expectations are regarding both the academic and clinical side of the house.

• Director HCC: This search has undergone an external review and recommendations have been made to the Provost/President regarding alignment and the need for a national search. There are plans to move forward with a national search.

• CGS Dean: The search committee has made a recommendation of two candidates.
• Associate Provost for Research: there is an internal search to vet the candidate pool.

e) Strategic Plan
• Creation and initiation of updated strategic plan, pull together around 300 individuals to meet with consultants to initiate the new strategic plan in mid-December. Tom as president of FS is involved in that conversation.

f) New Initiatives
• New degree programs – the new program on population health should be going forward to the education commission soon.

• Will start the process of applying for NCI-designated comprehensive cancer center. The Hollings Cancer Center was awarded a NCI-designated cancer center in 2009. NCI-designation is an acknowledgement from the NCI at being at the forefront of cancer research centers involved in developing and translation of scientific research and discoveries into treatments for cancer patients. Also, there is NCI grant funding that accompanies the designation to support shared resources.

• Kathleen Brady, who is serving as the interim associate provost for research is the Director and Principle Investigator of the Clinical Translational Science Award (CTSA). This is a $20 million award from the NIH over the next five years that is focused on translational research. The focus includes reducing the time it takes to get a discovery into the clinic, engaging the community in clinical research efforts, and train translational researchers. For more information, see the following link:

g) Questions from the Audience
  a. Genomics and Genetics Initiatives:

• We have an interim director currently, but there has been a hold in hiring the permanent director. There is also a lack of clinical genetics. There are on campus both education and clinical need for genomics and genetics. Dr. Sothmann agreed to put it as a topic of discussion with the Deans and HCC director candidates. Investment into genetics is another discussion and Dr. Sothmann stated that it is not at the bottom of the list regarding importance. The perception of some faculty is that many items are on hold with the hold of the HCC director. The perspective of the Provost and enterprise is that the HCC and CTSA are two centers with wide-over sight that we need to nurture and new money should be placed into both the HCC and CTSA.

b. Search for Regenerative Medicine Chair:

• Dr. Sothmann met with candidates for regenerative medicine chair and had conversations about the lack of a Dean for the College of Medicine. He discussed how the lack of a dean should not influence the decision of the candidate because as a smaller institution the leadership of the Provost and President are aligned and whoever is considered for the position should also align. The President and Provost will not bring someone into regenerative medicine that is not aligned with the goals of the institution. It was more difficult last year to assure people in a candidate position.

c. Tom Smith does meet with Dr. Sothmann regularly, so feel free to contact Tom with Issues that you would like to be brought up with the Provost.
IV. **President’s Report – Appendix B**

a) COM interim dean agreed to meeting with all COM senators (both basic science and clinical science). There is recognition that discussion about COM issues need to occur at the COM level and this is one way to hopefully achieve that goal. There is still need to determine how this will be structured and how many people will be involved. There is current anticipation that these meetings with the interim Dean will occur quarterly.

b) Strategic plan has been moved to an implementation group. Tom Smith asked for anyone with interest in serving as a representative to contact him.

V. **Committee Reports**

a) Faculty & Institutional Relationships - Mark Bowden, met a couple of weeks ago to cover handbook sections 4.0 and 4.01 and also sections 6.0 and 6.01. They will be moving forward with submission to faculty senate and faculty at large. Working at revising the faculty handbook to iron out inconsistencies and make it into a database format that is easier to search.

b) Governance -Martina Mueller is the chair and the committee is planning to discuss a meeting time.

c) Institutional Advancement – Alexander Chessman and Mathew Gregoski are currently acting co-chairs and the committee is planning to discuss a meeting time.

d) Communication & Education – The chair is Elizabeth Schuler and the committee is planning to discuss a meeting time. The PT workshop held in October was well attended and a success.

VI. **Electoral Unit Reports**

a) College of Dental Medicine
   - still searching for dean of oral rehabilitation with last candidate interviewing tomorrow

b) College of Health Professions - no report

c) College of Medicine Basic Sciences - no report

d) College of Medicine, Clinical Sciences – addition to consent agenda report
   - Impending breakfast meeting and submitted questions to Adam, forwarded to Tom. Any other issues, please forward to Tom.

e) College of Pharmacy - no report

f) Library Sciences and Information, nothing to add to consent agenda report

VII. **New business**

No new business from the floor.

VIII. **Adjournment**

No objections to adjourn, considered adjourned at 9:01 am.
Consent Agenda Items for November 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting

a) October 2014 Minutes

b) Committee and Unit Reports

i) College of Nursing Unit Report

Our college is preparing for the move on December 15th. Other than that things are quiet right now.

ii) College of Medicine – Clinical Sciences Report

The Clinical Sciences electoral unit has not met as yet. A search committee for the next COM Dean has not been announced.

iii) Library Sciences and Information

The DLSI is working to bring unit faculty together for a “Meet and Greet” in December. During this gathering, faculty will be invited to share information about their work and successes towards the mission of the DLSI. The unit will continue to refine its communication processes and the DLSI Senators look forward to a productive year serving on the Faculty Senate and University Committees.
Appendix A:
Provost/Faculty Senate
Faculty Surveys
Use

• Inform President/Provost regarding faculty evaluations on a broad range of topics
  – 36 Questions
  – Decision making, leadership, communication, organization, budget, diversity, collaboration
  – Comments: Strengths, Areas for Improvement, General

• Division Directors/Department Chairs/Deans/Provost Annual Performance Review

• Benchmark General and Individual Trends
Summary

• 25-30% of Faculty Respond
• Scale of 1(low)-5(high)
• Average Ratings: 35-40 Individuals Rated
  – Department Chairs/Division Directors: 4.29
  – Deans/Provost: 4.25
• Range 2.70-5.00
• Below 4.0 (6 individuals)
• Below 3.0 (1 individual)
• Particular areas where specific strengths or limitations perceived
• Individual decision on whether to share results
Appendix B:
Faculty Senate President Report
November 2014
Senate President’s Report
November 18, 2014

1) Handbook Revisions...anticipated completion of next stage by next week. Review with Provost and with Senate FIR/Exec.

2) Discussions of Search for COM Dean/MUSC VP for Medical Affairs and encouragement of University President and Provost to involve Senate. Discussed issue with interim COM Dean as well.

3) Moderated T and P workshop...planned and sponsored by Communication and Education Committee.

4) Met with COM Interim Dean...discussed possible quarterly meetings with COM-CS and COM-BS senators. Need feedback from senators regarding interest and likely attendance.

5) Please let me know if you would be willing to serve as a Senate appointee to any of the four Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan implementation groups:

   a. Recruitment and Pipeline Development
   b. Education and Training
   c. Engagement and Inclusion
   d. Communications, Community Relations, and Outreach