### MUSC Faculty Senate
**Draft Meeting Minutes**

**September, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Total Present: 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balasubramanian Sundaravadivel</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hartwell Karen A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnato Sara</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hays Angela A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batalis Nicholas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Helke Kristi P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowden Mark</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Helpern Joseph A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratton Charles</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hennig Mirko A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan Emily</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hill Monique A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock Andrew</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Holmes-Maybank Keri A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Joshua</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hudson Shannon P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter Laura</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ingraham Gabriel P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Nancy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Jones Walter P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartmell Julia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kalhorn Stephen A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayouette Monica</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kramer Rita A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabtree Elizabeth</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Krywko Diann A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies Chris</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lehman-Huskamp Kathy A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denham Sarah</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lopez Cristina P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz Vanessa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lynch Cheryl A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubose-Morris Ragan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Matheson Eric A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas Bonnie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moreland Angela P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Catherine</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Morissette David A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields Chris</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mueller Martina P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming DaNine</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mund Angela P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler Terri</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nobles Ryan A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankel Bruce</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Paintlia Ajaib A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman Geoffery</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Picard Jonathan A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Megan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poon Jennifer P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg David</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pulgilla Cahandarkala A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregoski Mathew</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Ralston Jonathan P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamil Lindsey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Rao Anil A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haney Jason</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Rohrer Baerbel A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salgado Cassandra</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Schandl Cynthia A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons Cephus</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Smith Shannon A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Tom</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Smolka Adam P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiotta Alejandro</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sterrett James A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suranyi Pal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sutkowski Natalie P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Miran</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Thompson Amy P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tormos Lee</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Turner Raymond A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandergrift William</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Watson Dennis P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilner Ira</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Wisniewski Chris P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolff Daynna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Woolworth Julie P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wray Dannah</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Wu Jennifer A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarnall Tammy</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Palanisamy Visu A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuler Elizabeth</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cowart Ashely A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Call to order** (Tom Smith, President)
   a) **Called to order at 7:49 am**

2) **Approval of minutes from August 2014 had email revisions**
   a) No quorum to vote on minutes

3) **Presentations**
   
a) **Parking Management**
   i) Our guest from Parking Management was Stewart Nixon, the Chief of Operations on the University Side. The purpose of the visit was to discuss the rise in parking fees and answers questions regarding parking.
   ii) The following items have contributed to the need for parking fee increases:
      (1) In 2009, the University purchased the Courtney Garage.
      (2) There was a plan to increase parking rates over 2009 to 2012 in order to build the Bee Street garage, but due to the poor economy and to avoid putting additional strain on employees, it was decided that the proposed increases in parking fees would be placed on hold.
   iii) The need to pay off the debt from the two items above and the potential projects in the future to maintain current parking lots and accommodate future parking needs, a new 5-year parking rate increase plan was adopted last year that outlines a tiered payment system. Annually, the budget is reviewed and a decision is made regarding the parking rate increase. The parking rate increase was approved in April 2013 by the Board of Trustees, Provost and President.
   iv) Questions and Responses
      (1) Will future increases go along with the Tier approach? Yes
      (2) Once the debt is paid, will the rates reverse? The money that goes into the system is used to maintain the system and future growth of the system. They are looking to break even. It is a 30 year debt and then we need to look at the maintenance of this very large system, they also need to look at parking projects for the future (e.g. new woman's and children's and the Horizon Project).
      (3) Is there a time in which the debt service will be paid? These are 30 year notes/morgages. Just paid hagood parking deck off a year ago. Depends on when it was brought on and how long the note is for.
      (4) Why do Roper employees park at the Courtney garage? Had to honor the leases (700 to Roper), they do pay more for their parking than MUSC employees. Roper has been approved to build a garage for 2016. Roper is charged $125 per space (market price). Those 700 spaces will come back to MUSC once the Roper garage is completed.
      (5) Do all employees at MUSC pay on the same scale? (e.g. later hours get a different rate). Most of the late night folks pay nothing, most are hospital employees and the hospital covers any fees incurred. Night-time parking in the Rutledge Tower, the hospital subsidizes any costs incurred. Anyone coming to work from 7 to 7, pay regular rates.
(6) The hospital still subsidizes for the majority of their workforce (not admin and managers). That is why it looks like hospital employees pay less than MUSC employees, but that is not the case because the Hospital chooses to pay the difference.

(7) What is the current status of M-Lot? Parking management system paid to take down the bank building at a significant cost because of asbestos. The thought was since they paid to remove the building and once it was down, the city stopped the construction in order to approve the plans for the new parking lot. Current recommendations is that it needs shrubbery for the lot according to the city before it can move forward. Hoping for October for it to be operational.

(8) What happened to the previous Parking Committee that was developed and the faculty senate representative appointed to that committee? Non-decision decision made that the committee would be suspended for a time. Challenges with getting people to come, still a recognized committee that needs to be recharged.

(9) What is the future for dental patients parking? This is currently an ongoing challenge. The challenge is to find a place to have the patients park that is close enough to the building. Primarily, patients currently park in PG2 lot. It is not a happily solution for most, but there is a lack of any other viable options at this time.

b) Ombudsman Presentation by John Waller
(for full presentation see Minutes Appendix A: FS_Minutes_09-2014_AppA-Ombudsman)

i) Report - Second Year update (there was a presentation). This body (FS) and John Raymond came up with this concept of the ombudsman. The office serves as an alternate pathway for dispute/conflict resolution. Strict confidence with reporting only to the President, but details are not shared.

ii) Over the course of the year around 60 to 65 people visit the office of the ombudsman (many individuals have multiple visits)
   (1) all colleges represented,
   (2) all ranks,
   (3) a few postdocs.
   (4) The gender split is around 50%.

iii) In addition, the ombudsman office also receives calls from non-charge individuals (the charge of the office was for faculty and post-doc). Non-charge individuals include undergraduates, MUSC and MUHA employees, patients and their families. There may need to be something put in place for the non-charge clientele.

iv) The most common reason for visits are non-renewal notices. In his experience, the root cause tends to be internally conflicting Faculty Handbook language.

v) Most common issue is bad behavior: failure to follow due process, bullying, and nasty behavior.
vi) Most outcomes are favorable or satisfactory. In approximately 25% of cases there is no follow-up for the resolution. However, there is no obligation to follow-up.

vii) Three recommendations were offered (3):
   (1) Fix faculty handbook contradictory language
   (2) Coverage of individuals not covered by the ombudsman charge
   (3) Re-educate those in power about due process. Training in conflict resolution might be worthwhile chairs, managers, and deans.

c) Discussion of COM Online Education
   i) Three guests from the COM 1st and 2nd year Curriculum Committee came to discuss the issues surrounding the online education initiative. In particular, they came to walk through the Joint Statement of Concerns regarding the proposed development and implementation of online degree programs for a 3-year M.D. degree or M.S. in Integrated Medical Sciences.
   ii) Background: The program was intended to create a new degree (MS in Integrated Medical Sciences) and over the course of two years fold that into the current medical education program by creating an online curriculum. The goal was to make the first two years of the medical school basic science requirements into a program that could be completed in one year online. There were a number of issues expressed by faculty regarding the timeline for the proposed development of the curriculum and for the way it was implemented. People involved in the current curriculum should have been greater involved in the online curriculum. They are not opposed to online education. The online curriculum is currently on-hold.
   iii) Summary of the main issues:
   (1) The governance committee for the curriculum of COM at MUSC was skirted before the curriculum went to the LCME. The online curriculum was pushing forward without any approval from the curriculum governance body for LCME at MUSC. And the rule for LCME is two year notice for any major curriculum changes. The two year notice was not given.
   (2) The driving force seemed entirely financial, secondary motive to address the indebtedness of students. There were concerns not being addressed regarding the quality of the education.
   (3) The plan morphed over time and each of the changes continued to disturb instead of quell faculty concerns.
   (4) Certain aspects of the implementation of the online program came across as playing one set of faculty against another and creating division.
   (5) IP is very vague in the handbook. There is confusion within the faculty regarding what is there intellectual property. Request to FS to address the issue of IP and applications in the handbook.
   (6) Many discussions about who are in charge of copyright infringement. Still unclear.
(7) Out of the discussions, there was a lot of intimidation. Intimidation is in the eye of the individual. Many individuals feel like the situation had an overall intimidation atmosphere.

iv) As a FS body, we need to consider several points from this. There is a shift for online education across campus. It is important that the FS considers a statement regarding faculty approval of a curriculum, it should be asserted. Different programs within a college (tracts) making sure that they are of the same quality. IP issues need some clarity. It might be worthwhile to charge a FS group with further exploration of these issues and come up with recommendations/suggestions/statement for guidance.

v) There are interim Deans currently in place for the COM, but no concrete plan released yet regarding the search for a new Dean. In the meantime, Interim Dean Deborah Deas is looking at the medical school component of the online plan, while the master's program appears to be on hold.

d) President’s Report

i) There is not a good space for the innaguration, lots of politicians, family, other college leadership. Not a lot of space for faculty and staff. Limited seats for faculty and staff (maybe 100 seats), the current plan is to have multiple viewing sites across campus. Dr. Cole's family will also have a viewing room. There is a reception to take place outside immediately following.

ii) Dr. Cole has met with the exec board and we discussed a variety of issues, we are still working to determine the best way to hold these meetings.

iii) Elections are coming up (this month) and an email should go out soon.

iv) Update in October or November (or electronic) from the COM Task Force on Engagement and Work/Life Balance.

v) Thank you for your service from the President.

4) Committee Reports

a) Faculty & Institutional Relationships- Mark Bowden:
Currently still working through Faculty Handbook changes, got through 6.01 in the handbook. Need to determine how to bring the changes to the full FS and then the faculty body as a whole. Have not yet gotten to section 7 (cancellation of appointment) and section 10 (IP).

b) Governance-Martina Mueller:
Nominations email should go out this week. Please consider running again if you have not served your six consecutive years. Encourage others to run, especially if there is a group or department within your college that has not been previously represented.

c) Institutional Advancement- Angie Moreland:
No report

d) Communication & Education- Julie Woolworth:
Faculty Senate will host a promotion and tenure (P&T) workshop on October 23rd, from 12-1 PM, in Bioengineering Building (BEB) room 112. All MUSC faculty members, especially those who are thinking about going up for promotion or tenure, are invited to attend. Each college will be represented on the panel, and following the panel discussion, a question and answer session will be held. Please contact Ragan Dubose-Morris (duboser@musc.edu) if you have questions.

Panel Members Include:
- Barb Edlund - College of Nursing
- Bob Poyer - Department of Library Science & Informatics
- Ken Patrick - South Carolina College of Pharmacy
- Brad Neville - College of Dental Medicine
- Besim Ogretmen - College of Medicine – Basic Sciences
- Gerald Silvestri - College of Medicine – Clinical
- Walter Jones - College of Health Professions

It was pointed out that currently the Broadcast Message regarding the P&T workshop does not mention that it is Senate Sponsored. This will be corrected.

The newsletter is currently awaiting a few additions before it is released.

e) Clinical Affairs- Daley Gregg:
   No report
f) Ad-hoc Committee: Modified Faculty
   Nothing to report
g) Ad-hoc Committee: Space
   No report

5) Electoral Unit Reports
   a) College of Dental Medicine
      No report
   b) College of Health Professions
      No report
c) College of Medicine Basic Sciences
   No report
d) College of Medicine Clinical Sciences
   The Dean of COM has departed. In the meantime, Dr. Deborah Deas will serve as Interim Dean and Dr. Bruce Elliot will serve as Interim Vice President for Medical Affairs. There is currently no mention of the search for a new Dean of COM.
e) College of Nursing
   No report
f) College of Pharmacy
   No report
g) Department of Library Sciences and Informatics
   No report
6) **New business** – No new business

7) **Adjournment**- Meeting adjourned at 8:57 am.
Appendix A: Presentation from Ombudsman
Ombudsman Office Update: The Second Year

John Waller
MUSC Faculty Senate
September 9, 2014
History - Why an Ombudsman?

- Dr. John Raymond proposed a ~4 yrs. ago
- Faculty Senate action 2011
- Provost Sothmann support of concept
- Growing trend among Universities
- ? Faculty & Student uncertainty over where to turn for assistance
MUSC Offices handling complaints / conflicts / disputes / “situations” etc.

- Gender Equity
- EEO / AA
- SHAC / EEOC
- Legal
- GME
- Medical Staff
- Compliance (Univ. + Hospital)
- Risk Management
- Internal Audit
- Public Safety
- HR / Employee Assistance
Where Does the Ombudsman Fit?

Alternate pathway for dispute/conflict resolution:
- Independent
- Neutral
- Impartial
- Confidential

Guiding Principles:
- Voluntary – nobody can be “sent” to the Ombudsman
- Confidential – strict unless risk of imminent harm
- Advocate for fairness & fair process (not individual or group)
- Unofficial – University NOT put “on notice”
Activity Summary – Year 2

- Visitors – 65 (many with multiple visits)
- Colleges:
  - Graduate Studies
  - Health Professions
  - Medicine
  - Nursing
- New this year:
  - Pharmacy
  - House staff
- No visitors:
  - Dental Medicine
Activity Summary - 2

- Faculty – vast majority
  - Faculty ranks – instructor to tenured professor
- Post-doc trainees – a few
- Gender:
  - Faculty – about 60/40 women: men - 50/50 last yr.
  - Post-doc – women 2:1 (small number) – 1:1 this yr.
- Ethnicity & national origin – United Nations
- “Non-covered” visitors - undergraduates, MUSC & MUAH employees, patients & families, etc.
Issue Prompting Most Visits

- Non-renewal notices – most common
  - Root cause for most: Internally conflicting Faculty Handbook language
    - “Death penalty” in Labor Law
    - Handbook NEEDS FIXING(pending)
  - 7.02a Non-reappointment and Termination of Non-Tenured Faculty (P 26):
    - Line 999: “When a decision of non-renewal of contract is reached, no reason for non-renewal need be given.”
    - Line 1004: “…faculty member may be advised upon request of the reasons which contributed to that decision.”
Next Most Common Issue

- Bad Behavior by someone higher on org chart (sometimes reciprocated)
  - Dept. Chair / Vice Chair / Division Director / to faculty member
  - Faculty member to faculty member
  - Faculty member to post-doc trainee
- Types of bad behavior:
  - Failure to follow due process
  - Bullying, creating hostile / threatening environment
  - Just plain mean & nasty
Follow-up and Outcomes?

Follow-up summary:
1. Return visits, phone calls, email updates & further discussion
2. Referral to other campus resources
3. Radio silence – (Visitor follow up not required)

Outcomes:
- Thanks from most
  - Satisfactory problem resolution
  - “Feel so much better” understanding issues and options
  - “They’re still jerks but thanks for trying to help”
- Silence (~25%)
Lessons & Recommendations

1. Fix faculty handbook contradictory language
2. Consider re-education of higher level individuals re: due process requirements
3. MUSC-wide issue: Clarify how individuals not now covered by Ombudsman’s Office can obtain similar informal assistance with complaints/issues/concerns
   - Employees
   - Undergrad students
   - External customers: Parents, Patients & Families
   - From outside MUSC looks like a Single Entity!

1. 
Lessons - 2

• Is there an educational opportunity?

• Issue:
  • MUSC tendency to “write you up” as first action in a dispute

• Opportunity?
  • Training in dispute management / conflict resolution for Chairs / Managers / Directors?
Questions?