Faculty Council

Meeting Specifics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Cadence</th>
<th>Executive Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly Scheduled</td>
<td>Third Tuesday of the Month</td>
<td>Dean DiPaola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 16, 2021</td>
<td>5:00-6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Chair(s) and Members

**Basic Science Members**
- Campbell, Kenneth
- Clark, Claire
- Hatcher, April R.
- Mellon, Isabel
- Nikolajczyk, Barbara
- Spear, Brett (Chair-Elect)

**Clinical Science Members**
- Ballard, Hubert (Chair)
- Beck, Sandra
- Hays, Lon R.
- Kapoor, Siddharth
- Neltner, Janna
- Stevens, Julia C.
- Toney, Dale

**Standing Guests**
- DiPaola, Robert
- Geddes, Jim
- Greathouse, Lauren
- Harris, Kim
- DiPaola, Robert
- Huddleston, Alyssa
- Sanger, Matthew
- Rogers, Cassandra
- Ross, Shavonna
- Tannock, Lisa
- Rowland, Michael
- White, Stephanie

**Visitors**
- Dutch, Becky
- Garvy, Beth
- Jones, Davy
- Pistilli, Judy
- Ragsdale, John

**Agenda Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call to Order</th>
<th>Presenter/Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Quorum</td>
<td>H. Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Minutes</td>
<td>H. Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Course Proposal&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (5 minutes) – <strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>H. Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve Proposed Changes to the Rules of the Faculty&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (10 minutes) – <strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>R. DiPaola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2021 General Faculty Meeting (5 minutes)</td>
<td>H. Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR Council (20 minutes)</td>
<td>L. Tannock/J. Geddes/B. Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Research Leadership Structure (10 minutes)</td>
<td>R. DiPaola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Committee Update on AR 6:2 (5 minutes)</td>
<td>D. Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Preread sent to Faculty Council on February 1, 2021
<sup>2</sup> Preread sent to Faculty Council on February 8, 2021
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Opening Remarks | • Meeting called to order by H. Ballard.  
• Quorum declared at 5:00 p.m. (Nine (of 13) members present.)  
• Approval of Faculty Council Meeting Minutes  
  – January 19, 2021, Regularly Scheduled  
    • Moved by L. Hays and seconded by B. Spears. Minutes approved. Eight approved, one abstained.  
  – January 22, 2021, Specially Called  
    • Moved by B. Spear and seconded by B. Nikolajczyk. Minutes approved. Eight approved, three abstained. |
| Review of Course Proposal – Action | • New Course: ER-844 Elective: Emergency Ultrasound  
| Approve Proposed Changes to the Rules of the Faculty – Action | R. DiPaola reviewed the proposed changes to the Rules of the Faculty and Administration of the College of Medicine (Rules) and the progress to date of the annual review process. The Executive Committee endorsed and approved the proposed changes on February 2.  
• Notable changes include:  
  – Faculty Council representation on the Committees;  
  – Removal of the Wellness in Training (WIT) Committee due to redundancy. The WIT functions as a subcommittee of the Graduate Medical Education Committee (GMEC);  
  – Removal of the Professional Code Committee because they now function within the Student Progress and Promotions Committee (SPPC), as they now make decisions. There was no need for a separate committee; and  
  – The Student Advisory Council serves as an official student forum. Removal of the word “medical” to be inclusive of all graduate students.  
    • D. Jones suggested the verbiage also be edited to state “…educational degree programs of the College...”  
  – Removal of the Committee on Advocacy in Professionalism and Ethics (CAPE). This was recommended because it is under the purview of students not faculty and functions within the SPPC.  
• A. Hatcher asked if graduate students are included in the other committees.  
• R. DiPaola said he will ask B. Garvy to look at GMEC to see if the graduate students can be included for wellness.  
• M. Sanger stated there is not a graduate student wellness committee and there will not be a wellness committee included in the Rules. However, there is a Wellness Office that is currently being proposed.  
• H. Ballard called for a vote for approval of proposed changes. L. Hays motioned to approve the changes with the edit stated by D. Jones. Seconded by D. Toney with the modification discussed. Nine voted. Approved unanimously. |
| March 2021 General Faculty Meeting | • H. Ballard stated a General Faculty meeting is needed so the Dean can present to the faculty the proposed changes to the Rules of the Faculty.  
• A Doodle poll will be sent to members after the Faculty Council meeting so a date can be chosen. |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| STAR Council                      | B. Dutch, J. Geddes, and L. Tannock introduced and overviewed the STAR Council’s work on the Service Teaching Administration Research (STAR) and Tier Plans.  
• B. Dutch overviewed the slides for the STAR model; evaluations showed some items needed to be addressed.  
• STAR Council brought forward two plans: STAR and Tier.  
• These plans will be presented to the STAR Advisory Council on Thursday, February 18. Faculty will have an opportunity to see and comment on the plans in the near future.  
• There were four major goals of the STAR plan:  
  1. Identify and implement a plan that would be fair and transparent to all members of the faculty.  
  2. Build a plan that would provide long-term sustainability, growth, and future investment potential for the college.  
  3. Outline a mechanism to link total compensation to productivity to guarantee the excellence of our faculty and college.  
  4. Create a plan that would be predictable to ensure faculty could anticipate their total compensation year to year.  
• L. Tannock noted these plans are only for basic science faculty and do not apply to anyone in the clinical compensation plan and Research Title Series faculty. The purpose is not to cut the budget. She also stated that budget health is very dependent on the revenue.  
• STAR Council wants as much feedback as possible. The plans are to be as fair and functional as possible.  
• STAR Plan key concepts are that all salaries are listed for 12-month appointments. This plan recommends all components of a faculty member’s activities and has been revised numerous times. There are five tiers. Superstar teaching faculty will top out at Tier Three. Faculty with some research will probably remain in Tier Four and possibly hit Tier Five.  
• STAR Plan consists of five points: Professional Development, Service, Teaching, Administration, and Research Roles. The sum of points determines a Tier level.  
• Salary Stability: faculty cannot decrease more than 10% each year nor increase more than 20% each year.  
• Nuances: Simple in conception and accommodates all components. Units review once a year. This does not apply to Assistant Professors but applies to someone in the first two years of an appointment.  
• There is an accurate number of faculty in Tiers Four and Five. L. Tannock feels it represents superstar teaching faculty.  
• D. Jones asked how this reflects across the departments distributed within.  
• B. Dutch mentioned that many departments did not see a dramatic change with their faculty within this plan.  
• This plan does not apply to lecturers or clinical faculty. |
J. Stevens questioned why mentorship is not reflected and how the plan would be implemented.

L. Tannock said this needs to go live July 1 and would slowly phase into affect. This would help faculty adjust before the next year to possibly save their salary difference from a less than positive year, i.e., the first year the plan is in place.

Dean DiPaola stated it is important to see this and give feedback. It is a model that pays attention to what faculty do. He wants to continue to monitor these plans and model it for the faculty to see outcomes.

L. Tannock stated every center director/chair has both plans and have had them since last week. STAR Council wants everything to be fair and has conducted a very thoughtful process.

Dean DiPaola would like the committee to review and provide comments to the STAR Council.

The Tier Plan was presented by B. Dutch. Concepts for the model are very simple. Service does not get calculated in a certain number. Instead of service, this plan is divided in to five tiers (A-E), e.g., research effort and classroom teaching effort. Ranges could be modified based on comments.

There are sub tiers in this model. There should be a way for faculty to be compensated for their hard work.

The two models are almost identical. The vast majority fall in the same tier in both models. Ranges would be adjusted to help incorporate a merit raise. Faculty need to feel a sense of importance and inclusivity, which helps the college retain good faculty.

Important Points:

- Ranges will be adjusted on a yearly basis to incorporate merit raises and national averages.
- Salaries above NIH cap can be granted to Professors in the Funded Effort greater than 50% category with approval from the Dean’s office.
- Faculty whose research effort moves to a higher category will be moved up to a salary within the appropriate range at the start of the next fiscal year.
- Salaries at the start of the plan (July 1, 2021) will be set at the salary for the 2019 fiscal year, with adjustments upward to fit with the listed categories.
- Future salary increases will be guaranteed not to decrease for a period of three years.
  - Faculty whose research effort moves to a lower category will (after the three-year period) be moved down to a salary within the appropriate range after that point.
  - The timing of salary reductions for faculty whose salaries are above the appropriate tier as of July 1, 2021, will be based on the number of years since their effort qualified them for the tier their salary is currently in.
    - Three years or more = reductions begin 2021
    - Two years = reductions begin 2022
    - One year = reductions begin 2023, etc.
| College Research Leadership Structure | - Funded research effort will include salary funded from external grants related to research, teaching, and/or service.  
  - Funded effort will be calculated based on percent effort towards the NIH cap.  
- Wethington awards and potential teaching and service awards will be in addition to these ranges.  
  - In certain circumstances, stipends can be used for specific special service/administrative leadership roles.  
  - In the Tier Plan, if no salary decrease occurs after three years, a greater than 10% change can occur.  
  - A. Hatcher questioned why faculty who are outstanding teachers are capped at Tier Three and do not have the opportunity to get to Tier Five. She suggested that the Wethington needs to be included. It would be nice to have a bonus for outstanding teaching.  
  - B. Dutch said C. Griffith and B. Garvy would need to get involved with this.  
  - D. Jones asked if there was any motivation in these models to encourage growth or creating an online master’s program. |
| University Committee Update on AR 6:2 | R. DiPaola announced J. Geddes is stepping down as Vice Dean for Research to phased retirement as of June 30. The college is working on a recruitment strategy and a call for this position.  
  - There would be three positions reporting to the Vice Dean for Research: Associate Dean for Biomedical Research (basic science focused), Associate Dean for Clinical and Translational Research (clinically focused), and Associate Dean for Research Administration (administrative leadership focused). Titles of positions may evolve.  
  - D. Jones asked if the organizational chart was revenue neutral based on the newer positions. Dean DiPaola said it will be close, but some additional investment may be needed.  
  - The organizational chart will be sent to the Faculty Council after the meeting.  
| Other Business | • H. Ballard asked D. Jones to present the University Committee Update on AR 6:2 at the next meeting due to time constraints.  
  • No other business brought forward at this time.  
  • Meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m. |