Interfaculty Council Meeting Minutes  
FY 2016 – March 16, 2016 – UCT-1505C

Present: Dr. Anne Sereno, Dr. Gurur Biliciler-Denktas, Dr. Jeffrey Actor, Dr. Joan Bull, Dr. Marie-Francoise Doursout, Dr. Anil Kulkarni, Dr. Jessica Lee, Dr. Donald Molony, Dr. David Volk, Dr. George Williams, Dr. Jake Chen, Dr. Lanny Ling, Dr. Trevor Cohen, Dr. Amy Franklin, Dr. James Langabeer II, Dr. Dean Sittig, Dr. Tiffany Champagne, Dr. Martina Gallagher, Dr. Catherine Reavis, Dr. Rebecca Tsusaki, Dr. Linda Highfield, Dr. Dejian Lai, and Ms. Margaret Wang.

Absent: Dr. Bindu Akkanti, Dr. Daniel Freet, Dr. Cameron Jeter, Dr. Kurtis Kasper, Dr. Elizabeth Scott, Dr. Ryan Quock, Dr. Rebecca Helmreich, Dr. Ross Shegog, Dr. Momiao Xiong, Mr. Julio Charles, Ms. Deanne Hernandez

Ex-Officio Attendees: Dr. George Stancel, Dr. David Marshak, Mr. Eric Solberg, Ms. Kathy Rodgers

Administrative Personnel: Ms. Terrie Schade-Lugo

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Anne Sereno, 2015-2016 IFC Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:35 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Dr. Sereno polled the members for any objections or corrections required to the minutes for January 20, 2016. Upon motion made and seconded, the minutes were approved with one abstention.

III. CHAIR / UT FAC UPDATES

Dr. Sereno

- Dr. David Volk was introduced as a new IFC Member assuming the place of Dr. Davide Cattano who, due to clinical scheduling, is unable to attend the IFC Meetings.
- Dr. Sereno reminded the IFC membership that the following guests would be in attendance at the April 20 IFC Meeting:
  - President Giuseppe Colasurdo
  - Dr. Michael Blackburn, EVP and Chief Academic Officer
- The IFC typically does not meet in May. Dr. Sereno will discuss whether the IFC would be interested in having a special speaker attend to discuss Faculty Burnout. If the IFC decided to have this speaker attend, it most likely would be scheduled at the May meeting. More to come on this possibility.
- In June, Mr. Scott Forbes with Governmental Relations will attend to provide current status of the budget at the state; and, the Chair-Elect nominations will be presented with the election at the July meeting.
- UT FAC met in January. The Chancellor will be attending the UT FAC meeting in April. Dr. Sereno advised if the IFC membership had any items or concerns for the UT FAC that they should email her or Terrie Schade-Lugo.
- Dr. Sereno advised that she was going to send an email to all schools suggesting that when they elect their representatives for the IFC, that they consider electing an alternate to attend during any regular member absences to assist continuity on the IFC and at the school.
III. CHAIR / UT FAC UPDATES - Continued

**UT FAC UPDATES:**

*Dr. Donald Molony & Dr. David Marshak*

- An electronic meeting with the Chancellor was held in February with the UT FAC Executive Committee. The current issues relevant to the health science centers are:
- The Chancellor is trying to develop a mechanism where funds may be tapped to support research in a manner similar to the *Brain Initiative* program. The Regents are supportive of this mission.
- The Health Affairs Subcommittee is collecting information about post tenure review procedures at all UT institutions to evaluate best practices to make recommendations, if change is warranted.
- On the Academic Campuses, continuum education is being reviewed across Texas school systems to understand the alternate forms of credits (dual credit) that undergraduate students are presenting when they enroll. This initiative is looking at the ways that dual credit can ensure excellence as well as success for students.
- Shared Governance Initiative is identifying what the ideal role of faculty in the governance at their respective institutions. Some of the campuses do not have a faculty represented body (i.e., faculty senate or interfaculty council) to deliberate on areas that are important to faculty. A white paper will be written and distributed to the campuses recommending best practices.
- The Chancellor has initiated a process equivalent to the *Rooney Rule* that specifies that in the final round of interviews for all senior administrative positions, final candidates must include a male, female, and a candidate from an underrepresented group. The UT FAC is developing a model HOOP Policy that will develop processes where the *Rooney Rule* can be applied to enhance the diversity of faculty and administrators.
- The Health Affairs Subcommittee put forward a resolution suggesting that UT System health campuses negotiate with insurance companies, together rather than individually.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- **Biomedical Burnout –Article**
  *Dr. George Stancel*
  Dr. Stancel advised that Dr. Holleman is on faculty at UT MD Anderson and has a regional and national reputation in developing policies to help faculty reduce stress levels. Dr. Holleman presented at the recent UT Shine Academy in Austin and Dr. Stancel provided the information if the IFC would like to have Dr. Holleman come back a presentation. After brief discussion, Dr. Sereno requested that the IFC let her know if there was an interest in having Dr. Holleman present.

- **Thomas F. Burks Scholarship for Academic Merit –Results**
  *Dr. Amy Franklin*
  Dr. Franklin advised that this year scholarship committee reviewed twelve (12) excellent applications, two (2) from each school. The applications were reviewed and ranked, independently, and the committee elected to award four (4) $1,000 scholarships.

  The recipients were: Viraj Bhise, *School of Public Health*; Erin Josserand, *McGovern Medical School*; Marco Leung, *Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences*; and Chen Liang, *School of Biomedical Informatics*.

  Dr. Franklin explained that the reason the committee chose to award $1,000 scholarships is that it permits the awardees to receive in-state tuition as well as they wanted to spread the award as far as possible on campus.
V. OLD BUSINESS

- Subcommittee Updates:

Faculty Status, Rights, and Responsibilities  
**Dr. Marie Francoise Doursout, Chair**

Dr. Doursout advised that the subcommittee began to review the gender allocation on the NIH grants awarded at UTHealth; however, not enough information is available to pursue this project. Therefore, the subcommittee decided to review the Regents Outstanding Teaching Award (ROTA) which was initiated at the health science centers in 2012. In 2012, ten (10) awards were received by UTHealth with four awards to women -one award to a woman at the Medical School. In 2013, ten (10) awards were received at UTHealth with five awards to women -two awards to women at the Medical School. In 2014, nine awards received at UTHealth with seven women awarded -two awards to women at the Medical School. In 2015, ten awards received at UTHealth with two women awarded -one award to a woman at the Medical School. Conclusion is that the subcommittee wishes to see more women apply for the award consideration.

The committee is still reviewing the Dean’s Teaching Award information and will bring it forwarded to the IFC in the future.

Further information was provided regarding the gender allocation of holders of endowments at UTHealth and more specifically, the Medical School. Dr. Sereno suggested that a report on the information provided would be prepared to be distributed.

Faculty Governance and Academic Affairs  
**Dr. George Williams, Chair**

Dr. Williams distributed and explained the proposed peer evaluation process guidelines, including the Model Peer Teaching Evaluation Tool -which was very closely modeled after the School of Dentistry’s format. Each School Department is encouraged to add elements that are pertinent to their area. Dr. Williams advised that the goal was to present this to the IFC and gather feedback. Suggestions were provided to be considered by the subcommittee were as follows:

- Consider changing “remediation” to “improvement/self-improvement” under guideline 4;
- The questions in the sample are quite important and if faculty are aware that they will be evaluated on these activities, it may quickly change some teaching behaviors and benefit the learning environment. This is viewed as a good tool to augment positive changes.
- Regarding deficiencies, possibly consider a different evaluator for the second evaluation.
- Designated evaluators - how many?
- Expert evaluators – how many? / how will they be recruited?
- Is it a one-time evaluation? Will they know the evaluation is coming?
- Suggested that question 4 on the Evaluation Tool be reworded: “regarding the sensitivity to the place of where the learner is...”
- “Training the evaluators” should be mentioned in the guidelines;
- Add “Teaching” to the title of the evaluation guideline title “Proposed Peer Teaching Evaluation Process Guidelines for UTHealth Faculty.”
- Consider how expert evaluators are recruited.
- It will not be a one-size fits all -example is SBMI does not have departments. How do you expect this to be coordinated with the curriculum committees, who will be reviewing the syllabi for the courses at each school? Would it be implemented by the curriculum committees at each school? Possibly consider adding guidelines on what is the optimal observation and how much review of the course material is necessary in addition to watching a lecture?
Do you need a content expert or, do you need someone who can evaluate teaching delivery or the way feedback is provided, as in the clinical areas?

What principles in teaching are being followed? Is it student centered learning or, is it problem-solving principles?

Do we have the manpower to do accomplish this task?

Any thought about this being an elective activity for your portfolio?

In summary, this was an excellent first-pass, very brief, and a very sensitive topic. More work to polish the document is planned and then to bring it back for further discussion.

**Administrative Affairs**

Dr. Sereno reported on the IFC Executive Summary Report as well as the Subcommittee Report on IP on behalf of Dr. Shegog. The materials were provided in the meeting packet. There is a two-page executive summary report with two appendices. Appendix A is the Survey; Appendix B is the Subcommittee Report. Figure 7 includes comments on how to enhance commercialization and Figure 9 includes the comments regarding whether IP should be considered for P&T. Comments provided were as follows:

- Add “commercialization” in the sentence beginning: In addition, the majority are presently not in favor of including “commercialization” as criteria for promotion and tenure.
- Suggested adding a sentence under recommendations 3. Agreements should be consistent with the maturity of the intellectual property.
- Suggestion to delete the opening phrase and shorten the last sentence in the summary and recommendations as follows: “Although the new Regents Rules assert ownership of intellectual property…” To read: “The changes to the Regents Rules do not deal with the many concerns expressed by faculty nor do they incentivize faculty to engage, no matter how interested.”
- Add the following to the last paragraph, first sentence: “Although most faculty reported an estimated value of their IP as less than one million dollars, even a small return on such products, with little or no investment by the University, would return income “and prestige” to the University.”

Motion was made, seconded and unanimously accepted, with corrections.

**Guidelines for Promotions Discussion**

Dr. George Stancel provided background on the activities concerning this topic. The IFC passed a motion to endorse writing language to enable promotion and tenure committees to consider intellectual property (IP) in their considerations. The Administrative Affairs Subcommittee was charged with creating the language and Dr. Shegog worked with Dr. Stancel to draft language. The draft language attempted to capture the spirit and emphasize that including IP as a factor to be considered does not mean you have to generate IP to be promoted. It is added to the list of items that can be considered in the context of the faculty member’s overall performance, contributions to the university, and to the discipline. Suggestions were provided as follows:

- Align the IP sentence in I. Associate Professor, C. Research to agree with II. Professor, C. Research.
o Remove “should be considered but” in the last sentence in the first paragraph to read: “These criteria are not intended as minimum standards nor is it necessary that an individual contribute to all of the listed activities.

o Under I. Associate Professor, A., last paragraph to be reworded to agree similarly as mentioned in above.

o Under I. Associate Professor, A. 3, change “and” to “or” to agree with II. Professor, A. 3.

o Remove extra “.” On I. Associate Professor A. 3.

o Under the General Guidelines for Consideration, there is a difference between Associate Professor and Professor concerning the minimum of years in the rank before being considered for promotion.

o Question regarding “Clinical Practice”

Brief discussion regarding clinical practice falling under Service, only, in this document. Dr. Stancel advised that it was a valid concern and as this document was created in 1999, and it would be appropriate to review the document. Clinical Practice is the leading income for the university and this document does not provide enough importance to this group of faculty. Dr. Sereno charged the Administrative Affairs Subcommittee with the review and revision of the document.

Dr. Sereno reconfirmed that the addition of IP in the Guidelines for Promotion was agreed to, by majority.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS  

Dr. George Stancel, EVP for Academic & Research Affairs

• SACS Reaccreditation

Dr. Stancel advised that the five-year reaccreditation report was submitted and he recognized Deanne Hernandez, Kathy Rodgers, Eric Solberg, and the Associate Deans for Academic Affairs in the schools. We will hear back on recommendations, if any, in June 2016.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 1:06 PM. The next IFC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 20, 2016.

Approved by Interfaculty Council on 4/20/2016.