Interfaculty Council Meeting Minutes
FY 2018 – June 20, 2018 – UCT 1726

Present: Dr. Ryan Quock, Dr. Lisa Thomas for Dr. Allison Edwards, Dr. Stacy Drake, Dr. Elda Ramirez, Dr. Rebecca Tsusaki, Dr. Ines Moreno-Gonzalez, Dr. Joseph Alcorn, Dr. Marie-Francoise Doursout, Dr. Veronica Gonzalez, Dr. Heidi Kaplan, Dr. Jessica Lee, Dr. Amber Luong, Dr. David Marshak, Dr. Donald Molony, Dr. Monica Verduzco-Gutierrez, Dr. Kirk Roberts, Dr. Luca Giancardo, Dr. Ashley Clark, Dr. Cameron Jeter, Dr. Nikolaos Soldatos, Dr. Ross Shegog, Dr. Michael Swartz, and Jacquelyn Sterling-Logan.

Absent: Dr. Syed Hashmi, Dr. Gurur Biliciler-Denktas, Dr. Lanny Ling, Dr. Joan Bull, Dr. Tiffany Champagne-Langabeer, Dr. Amy Franklin, Dr. Ariadne Letra, and Dr. Craig Hanis

Ex-Officio Attendees: Dr. Kevin Morano

Administrative Personnel: Ms. Terrie Schade-Lugo, CAP

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Ryan Quock, 2017-2018 IFC Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:37 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Dr. Quock polled the members for any objections or corrections to the minutes for May 16, 2018. Upon motion made and seconded, the minutes were unanimously approved.

III. NEW BUSINESS

Campus Reports:
Dr. Quock requested that each school’s governance officer provide a school report.

School of Dentistry (SOD): Dr. Ashley Clark
• We had a successful Faculty Retreat June 4-5 and made progress towards completing our documentation for accreditation; two site visitors were available to answer questions and assess progress with overall encouraging remarks.
• An alumni of the School of Dentistry was named Dean of the Woody L. Hunt School of Dental Medicine at Texas Tech University HSC El Paso.
• Dr. Ronald Johnson, Professor and former Dean of the School of Dentistry donated $100,000 (which was matched by the Game Changers Initiative) to establish “The Ronal Johnson, DDS Research and Academic Excellence Impact Fund.” The endowment supports Advanced Education in Pediatric Dentistry.
• The American Student Dental Association (ASDA) Chapter from the School of Dentistry won the “Best Website” and “Outstanding Advocacy” awards at ASDA’s Gold Grown Awards Ceremony. The School of Dentistry’s Kate Richardson received the District 9 Delegate of the Year Award.

Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences (GSBS): Dr. Ines Moreno-Gonzalez
• Programs are currently working on generating new bylaws, and selecting steering committee, and program directors. The Neuroscience Program has new program director, program co-director and steering committee members starting on 09/01. Biochemistry and cell biology Program has a new bylaws that was recently approved by the program members.
• Spring GSBS Scholarship: 58 applications have been received for Spring 2018 cycle. There are 19 potential awards to be distributed among the candidates.
• Request for faculty volunteers to potentially serve on a GSBS Standing Committee in 2018-2019. The term would begin October 1, 2018. Available committees: Academic Standards Committee, Admissions Committee, Curriculum Committee, Membership Committee, Student Scholarship Committee
• Presidents’ Research Scholarship: Application Deadline: July 2, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. Award Amount: $5,000 stipend supplement. These Scholarships are supported with funds provided by the Presidents of The University of Texas Health Science Center and the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center to recognize the most outstanding research accomplishments by senior students at GSBS prior to graduation. The awards are intended to be the most prestigious honor given to current GSBS students.
• Dr. John J. Kopchick Research Award: This award will support up to $50,000 of research expenses over a one-year period. The award is intended to provide pilot funding for innovative research projects in any area of biomedical science. All GSBS students who are in the M.S., Ph.D. or M.D./Ph.D. degree programs and are in good academic standing are eligible to apply. Application deadline is June 25.
• Darlington faculty award: Nominations are now being accepted from GSBS faculty for the 2018 Paul E. Darlington Mentor Award. Application deadline: June 8. The purpose of the award is to recognize an exceptional faculty member who consistently demonstrates excellence in service and leadership at the GSBS. The recipient will receive a $4,000 cash prize and a commemorative plaque.

School of Biomedical Informatics (SBMI):
- Dr. Luca Giancardo for Dr. Amy Franklin
- Retired SBMI Associate Professor, James “Jim” Turley, PhD recently donated $100,000 to fund the James Turley Endowed Scholarship for Global Health. The scholarship, which is being matched thanks to the UTHealth Game Changers Initiative, will go to SBMI students in good academic standing.
- SBMI team won the MITRE Healthcare Anti-Fraud Academic Competition. The SBMiners team includes Ph.D. student Kang Lin Hsieh and M.S. students Adeola Akinfaderin, Avi Raju, who served as team lead, and Bin Yao. Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Associate Professor Susan Fenton, Ph.D. is the team’s academic advisor.
- UTHealth launched pilot study to help people confronting opioid dependence and overdose. The study is being conducted in conjunction with the Houston Fire Department, Memorial Hermann-Texas Medical Center and the Houston Recovery Center. James Langabeer, Ph.D., M.B.A., is the study’s PI.
- Degui Zhi, SBMI associate professor, earned a $2.3M genome research grant from NHGRI.
- SBMI is now a Registered Education Provider (R.E.P.) for the Project Management Institute (PMI). SBMI’s Systems Analysis and Project Management course, also called BMI 5328, meets the educational experience requirement needed for Project Management Professional (PMP) Certification.

School of Public Health (SPH):
- Dr. Ross Shegog
- There has been a search for the Director of the Population Health Research Center in Dallas, which is an expansion of the Dallas Campus in conjunction with Dallas Children’s. There have been good
candidates and the candidate field is now narrowing. It is a unique opportunity as it is the first Population Health Research Center that is Pediatric focused as well as it represents the collaboration of clinical and public health enterprises and promises to be a nice profile raiser for the School of Public Health.

- We are looking at scholarships for our students; so, those applications are going in.
- At Faculty Council meeting tomorrow, we will be talking with the Dean to find out more about the budget situation and getting a little more transparency to understand about some of the decisions having to be made. We also want to understand more about the metrics table that is being developed by our administration to look at productivity and the uses of that in relation to making promotion and tenure and other decisions.
- Continuing with our Worklife Survey results review and discussions.

Cizik School of Nursing (CSON):  

Dr. Elda Ramirez

- The Dean advised that the present structure will be changing from a three department structure (Acute and Continuing Care, Systems, and Family) where undergraduate, graduate, research and doctoral students were all mixed into the different departments. The decision is that the school will be separated by undergraduate, graduate, research, and doctoral structure and then, for example, under the graduate program would be the Nurse Anesthesia, DNP, and Master’s programs. There is a big push to support the research agenda.

McGovern Medical School (MMS):  

Dr. Monica Verduzco-Gutierrez

- We are in the midst of summer programs offered by our medical school. The Joint Admission Medical Program (JAMP) is a special program created by the Texas Legislature to support and encourage highly qualified, economically disadvantaged Texas residents pursuing a medical education.
- The other program is the pre-entry program. This summer there are 30 students in it (23 from UT and 7 from Baylor). This program helps accepted students get a head start on the first semester.
- Residency counseling has begun for MS4 students and was successful last year.
- There was a Step 2CS workshop. Last year we had a 6% failure rate (the national average is 4%). This workshop is intended to improve our pass rate.
- There will be an expansion of Harris County Psychiatric Center. Also, there is special funding available to help victims of sex trafficking.
- President Colasurdo will be attending our Faculty Senate Meeting tomorrow to give the President’s Address to the attendees.
- Medical students and undergraduate students are on campus participating in the Summer Research Program.
- The new curriculum now has students that just completed their basic science years transitioning to their clerkships. Because of the timing between the old and new curriculum, there is a new summer curriculum for all students rising to their third year, on skill sets. The new curriculum has been widely very well received.

Chair-Elect Introduction of Candidates:  

Dr. Quock

Dr. Quock solicited from the floor any nominations to be considered at this time. No nominations were provided. A motion was made to close the field of nominations. Upon motion made, seconded, and unanimously approved, the Chair-Elect nominations were closed.
The two (2) nominees for the IFC Chair-Elect are: Joseph L. Alcorn, PhD, from McGovern Medical School; and Elda G. Ramirez, Ph.D., RN, from Cizik School of Nursing. The nominees addressed the attendees as to their vision and interest in the IFC Chair-Elect position. Dr. Quock announced that the confidential voting would be conducted via poll to permit the entire membership to participate. Once all have voted, an email will be circulated to announcing the IFC Chair-Elect for FY 2019.

Subcommittee Reports:

Governance & Academic Affairs: Dr. Cameron Jeter, Chair

Dr. Cameron Jeter thanked her subcommittee members for their enthusiasm and work. As a reminder, the subcommittee’s charge was to assess the six honor codes at the six schools. The results were captured in a table summary that was included in the IFC Meeting materials packet. The point of the table was to show that not all honor codes are even named an honor code and the contents varied.

- The first recommendation of the subcommittee is to provide a template, not to make them identical, but to ensure that the key components of the code are contained in each.

Secondarily, each subcommittee member attended with Dr. Jeter, an interview with the disciplinary officer of their respective school. A standard interview was used to ask questions of all six disciplinary officers. They all followed HOOP 186, similarly, but not identically. She advised that since the May IFC meeting, the final interview was conducted with the disciplinary officer of the McGovern Medical School (MMS). Historically, all of their disciplinary actions, including academic dishonesty, and other conditions of behavior, etc., would go through HOOP 186 and the procedures for a hearing; however, years ago, the MMS and other medical schools around the country, were able to fold that into their academic review processes. The disciplinary officer relayed that approximately 95% of their cases are heard in front of their Student Evaluation and Promotion Committee (SEPC), with the remaining cases having the option of going through the hearing procedure described in HOOP 186. So, the appeals process and due process is handled by the SEPC. One of the other disciplinary officers said that at his school, issues of academic nature and discipline nature are often blurred to him and he would appreciate the opportunity to visit with other disciplinary officers to see how they handle it.

- The second recommendation of the subcommittee is to suggest that all disciplinary officers meet for opportunity to have open discussions.
- The third and final recommendation is that if any action is taken, that it is to be done in conversation with the Office of Legal Affairs (OLA).

Faculty Status, Rights, and Responsibilities: Dr. Amy Franklin, Chair

The final report was tabled until the July IFC Meeting.

Administrative Affairs Subcommittee: Dr. Ashley Clark, Chair

Dr. Ashley Clark provided the background on the description of the subcommittee: The Administrative Affairs Committee will deliberate and make recommendations to Council as well as serve as a liaison between the faculty and the administration for dissemination and exchange of information on institutional strategic planning, operational budget planning and priorities, institutional management and effectiveness, performance appraisal of administrators, and other UTHealth-wide administrative activities. The committee will monitor, and when appropriate, represent faculty interests in deliberations over UTHealth-wide administrative policies and priorities.
The FY 2018 Administrative Affairs Subcommittee charge was as follows: Assess and report on status/process of annual Faculty Development Plan & Activity Report at each school. Issues, such as relevancy of timing of Faculty Development Plan to faculty member trajectory and purposes that Activity Report evaluation are utilized for, should be explored.

Dr. Clark explained that the subcommittee broke up the charge in three ways and then reviewed each school based on the charge. The reviews were based on (1) Status/Process of Faculty Development Plan and Activity Report; (2) Relevance of Timing to Faculty Member Trajectory; and (3) Purposes that the Reviews are Utilized. Dr. Clark summarized the chart that was projected (said chart and report are made a part of these minutes.)

(1) All schools in the Health Science Center (HSC) have a written policy delineating the timeline and process for annual faculty review. Cizik School of Nursing (SON) and the School of Biomedical Informatics (SBMI) have specific policies on the process that follow the Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOOP) policy 111. The School of Dentistry (SOD) and the School of Public Health (SPH) have new documents yearly delineating the dates and policies per HOOP 111. The Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences (GSBS) is slightly different from HOOP 111 in that the faculty members are annually evaluated after three years of service. McGovern Medical School (MMS) has a policy for faculty review that is similar to the other five schools; the policy can be found on their Faculty Affairs webpage. Many MMS departments have individual policies that support the overall review system and timeframe.

(2) The consensus is the timing of these reviews generally starts after completion of the fiscal year (around September). GSBS does not provide a specific time of year. Each of the representatives from the various schools believe the timing of these reviews is appropriate. It is noted that the SOD faculty do not meet with their chairs until October or November to discuss goals.

(3) The precise utilization of the reviews remains vague, though most agree annual feedback is one of the primary functions. The Cizik SON and SOD defer to HOOP 111; it appears SBMI does this also. GSBS has different utilization depending on the year of service; by year three, individuals minimally involved will either resign their faculty appointments or increase participation. By year five, there are five possible outcomes ranging from reappointment with highest commendation to termination of appointment. MMS performs reviews to remain compliant with the mandate by UT System to review all faculty members annually. MMS utilizes the reviews to assure faculty members are meeting with their chair or division head yearly to discuss progress and expectations, track progress toward tenure or promotion, and identify any opportunities for improvement such as productivity or collegiality. SPH uses annual activity reports (AARs) to assess level of performance, as a guide for setting research, teaching, and service goals for the following academic year, and toward metrics for incentive pay. Three-year annual reviews are used to these reviews for faculty incentive pay, recognize level of performance and, in the event a faculty member does not meet expectations, to develop a remediation plan to be reviewed at the 6-year review.

Dr. Clark advised that HOOP 111 specifically addresses how the reviews should be used with the exception of non-tenure track faculty. A majority of faculty at all the schools are on the non-tenure track.

- The recommendation of the subcommittee is that in the next fiscal year that the IFC subcommittee addresses that the non-tenure track faculty do not have any specific in HOOP 111 on how their reviews should be utilized.
Dr. Morano advised that possibly the issue with the non-tenure track faculty reviews not being specifically delineated in the HOOP is that the HOOP policies follow the Regents’ Rules and if it is not mentioned there, it is not in the HOOP. Tenure track faculty are considered, for the most part, as permanent faculty and there is policy and procedure specific for this group. The non-tenure track faculty reviews follow the exact procedure as the tenure track faculty; the expectations are different but the approach and content of the reviews are probably the same. If the IFC wishes to encapsulate that better, we can do that; however, it probably is not an omission but rather we have never been told we need to do more, so it is not written down.

The summary of this discussion is as follows: In practice, with the work of many individuals at the schools, the expectations and the benefits that are being applied in the tenure track faculty are also being applied, in many cases, towards the evaluation and mentoring of the non-tenure track faculty. However, at the HOOP policy level, it would be good to codify this information so that it stays in place at the policy level, not relying specifically upon people to keep it going at the schools. There are people who take the non-tenure track path, initially, with the intention that later on if they are successful, they will ask to be considered on tenure track; so, we have to make the criteria such that this pathway should not be precluded by being a good citizen on the non-tenure track.

Upon motion made, seconded, and unanimously passed, it was requested by the IFC Membership that the IFC Secretary furnish this information to the HOOP facilitator to find out what the process would be to request that HOOP 111 be reviewed to discuss this specific recommendation.

Dr. Clark thanked her entire subcommittee for their work on this project for FY 2018.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Revised Bylaws Discussion and Vote  

Dr. Quock reminded the attendees of the discussion conducted at the May IFC Meeting and that the suggested language was discussed and agreed to be provided to the OLA for review and comment. In line with the IFC Bylaws, any such updates to the Bylaws must be presented at two consecutive meetings before adoption. A redlined document was provided to OLA and upon their review, they provided suggested language that appears in blue type. Upon motion made and seconded, the revision with the suggested language from OLA was unanimously approved for adoption.

Faculty Status, Rights, and Responsibilities – FY 2017  

Drs. Heidi Kaplan and Marie Francoise Doursout

The FSRR subcommittee from FY 2017, has collected all findings from the charge they were given regarding Faculty Retention. Dr. Heidi Kaplan provided a summary of how the numbers were gathered and Dr. Marie Francoise Doursout will review the table provided to the attendees (said table is made a part of these minutes.)

The enormous amount of information provided was prepared in a chart format of departures divided by department, total number of departures, and gender. The chart outlines the number of departures as well as percentage of that department. Also, supplied on the chart is the total female departure count percentage of the department.
Dr. Marie Francoise Doursout advised that several departments had greater than 10% departures, which were bolded on the chart. The total female departures per department column reflects less than 30% departures in italics on the chart. The ratio of male / female departures is about 10% overall. The reason for leaving was mainly represented as resignation.

Dr. Kaplan advised that in a previous meeting, she discussed how the reasons for departure are entered into the system by each department’s supervisor. The departure reasons were not felt to be adequate and feedback has been provided to consider updating the system responses to better capture the information determining why they left.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Associate Vice President Announcements

Dr. Kevin Morano

- The announcement of the awardees for the Regents’ Outstanding Teaching Award (ROTA) was just released. Congratulations to the IFC Chair, Dr. Ryan Quock, for being one of the two awardees for UTHealth. The other awardee is Dr. Susan Ruppert from the Cizik School of Nursing. This is a very prestigious, lucrative, state-wide award for UT System and, it represents the best of the best of our teaching faculty.
- The call for nominations for the President’s Scholar Awards will be circulated in the next two weeks. As a reminder, previously we had an award for Teaching and for Research. Last year, we added a third award for Patient Care/Clinical Service. The nominations will be due in September 2018.
- We are currently in the process of selecting the candidates for nominations to the Shine Academy, which also is processed through the UTHealth Office of Faculty Affairs & Development. We will put forward four nominations to the Shine Academy for review and membership consideration.
- UT System has sponsored a software package that was accessible via the web called Influent, previously called SciVal. It was introduced, launched, and was almost completely unused by the majority of our faculty. A few did use it as there was one side called SciVal Funding where you could look for funding opportunities based on keywords; and the other side was called SciVal Experts, which was a convenient way to find other colleagues to collaborate within our organization and other UT components. Unfortunately, UT System has decided to stop funding the software and the price quoted to us to fund it on our own was truly astronomical. We are looking for ways to replace that resource.
- When Dr. Michael Blackburn began in his role as EVP and Chief Academic Officer, he started a program to fund collaborative research grants that required at least two investigators from at least two different schools at UTHealth. The first round went very well, although it was very expensive. Right now, we are in a challenging fiscal climate and unsure as to when the program will be relaunched. Leadership recognizes the value of collaboration and is trying to foster that through a variety of different ways, but we have to still be able to temper it with the resources we have to support it. Dr. Morano suggested possibly trying to locate researchers by an ORC ID. Brief discussion concerning alternatives for consideration was conducted.
- Dr. Morano opened a discussion with the attendees concerning the recently circulated Memorandum from Dr. Michael Blackburn regarding two substantive changes for those submitting grants through Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA).
  - The largest change that is occurring first is that they are changing from a self-submission model to a SPA submission model, which mirrors how SPA (formerly known as Office of Sponsored Projects) previously managed the process. Approximately 5-6 years ago, the process flipped to where the investigator was given the power to do the submissions, coincident with the adoption
of a grant management system called Cayuse424. The bottom line is that over the last few years – and especially this year, there have been a large number of errors made in the grants being submitting resulting in them not being accepted – not going beyond Step 1. This is in part with how NIH (mostly) and NSF, are becoming stricter on how they are dealing with mistakes. Leadership has decided that the solution to this situation is that we will revert back to SPA for doing the final submission. SPA will do the quality review up to the last deadline and they will submit it on your behalf. They are not changing the existing deadlines that have been in existence over the last few years. The only change that the submitter will notice is that they no longer can submit it themselves – they have to rely on SPA to submit.

The second change is that we are replacing Cayuse424 with what is supposed to be a bigger and better package, it is far more robust as it not only assembles the packet to be submitted, it keeps track of things – e.g., it keeps track of funding, spending; it is a much more comprehensive grants management tool for the whole institution.

Questions discussed were as follows:

Q: If the deadline is not changing, does that mean I can send my grant on June 5 to SPA and tell them to submit it on June 5?
   A: All proposals require 10 days advance for the non-science components and 3 days before for the science components. This is not changing. The difference is that before, you could finish the science at 4:57 PM and submit it yourself; now, you need to submit it 3 days in advance to SPA for review; if you do not make that deadline, they will do the best they can – it will always get submitted, but if it is, for example, submitted at Noon that day, it will not get a quality review, that will be up to you to do the quality review.

Q: At SBMI, they have a mini-SPA within SBMI. Will they still be able to do their review?
   Preference is to have the local person we work with be given the power that SPA has in submitting the grant.
   A: Submission will still be at SPA, and training will be provided to the personnel that will be using the new robust grant management system. These personnel will become power users in this new system – more than they ever were in Cayuse424. This means that unless you wish to be interacting with the new system, you probably will not be actually in it, the trained personnel will manage the items you will be providing.

Q: If you have been on a study section, you have a two week waiver or flexible deadline; is that built into this system?
   A: The RNA form is where you would put your deadline for your grant.

Q: If all the parts are there with the exception of the research part, will they go ahead and start reviewing the packet or, do they wait for the entire grant to be done before they begin their review?
   A: If all the non-science portions are in, they will review it and flag any issues. Once you submit the science to them, on time, if your science portion is supposed to be 6 pages and you submitted 7 pages, they will be able to flag it so that you can make the corrections. As previously explained, if you submit it late, they will not be able to check it and you take that chance with the submission being not accepted.

Q: Two questions, (1) Were the grants that were sent back, department specific? The feeling is that the basic science department have been doing this process for years without any problems and are upset about this because they feel they are bearing the burden of the clinical departments.
   (2) The SPA website states “The complete proposals received by 5 PM the day before the deadline will be reviewed and submitted. Complete proposals received on the day of the
deadline will be processed on a first in first out basis. SPA will work to ensure all proposals are submitted by the deadline.” We are hearing that the deadline is not changing but the perception with this verbiage is that it does not sound like SPA will submit all proposals.

A: Dr. Morano has been told that ‘no’ proposal will ever ‘not’ be submitted. Maybe with this verbiage being used, they are leaving themselves a little bit of room. They will guarantee that if the proposal is submitted 24-hours ahead, it will go in; however, without a guarantee they will still do their ultimate best to make sure it happens. Formally, if they have a deadline of 3 days before and you do not meet that deadline, theoretically they could say we are not submitting your grant because you did not make the deadline, by rule. However, they are not even going to enforce those rules. What they are saying is the closer you get, the less attention you will get. If you want to send something in at ten minutes till and if we still have time, bearing in mind that there may be 10 proposals before yours that also submitted it at ten minutes till, there may be a chance that it might not get submitted.

Dr. Morano suggested that the IFC invite Ms. Kathy Kreidler to one of the meetings to discuss any concerns that have not been explored in this discussion.

Dr. Quock requested that Dr. Morano encapsulate the concerns shared in this discussion and pass on both the IFC’s gratitude to SPA for having a lenient and generous approach to the new rules, as well as to communicate that we still have concerns about the ability for our grants to be submitted on the deadline days. We realize that because of the rules that they will be a logjam of grants to be submitted on the deadline date; however, we have this concern and hope to work with SPA, as a faculty body, to constructively tweak things as they happen. Dr. Quock requested that the IFC membership think about whether an invitation should be extended to Ms. Kreidler to come visit the IFC. He further requested that the membership email himself and Dr. Hashmi so that they can ensure this visit is organized.

Dr. Morano further advised that the transition is already in place as it began on June 5. There is a transition schedule that can be found on the SPA website.

VI. MISCELLANEOUS

VII. ADJOURNMENT
A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 1:09 PM. The next IFC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 18, 2018.

Approved by Interfaculty Council on 07/18/2018.