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Robert Small, President
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Daniel Clinchot
Vijay Pancholi
Dale Vandre

❖ DEAN’S UPDATE
➢ Dr. Souba wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

❖ ELECTIONS
➢ Dr. Small introduced Dr. Alan Harzman as a self-nominated candidate for secretary. Dr. Harzman was elected by a unanimous voice vote.

❖ BEST PRACTICES FOR ENHANCING FACULTY DIVERSITY
➢ Dr. Leon McDougle, Assistant Dean for Diversity & Cultural Affairs, presented a review of the current state of diversity in the College of Medicine, along with suggested best practices for increasing diversity. His slides are attached. Of note, racial and ethnic diversity have increased in the COM over the last eight years, but the number of tenured African Americans, for example, remains quite low. He cited recent reviews by the university as well as the LCME that were fairly critical of our current plans to increase diversity. His slides suggest several ways to increase diversity through college programs but also through specific hiring practices that can be used on more local levels.

❖ COLLEGE OF MEDICINE PATTERN OF ADMINISTRATION
➢ The majority of the meeting was then spent discussing proposed changes to the COM Pattern of Administration. The executive summary and full document are included in these links for reference.
➢ The discussion began with Dr. Vandre and Dr. Bornstein outlining the history of the bicameral system currently in place, including that it began several years ago after a period of less faculty involvement in decision making. However, in recent years, participation and active discussion in the Faculty Council (FC) has decreased.
➢ Several people expressed concerns about any decrease in faculty involvement in decision making. Some pointed out that in the past there has been even less and that assuming that future deans and administrations will enact faculty-favored policies would be naïve. Whether or not having six faculty representatives on the College Assembly is more or less representation than the current scheme was debated.
Dr. Rotter suggested that routine reports (for example, the diversity report offered today) may be best offered online. Even voting may be better handled online. Meetings might be reserved for discussion.

Dr. Small suggested that the six FC representatives to the College Assembly should represent the views of the overall FC.

Dr. Miser suggested that the new FC could address a scheduled list of common topics, giving members a framework to use to consider issues and survey the faculty they represent. Dr. Wolf agreed that asking members to bring forward ideas for discussion during an “open forum” time is less likely to generate discussion than providing a general topic to start the discussion.

Dr. Pesavento brought up the varying levels of faculty involvement in decisions within the various departments. The general consensus was that such involvement is relatively limited. This may be partly due to some departments only meeting quarterly. Also, as Dr. Bornstein pointed out, faculty meetings in clinical departments also serve as practice plan meetings with less academic focus.

Dr. Bornstein stated that some issues (e.g., the potential merger of OSUP into OSUMC) are OSUMC issues and not COM issues. Therefore, they may not be relevant to the FC. Dr. Pesavento pointed out that these distinctions are frequently unclear to the faculty.

Dr. Pancholi pondered whether FC involvement is poor because of attitudes coming from the faculty or attitudes that began because of the current structure.

Dr. Small expressed that more communication will need to occur before faculty apathy will decrease. He has been working on an FC website to try to help with this.

Dr. Harzman suggested that routine updates could be done online, voting done at the occasional meeting or online, and discussions of issues coming from the faculty could provide more “raucous” discussions during the meetings.

Dr. Bell inquired about what recent votes have been held by the FC and whether the results are available.

Toward the end of the discussion, Dr. Bornstein floated the following (paraphrased) alternate solution:

- Faculty Council (similar membership as now) brings issues from the faculty and discusses them. Agenda is set by the membership, rather than by the Deans, as it is currently. FC would meet the week before the College Assembly and have access to its agenda in advance, with the goal of discussing and coming up with opinions on those items.
- 6 members of the Faculty Council serve on the College Assembly and vote. They also take issues from the FC to the Assembly for further discussion. In some ways, this gives faculty members more actually voting power than now.
- The Assembly discusses and votes on major changes (as outlined in the document).
- Those changes are then taken to the departments for a vote of the full faculty in each department. Each department is then represented by that one unified vote. Matters would be decided based on a percentage (as yet unspecified, e.g. half or 2/3) of the departments approving it.

The meeting was adjourned by Dr. Small, with plans for ongoing discussions of the Pattern of Administration issue.

These minutes are highly paraphrased and condensed. Any misrepresentation or omission of an individual’s comments is unintentional and will gladly be corrected.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan E. Harzman, MD