

Dean's Faculty Advisory Committee
University of Tennessee, College of Medicine

March 4, 2019

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the president, Dr. Lawrence Pfeffer, at 12:06 PM on March 4, 2019, in the Coleman building, Room A101.

Attendance

The following members were present:

Martin A. Croce, MD, Terry Cooper, PhD, Rebecca Anne Krukowski, PhD, KU Malik, PhD, Haavi Morreim, JD, PhD, Mark Bugnitz, MD, Lawrence Pfeffer, PhD, Reese Scroggs, PhD, Burt Sharp, MD, Claudette Shepherd, MD, Laura Sprabery, MD, Jerome Thompson, MD, MBA, Joe Willmitch, MPAS, PA-C

The following guest(s) was (were) present:

Scott Strome, MD, Polly Hofmann, PhD, Martin Donaldson, DDS

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as written. Minutes had previously been distributed by electronic means.

Business

Pres. Pfeffer proposed that, going forward, it is important to formalize the process for DFAC subcommittees' function. He proposed the following: The DFAC President will provide the Chair(s) of the subcommittee with a brief written formal charge defining the issue(s) they are to review and resolve, and a general timeline for submitting formal written reports to DFAC – initially by providing a draft report to the DFAC President for his/her comments and followed by a final report transmitted to the President and then to DFAC. At each DFAC meeting following the formation of the subcommittee and prior to submitting the final report, the subcommittee Chair(s) shall provide a brief update on the progress of the subcommittee deliberations. Once DFAC has reviewed and approved the final report, it will be provided to the Dean for his/her review and recommendations.

The DFAC then discussed the new policy on Peer Review of Teaching. Dr. Hofmann indicated that the UT Board of Trustees has decided that everyone being considered for tenure must have a peer review of teaching. The policy does not allow for ample lead-up time; hence the matter has some urgency. The current proposal is essentially an interim process to address faculty who will to begin their tenure application process later this year. After this first year DFAC could develop a more refined approach for consideration by the CoM. Dr. Hofmann has sent her proposed interim protocol to the DFAC and also to faculty who are up for tenure this coming year. DFAC members are now invited to send comments to Dr. Hofmann within the next week, cc'ing Dr. Pfeffer.

Discussion noted, as a general matter, that there are different formats for those who teach in the clinical setting, versus in classrooms, versus in the research setting. Teaching formats could range from lectures,

to journal clubs, to mentoring a lab fellow, or whatever is the faculty member's usual teaching format. Two observations are required, although one observer could be used.

In the interim, the only requirement is that the faculty member *receive* peer review, not that they "pass" it or receive any sort of remediation. Thus, for now the goal is to satisfy the peer review requirement in good faith, while developing a permanent policy.

Although the peer reviewer will fill out an appropriate form, the reviewer and faculty will have a private conversation that will not be reported, designed to promote useful improvements in the faculty's teaching. Ultimately it will be desirable for faculty to have the option of requesting additional private feedback that will not be reported anywhere, and perhaps beyond that to create awards for excellent teaching. Dr. Strome noted that another potential development is an Academy for Teaching, to share best practices in teaching across all 4 UTHSC campuses. Initially the goal is to provide feedback for improvement, but ultimately the hope is to create collaboration that can build tools for better teaching across the board. LCME is coming, hence massive changes will not be made in the short term. Still, it can be helpful to have beta-tested some improvements.

Pres. Pfeffer then turned to the subcommittee currently working on promotion requirements for non-tenure faculty. Past-president Thompson displayed a grid depicting some differences between tenure- and non-tenure track faculty. Currently it appears that, at least for some activities, there is little or no difference between expectations for tenured, versus for non-tenured faculty, for a given work description.

Dean Strome proposed that it should mean something – concretely – to be a professor, an associate professor, or whatever category. A central question, he suggested, is: [1] What are the standards for each rank. Quantification or some metric seems appropriate, incorporating quality as well as quantity. Related questions concern how to mentor someone.

Yet another question to consider: [2] How do we show that we value clinician educators? what keeps a clinician in academic medicine? It is a bit more obvious why a basic science researcher would want to be in academia. We need to consider how to award value for clinicians who could instead be in private practice.

For academics it is essential to publish. This is the heart of academia, Dr. Strome indicated. A promotion to full professor, or to associate, should have important meaning in terms of achievements. Traditional academia means publishing, and obtaining extramural funding further identifies the person as a basic scientist.

Finally, Dr. Strome refined the current subcommittee's requested focus: promotion expectations, specifically for Clinician Educators (most of them presumably non-tenure track).

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the committee will be held on April 1, 2019, at 12:00 Noon in the Coleman building, Room A101.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

E. Haavi Morreim, JD, PhD
Secretary