

MINUTES
483rd MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
3:00 pm, Wednesday, December 11th, 2019
School of Medicine | Mary Elizabeth Garrett Board Room | MRB 103

PRESENT: Akst, Al-Grain, Antoine, Benjamin, Bennett, Bigelow, Bitzer, Blakeley, Boss, Bulte, Cabahug, Campbell, Cervenka, Cooke, Cormack, Doetzlhofer, Donehower, Duffield, Eberhart, Fu, Inoue, Karjoo, Macura, Mahesh, Manahan, Marino, McGrath-Morrow, O'Brien, Pierorazio, Razzak, Redmond, Reesman, Seymour, Stayman, Stewart, Swenor, Tamashiro, Vernon, Wagner-Johnston, Williams, Wolfgang, Wu, Zeiler

Mmes: Messrs:

ABSENT: Burke, Carr, DeZern, DeZube, Dirckx, Gallia, Garcia, Gourin, Hutton, Ingari, Kim, Margolis, Merkel-Keller, Ponor, Stevens

Mmes: Messrs:

REGULAR GUESTS: Drs. Faraday, Fivush, Levine, Rand, Skarupski

Mmes: Guy Messrs:

GUESTS:

Mmes: Drs. Cabahug, Chisolm **Messrs:** Drs. Hellmann, Siewerdsen

- I. Welcome and review of the 482nd minutes.** Dr. Mahesh welcomed the senate members to the meeting. Members were reminded if absent, to assign a proxy and to share the minutes of the previous meeting with departments.
- II. Approval of the minutes.** The minutes of the 482nd meeting of the Faculty Senate, November 6, 2019, were presented. A motion was made, seconded, and minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Meg Chisolm, MD, Professor, Psychiatry & Behavior Sciences and David Hellmann, MD, MACP, Vice Dean, Johns Hopkins Bayview; Clinical Excellence Promotion track.** This track is designed to recognize, reward, and advance the careers of faculty whose primary academic focus, professional effort, and time commitment is the sustained delivery, support and teaching of clinically excellent patient care. Formal definition and recognition of clinical excellence has been a goal of JHU-SOM for decades (see Christmas C, Kravet SJ, Durso SC, Wright SM. Clinical excellence in academia: perspectives from masterful academic clinicians. Mayo Clin Proc. 2008 Sep;83(9):989-94). A recent effort to define and recognize clinical excellence is the Miller-Coulson Academy (<https://www.hopkinscim.org/initiatives/miller-coulson-academy/>). This laid the groundwork for the Clinical Excellence Promotion Track. The initial criteria for promotion along the Clinical Excellence Track (CET) has been proposed and approved by the Clinical Excellence Committee (CEC, see prior faculty senate meeting notes for additional details about this committee) and the committee is now sharing the requirements for the promotion package to faculty in preparation for receiving initial applications in January 2020.

At the time of hire, faculty will indicate a nonbinding preference for promotion track in order to inform mentoring and career development. Formal selection of a track will occur during the application for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor.

Until Nomination Manager is updated, the application package will include a pdf-fillable form. The package will require an Academic CV, online 360 surveys, internal/external reference letters, and the nomination letter. The CEC is putting together the criteria for the 360 review and this will be sent as a survey to the committee to be finalized. This will be a core component of the application and is unique to this path. The nomination letter should highlight the seven promotion criteria with an emphasis on evidence of clinical excellence. The letter should also describe evidence of other accomplishments supporting the clinical excellence of the candidate. The Academic CV should be submitted in the approved ABMF Dec 2015 version. The candidate will provide the Clinical Excellence Promotions Committee 25-30 referees, including email addresses. Referees will receive a brief online survey asking them to rate the candidate on several dimensions of clinical excellence. A request for overall evaluation of the candidate for promotion on the Clinical Excellence track will be sent to internal and external peers, leaders, staff, learners or patients. Reviewers will be provided with the candidates' CV and 360 evaluations and asked to assess the candidate's clinical excellence. Questions and clarifications made during the presentation included:

- There is overlap between the “clinician of distinction designation” in the traditional or scholarship track and the CET and hence, a given faculty member who is clinically focused may have the option of applying for promotion through either the CET or the scholarship track with a clinician of distinction designation. In either case, they would need to review the details of the criteria with their mentor/mentorship team/department leadership and decide which track best matches their strengths, contributions and accomplishments.
- There was concern expressed for faculty who are now 80% clinical/20% research who desire the scholarship track will be judged “more harshly” on this track and be “pushed” to the CE track. It was expressed that the promotion committees are instructed to assess each promotion packet on its own merits and the degree to which the candidate meets promotion criteria according to each rank and each track. Finally, the choice between the CEC and the scholarship track is to be made by the faculty member with advisement from their mentors and department leadership, but it is ultimately the faculty member’s choice.
- A question was asked about the relationship between the CET and the Miller-Coulson Academy. If in Miller-Coulson academy, would be expected to qualify for promotion at associate professor of CEC in most cases. However, someone promoted through the CET may not necessarily be elected into the Miller-Coulson Academy.
- Question asked about the relative weight of education and mentorship activities in the CET versus scholarship tracks. The answer is that they are important equally across both tracks. The main intent is that faculty seeking promotion are engaged in the academic mission in both tracks.
- Suggested to separate teaching and mentorship activities in future versions of the gold book promotion criteria.

IV. Nauder Faraday, MD, MPH, Sr. Associate Dean for Faculty Development; Update from Mentorship Best Practices Leadership Committee. Effective mentorship correlates with professional success and job satisfaction for faculty. In recent JHU surveys, 20% of faculty members reported having no mentor. The Office of Faculty Development formed a committee of faculty development leaders from all basic science and clinical departments to create suggested mentorship best practices. The Report of the Mentorship Best Practices Leadership Committee outlines the definitions of various career guidance relationships (i.e. mentor, advisor, sponsor), recommended logistics for creating mentorship opportunities and recognition of the time and effort required for effective mentorship. As part of this report, several models and tools to support increased positive mentorship experiences and recognition of effective mentorship efforts were shared. The committee has made eight recommendations and asks the Senate to review and determine two or three that should be the initial focus for SOM initiatives. Senators were asked to review within their department what the standard procedures around mentorship are and get feedback about departmental priorities regarding mentorship activities and bring this information back to the Faculty Senate. Dr. Mahesh stated that the Senate will review and bring Dr. Faraday back in March 2020 for recommendations.

V. Jeffrey Siewerdsen, PhD, Professor, John C. Malone, Professor, Vice Chair, Biomedical Engineering; Imaging Physics and Engineering in Translational Research & Education. A new feature of the Faculty Senate is to invite faculty that are doing exciting, transdisciplinary work to present highlights of their work to inspire collaborations and emphasize some of the exciting faculty and discovery at JHU-SOM. In the inaugural “Bright Spot” segment, Dr. Siewerdsen presented some of the advancements in translational research across biomedical engineering, computer science, radiology, radiation oncology and neurosurgery that are having real-time translational impact. The specific role of Medical Physicists in clinical care and all forms for translational research were discussed as was the power of incorporating biomedical data science to inform clinical care with the example of “Spine Cloud” as a model for predicting outcomes from spine surgery.

VI. Philippines Cabahug, MD, Assistant Professor, Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Kennedy Krieger; Update from Welch Library Advisory Committee meeting. Items discussed were: Budget allocations for FY2021, updating the library management system, and creating ways to publicize internal webinars and podcasts and manage the increasing requirements for open access publications. Members of the committee are invited to the February senate meeting to discuss the resources they have available to faculty.

VII. Other business; Conflict Resolution Procedures; Part-Time Faculty policy (Blue Book); Update on the Commitment Policy workgroup recommendations. Conflict Resolution procedures for graduate students presented, critiqued and edited were again reviewed and voted upon with unanimous approval (one abstention).

Blue Book revisions were approved unanimously with one abstention. Commitment policy workgroup recommendations: The workgroup having met once will meet again to discuss and formulate recommendations that will be presented to the faculty senate for approval.

With no further announcements, Dr. Mahesh thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 4:46 PM.

The Faculty Senate will meet next on January 22, 2020 in The Mary Elizabeth Garrett Boardroom (MRB 103).

Respectfully submitted,

Jaishri Blakeley, MD
Faculty Senate Secretary
Monica Guy
Recording Secretary