1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Dr. Meert at 3:05 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The minutes from the previous faculty senate meeting on December 3, 2015 were distributed and approved.


   a. Dr. McLean provided a slide presentation outlining the results of the 2016 match, noting that the overall match for WSU students was largely successful. Highlights include:
      • 284 WSU participants with a total match success rate on match day of 95.8%. Dr. McLean noted that that percentage has fluctuated up and down over the past four years, this year being a little down.
      • This can be compared to the national average of 93.8% for U.S. allopathic schools (and 96.3% for all schools). Dr. McLean noted students failing to obtain residencies is a concern nationwide. While there are about 18,600 U.S. medical school seniors, there are about 60,000 applicants for the ~27,000 PGY1 positions and another ~2,600 PGY2 positions nationwide.
      • WSU is the number 1 provider of physicians to the state of Michigan. In 2016, 52.6% of WSU students matched to positions in Michigan, continuing an upward trend over the past four years. Many students placed to regional hospital partners.

   b. Dr. McLean was asked about the seniors who did not match. She noted that half matched subsequently in the Supplemental Offer and Acceptance Program (SOAP) while 12 seniors remain unmatched. Most of the unmatched students will take a year to do research and try again next year.

   c. Dean Sobel noted that he considers it unacceptable that some students will not have a residency after they graduate with an M.D., and often a large loan debt. He indicated that Dr. Baker and his team are working to prevent this scenario in the future. Some of the approaches include earlier identification of students who may be in trouble and so that additional support and remediation can be provided, tighter promotion criteria, and possible alternatives to promotion.

4. Dean’s Report, Dean Jack D. Sobel, M.D.

   a. Dr. Sobel announced and congratulated the new Chair of the Department of Pharmacology, Dr. Raymond R. Mattingly, Ph.D., and the new Chair of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Chaur-Dong Hsu, M.D., M.P.H., FACOG.
b. The Dean thanked the new Interim Vice Dean for Research, Dr. Linda Hazlett for taking the position to fill “the big shoes” of Dr. Bonnie Stanton who is leaving to take the position of Dean of a new medical school. Dr. Hazlett will serve for 12-18 months in this role while a national search is conducted for a permanent Vice Dean for Research. Dr. Sobel indicated that this transition will be a good opportunity to review and further define the position and role of the Vice Dean for Research, such as the office’s budget (the dean indicated that the Vice Dean’s office never had a budget), and its relationships to graduate programs and to the Vice President for Research.

c. The Dean discussed the problem of unproductive faculty. He suggested that costs associated with unproductive faculty are affecting the ability of the school to hire new faculty in all basic science departments and to increase overall research productivity. He noted that our research ranking has dropped over the past 15 years. To address these issues the Dean has identified 29 unproductive or underproductive faculty (Ph.D.s) and sent them letters inviting them to meet with the dean to discuss options for their future and whether there is any cause or justification for dismissal or de-tenuring, or a host of other options. He stressed that this will be an opportunity to discuss future options and noted that he does not dismiss anybody or have the capacity to de-tenure anybody. He noted that there will be a second wave of perhaps 12 similar letters going out to Non-Ph.D. faculty clinicians identified as unproductive in scholarly activity and research. The Dean also indicated that there is a need to increase overall research productivity. He noted that there are many talented productive faculty doing outstanding research yet there has been no incentive to obtain multiple grants, to increase publication results, or to be involved in other research areas.

d. Mr. Hefner asked the Dean to comment on faculty expectations. The Dean indicated that he believes that past achievements and expectations for the future should be documented and discussed with Chairs. He said this has not been happening as much as it should be. He said it is important not only for defining goals for the year and future but also for faculty assessment for Promotion and tenure and for Selective Salary considerations. He said this is also an important aspect of addressing the need to increase productivity and overall research at the school.

e. The Dean also mentioned his suggestions and discussions with the Executive Committee (EC) of the Faculty Senate to change the School of Medicine Factors and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. He noted that he and the EC agreed to make some changes to increase the standards and to be more specific. They standards are not increased to the extent he hoped but they are a compromise with the EC. They will become effective next year. [These changes to the Factors and Guidelines were discussed again in the President’s report, below]

5. Report from the President of the Faculty Senate, Kathleen Meert, M.D..

a. Dr. Meert reported on the process to change the Factors and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (Factors). She described how, based on the Dean’s request and specific suggestions for changes to the Factors, the EC had formed a subcommittee to consider these changes. The subcommittee reviewed the suggestions and discussed them with the Dean on two occasions,
compared them with Factors and Guidelines from other Medical Schools, and ultimately inserted some of the changes designed to increase and clarify standards for Research-Educator faculty. Dr. Meert read the relevant changes. The changes were approved by the Dean and the EC as a whole and they will go into effect in 1 year. Dr. Meert also noted that one specific change requested by the Dean to include a specific metric for faculty compensation from grants was not included. The EC subcommittee felt that such metrics are an administrative issue and should not be a part of criteria for academic achievement; additionally, such metrics were not found in the Factors and Guidelines of the many medical schools reviewed by the committee.

b. Dr. Meert outlined open positions on the EC and the Academic Senate, mentioned the EC nominations and self nominations, and called for additional nominations from the floor. There were no additional nominations. She mentioned that Dr. Steve Lerner, Secretary of the EC, is running for the at-large position in the Academic Senate and urged the faculty to vote for him.

6. Report from the Vice Dean of Medical Education, Richard Baker, M.D.

a. Dr. Baker provided an update on the LCME review. First he reviewed the timeline of events since the LCME review in March 2015, which resulted in identification of deficiencies in 13 standards. After the reconsideration hearing in October 2015, at which the progress in addressing these deficiencies was addressed, the LCME removed the probationary status.

b. In March 2016 two LCME co-secretaries visited and in doing so provided very useful input for further development of an action plan. One common theme was the appearance that WSU has too many students for the level of available resources. Dr. Baker indicated that one goal is to have strategic investment to show that we can educate our classes of ~290 students effectively. Such strategic investment includes investment in and work by the Offices of Diversity, Medical Education, and Continued Accreditation and Assessment to ensure continual organizational improvement.

7. Old Business: None

8. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Russ Finley. Vice President, Executive Committee of the SOM Faculty Senate