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I. Executive Summary:

The Ad Hoc BSD Faculty Science Review Committee was convened at the behest of BSD Dean/VP/CEO Madara, Provost Rosenbaum, and President Zimmer in March 2009 in response to growing faculty concern over perceived changes in governance and decision-making practices following the merger of the Biological Sciences Division (BSD) and the University of Chicago Medical Center (UCMC) in 2006, and exacerbated by the financial crisis of 2008-2009.

The Committee met with faculty in a series of 24 town-hall style meetings. Members heard widespread consensus around two related points: first, faculty noted a significant decline in advocacy and support for the academic missions when comparing the pre-merger and post-merger Madara administrations; and second, faculty voiced concern and dismay over perceived shifts in governance practices that appeared to distance faculty from decision-making processes while relegating the academic mission secondary to decisions based on financial considerations, organization re-structuring, and management.

Two positive observations shaped the Committee’s response. First, the majority of faculty continued to support the merger as a necessary step toward the desired goal of building and sustaining a unified academic vision and strategy that draws upon all elements of basic, clinical, and community research throughout the BSD. Second, a significant portion of the faculty counseled the Committee to maintain Madara as Dean/CEO, or risk a major setback for the BSD. The Committee concurred; however, we learned in August that Dean Madara intended to relinquish his responsibilities as BSD Dean/VP/CEO beginning October 1, 2009.

The Committee focused on issues related to governance and advocacy of the academic missions in the context of the ongoing merger of two institutions with fundamental differences in culture, governance structures, and management styles. We sought solutions to restore faculty confidence in governance and decision-making; to re-engage faculty in these processes; and to return the central focus of the Division to the process of planning, building and promoting programs of academic excellence. We also addressed two additional faculty concerns: the education of the next generation undergraduate and graduate scientists, and the structure/prioritization of the core resources to support division-wide research.

The Committee anticipates that the BSD will increasingly find itself in the role of arbitrator as we strive to balance the demands of a complex health care system alongside a culture of independence and creativity that has long fueled discovery in academic research. We recommend the formation of a BSD Faculty Council as a means to engage faculty and leadership in constructive two-way communication as we chart our course through the opportunities and challenges ahead.

The proposed Dean for Research and Graduate Education (DRGE) would oversee and implement the Dean/CEO’s research policy and assume responsibility for the strategic planning and quality control of research and graduate education throughout the BSD; advocate for the academic missions of ALL faculty in the BSD; promote policies to engage faculty in academic decision-making; and work to insure that governance practices throughout Chicago Biology and Medicine (BSD plus UCMC) are consistent with the core values of the University. A major goal is to insure that ALL faculty in the BSD, regardless of department affiliation, have equal and effective advocacy for their respective academic missions.
II. Committee Process and Summary of Faculty Interviews:

The Ad Hoc Faculty Science Committee was constituted by Dean Madara in March of 2009, at a time of growing dissatisfaction and unrest among the faculty in the Biological Sciences Division. Before the Committee was formed, this unrest had been expressed through private discussions among faculty and public letters of concern. Against this background, the original charge given by the Dean to this Committee - to review the structures and organization within the Division with the goal to strengthen scientific inquiry - was deemed too limited to address the range of related issues that appeared to underlie the dissatisfaction of BSD faculty.

Upon completion of the 24 town-hall style faculty meetings described below, the Committee re-defined its Charge and Scope as follows:

**Charge:** to lead an open and inclusive discussion and evaluation of academic governance and decision-making processes in the Biological Sciences Division (BSD) and of any and all processes and structures that impact the research and education missions, including those at the interface of research, education, and patient care.

**Scope:** The Committee’s evaluative responsibility spans all aspects of research and education including the training of academic and medical professionals. It is not appropriate for this Committee to make recommendations regarding patient care, management, or fiscal policy, however, when decisions in any of these areas impact research, education, or training, they do fall within the Committee’s scope.

**Information Collection Process:** The Committee’s first goal was to meet with a broad range of BSD faculty to determine the charge and scope of the Committee’s review, and to establish the Committee’s priorities. One or more of the Committee Co-chairs plus at least one additional Committee member met with twenty-four independent faculty groups over a period of six weeks. Faculty in nearly every BSD department were represented in the process. Larger departments like Medicine were given multiple opportunities to attend these discussions including meetings specifically requested by several sections. Overall it is estimated that Committee members met with well over 300 faculty, or approximately one-third of our ranks. Two of the twenty-four groups consisted of clinical unit leaders; all other meetings were open to faculty regardless of rank. Department chairs were invited to all meetings; in most cases the chairs left mid-way through the meeting so that faculty had the opportunity to exchange views in the absence of their department chair. One or more Committee members took notes throughout the meetings.

The full committee met approximately every other week throughout the six month evaluation. Meeting minutes were posted to an all faculty website (*Chalk*) and faculty were invited to weigh in by email or post comments directly to the Chalk website. A faculty survey was conducted early in the process with responses shared on the web site. Several faculty members requested to meet individually, or in small groups with the full Committee. Notably, Drs. Dan Margoliash, Marcus Clark, and Harinder Singh, authors of the 04/03/09 faculty letter to Dean Madara, met as a group with the Committee. Some faculty requested anonymity in their responses; commentary from others who met with the Committee was included in the Committee notes and shared with the faculty. As information from these faculty meetings informed the Committee’s charge, several sub-groups were convened to tackle specific priority areas of concern identified by faculty. Each sub-group consisted of a mix of Committee members and *ad hoc* faculty.
members. The sub-groups included: Academic Governance; Core Facilities; Graduate and Undergraduate Education; and the Urban Health Initiative. Each sub-group conducted interviews with various faculty and administrators.

The Committee Chair and Co-chairs (often accompanied by other Committee members) met one or more times with the following individuals: President Zimmer; Provost Rosenbaum; BSD Dean/VP/CEO Madara; Executive Vice Dean of the BSD, Kumar; Chief Strategy and Financial Officer Furnstahl; VP for Business Strategy and Planning, Sharigian; and chairs of the following departments: Medicine, Surgery, Pediatrics, Radiology, Obstetrics and Gynecology, Neurology, and Psychiatry. The Co-chairs also met with Chief Medical Officer/Dean for Clinical Affairs Golomb along with the clinical chairs and senior administrators of The University of Chicago Medical Center (UCMC). The Committee Chair represented the Committee in meetings with the Council of the University Senate and the Medical Center Board of Trustees. The Co-chairs communicated on multiple occasions with Dr. Arthur Rubenstein, Dean for Biological Sciences and Hospital CEO at the University of Pennsylvania.

Summary of Faculty Opinions: The Committee heard a broad range of comments, observations, and suggestions. The following two sets of comments were expressed repeatedly and broadly among all tracks of BSD faculty (Research Scholars, Clinical Scholars, and Academic Clinicians) from both basic and clinical departments.

1. The system by which faculty (and department chairs) advocate for issues related to research and education has eroded over the past two to three years.
   a. Many faculty feel that they have lost their voice in governance and decision-making.
   b. In the clinical groups, there was broad consensus that decisions regarding patient care are being made without due consideration to downstream effects on research, training, and educational missions, and that consequently, these missions are suffering.
   c. A small, but significant fraction of faculty noted that the challenges of running a modern urban health care facility have demanded a disproportionate amount of Dean Madara’s time since he assumed the UCMC CEO position in 2006, contributing to the decline in academic advocacy.

2. There was broad consensus among 21 of the 24 faculty groups that Divisional governance practices had shifted noticeably over the past two to three years. In particular, faculty note a shift away from the collegial style of governance characterized by a more inclusive consultative process toward a more corporate-feeling, top-down style of decision making, accompanied by a lack of transparency in the decision making process. Consequently, faculty report:
   a. A widespread decline in faculty morale coupled with a sense that the research and teaching missions are being devalued and that its practitioners are increasingly under appreciated
   b. A sense of disenfranchisement from the mission of the BSD

While the opinions above were broadly consensual among faculty groups, several dominant sub-themes were also raised among a substantial minority of faculty:

3. Need for a long-term academic plan or strategy throughout the BSD
4. Concern over the adequacy and sustainability of research-support core facilities
5. Concern over the quality of Graduate and Undergraduate Education programs

It is also interesting to note what was *not* brought up by the faculty.

6. In only 1 of the 24 meetings did faculty spontaneously comment that the administrations’ response to the economic downturn was too severe.

7. In only 1 of 24 meetings did faculty spontaneously comment that the costs incurred by the New Hospital Pavilion project were responsible for much of the current economic hardship.

Finally, the Committee notes that despite concerns about advocacy and academic governance, two observations were noted in multiple faculty meetings that met with broad faculty agreement:

8. Faculty continue to support the BSD/UCMC merger as a necessary step toward the desired goal of building a division-wide academic vision and strategy.

9. Prior to assuming responsibility for UCMC, Dean Madara was exceptional in his tenure as Dean of the BSD. Many maintain that Madara is a bold leader with vision, and counsel the Committee to seek solutions that harness his talents and that of the faculty.

In late July 2009 the Committee submitted a draft version of its governance proposal documents to the faculty for their review. The Committee followed with two Town Hall-style meetings where the Committee Chair summarized the proposals and then opened the floor for discussion. Summaries of both Town Hall discussions were subsequently posted on the faculty Chalk web site. Recommendations from the Town Hall meetings were discussed by the Academic Governance subcommittee and summarized before the full Committee. Among the faculty suggestions incorporated into the final proposals were: (1) proposed reduction of the number of direct reports to the Dean/CEO; (2) proposal that the top-level advisors to the Dean/CEO (the Resource Group, or cabinet-level positions) should be kept to a small number and should be balanced in terms of representation for academic missions versus the primarily non-academic missions; and (3) changes in the BSD Council proposal allowing Council representatives to formally represent the faculty and thus afford the Council greater authority.

Proposed Responses to Faculty Concerns: The Committee has drafted proposals for a new **Dean for Research and Graduate Education** and a **BSD Faculty Council** designed to address the broad and consensual faculty concerns over lack of advocacy and problematic governance processes summarized in points 1 and 2 above as well as the expressed need for leadership to develop long term strategic academic planning stated in point 3. The Education and Core Facilities subcommittees have submitted proposals to address points 4 and 5. The General Duties described under section 3 of the Dean for Research and Graduate Education proposal reflect the deliberations of the Urban Health Initiative subcommittee.

It is proposed that the recruitment of a new Dean for Research and Graduate Education, and the formation of a BSD Faculty Council, will serve to re-engage faculty in academic decision-making processes, provide a direct connection between faculty representatives and the Dean/CEO, and in so doing, help ensure that our academic mission and our academic values are given appropriate consideration at every major decision junction going forward.
III. Narrative and Overview of Governance Proposals

In a series of interviews spanning faculty groups in both basic and clinical departments, the faculty voiced widespread concern over academic advocacy and governance. It is the Committee’s opinion that these concerns in large part correlate with changes in the organizational structure, and with ensuing changes in administrative policies and governance practices, that were coincident with the merger of the BSD and UCMC beginning in 2006, and were exacerbated by the financial crisis of 2008-2009.

The background for the changes alluded to above is the merger of a complex hospital enterprise with the biology and medical arm of a major university including a diverse array of 21 academic departments and 13 graduate training committees.¹ The Committee’s proposals are made against the background of our continuing efforts to integrate two organizations that have fundamentally different styles of management, cultures, and governance.

The Committee notes that the fit between an academic enterprise and a health-care system in any such merger will likely never be ideal. There is no perfect solution to integrate scientific investigation with patient care, nor is there a perfect way to integrate administration and management of these disparate, but closely linked, activities. And, there will always be tension between the separate cultures (research, administration, patient care) that require re-assessment of management structure, core values, and resource allocation. The Committee also notes that we are proposing solutions for evolving rather than static institutional relationships, so that in some instances desired end-points are clear, but implementation and timelines are dependent upon the outcome of processes currently in transition. In such cases the Committee has sought to articulate desired end-goals, but left the details for their implementation to the vested parties.

The Committee was constituted to collect and evaluate information related to academic governance and decision-making processes in the BSD, and to review and make recommendations on processes and structures that impact the research and educational (graduate and undergraduate) missions. Early in the faculty interview process, it became clear that issues related to patient care could not be entirely separated from the research, education, and training missions of broad segments of our academic colleagues (clinical, translational, community, global health, etc.). Indeed, a single point that resonated broadly, particularly among faculty from the clinical departments was that patient care is essential to many of our faculty’s research, educational, and training missions.

This point is illustrative of the broader principle that compartmentalization of missions (academic, patient care, administration, etc.) is contrived in an evolving enterprise like Chicago Biology and Medicine, and that even early-stage planning in each of the mission categories must anticipate impact on adjoining categories. While this intermingling of academic mission and patient care bodes well for the merger process, it has also revealed the limitations of the Committee’s charge and the restricted breadth of its members’ expertise. Although we have consulted broadly with administrators, financial experts, Deans, department chairs, colleagues outside the BSD, and our own faculty, the Committee recognizes that it has first-hand

¹ While such a merger is in many ways unique among our peer institutions, the systems at UCSF, University of Pennsylvania, Duke and Johns Hopkins are examples that exhibit some important parallels. Our thinking has been informed by experiences at these and other institutions in grappling with some of the issues we address.
knowledge of only some of the parts of a machine whose function derives from the interplay of all parts. Our goal has been to recommend solutions to: (1) restore confidence and trust in our governance and decision-making processes, and develop mechanisms to enrich these processes going forward, (2) maximize advocacy for the research and teaching missions of all researchers, and (3) promote programs of academic excellence throughout the BSD.

The Committee shares the opinion voiced by the majority of faculty consulted that James Madara was an exceptional leader with the vision to lead Chicago Biology and Medicine (CBM) through these tumultuous times. However, the Committee agrees with many of the faculty we interviewed that it is practically impossible for any single individual to effectively manage the burdens of hospital administration, patient care, diverse educational missions, community health, and all forms of research. We also agree with those faculty who opined that the current position of Executive Vice-Dean has too little authority to make decisions and allocate resources to be an effective advocate for the research and education missions.2

Our proposal entails two intertwining initiatives to address these issues and which we expect to enhance the governance of the BSD:

1. Dean for Research and Graduate Education

a. Background
The newly constituted Dean for Research and Graduate Education (DRGE) will play a critical leadership role in the research and education agenda of the BSD. The Committee envisions a model whereby the Dean/CEO is responsible for the vision and broad direction for research and education throughout the BSD, identifies themes and signature programs, and determines policy for the management of, and resource allocation to the academic operations. Dean Madara’s signature policy, which has the support of the faculty, has been to delegate the majority of management and budget allocation decisions to the department chairs and institute directors. Through this policy, the chairs and institute directors determine how the majority of resources committed to research and education are deployed. Nonetheless, there is substantial support for retaining sufficient resources at the institutional level to seed promising new initiatives, to take advantage of major opportunities that arise during the year, and to make strategic moves possible by allocating additional funds at the margin. Another current policy that we strongly endorse has been to encourage and incentivize chairs to think collectively about ways to pool departmental resources for strategic recruitments or to build new programs. The successful partnership among six departments and the Argonne National Laboratory to fund the Institute for Genomics and Systems Biology is a recent example of this approach. Importantly, this example also illustrates a basic principle underlying the justification for the DRGE proposal. This complex partnership would not have succeeded without significant intervention from a skillful dean with authority over resources and the trust of the department chairs.

The Committee supports the previous administration’s policy for dispersal of funds to the department chairs. The proposal builds upon this model by putting in place an individual who will partner with the chairs and directors to facilitate this approach and who will assist them in

2 The majority of Committee members disagree with having the DRGE report jointly to the Dean/CEO and the Provost. The current and proposed structure invests a single individual (the Dean/CEO) with the authority to make enterprise-level (research, teaching, patient care, hospital, medical education, community relations, etc.) decisions. A joint reporting structure for the Dean for Research and Graduate Education, or for any other senior level administrator, would jeopardize this essential cohesion of the enterprise.
optimizing the use of resources at the margin of the Dean/CEO’s dispersal. The Committee also notes that the effectiveness of the DRGE model will grow with the trust of the chairs and institute directors.

b. Strategic Planning
A central feature of the proposed Dean for Research and Graduate Education position is the faculty recommendation to develop and continuously refine a Division-wide, long-term academic strategy. The Committee recommends that the DRGE be charged to organize and lead this faculty-driven process which should encompass all types of research throughout the Division. The Committee recommends that the DRGE lead regular retreats with faculty to frame key Division-wide academic priorities, to map the underlying programs and infrastructure required to support these priorities, and to discuss program-building and recruitment strategies across departments and institutes. Prior to 2006, BSD Dean Madara held two-day, off-site retreats that addressed similar issues with chairs, directors, and faculty leaders. The DRGE would revitalize this critical role.

From this process, we envision that the DRGE would frame a unifying vision for research and education throughout the BSD. The process would map strategic relationships among the various research programs and supporting infrastructure. These maps, in turn, would help to guide strategic recruitment, infrastructure planning, new program development, graduate education initiatives, and faculty retention. It is envisioned that this long-term strategy would be the foundation for building novel research and education programs that span multiple departments or divisions at The University of Chicago. It has the added benefit of providing a further inducement in our efforts to attract leading basic and clinical researchers looking to match a premier academic home with the opportunity to collaborate with world-renowned experts in clinical, translational, community, and global health research. Such a strategy would also recognize the long-standing preeminence of ‘curiosity-driven’ science in fueling basic and applied discoveries.

The Committee notes the critical relationship between the DRGE and the Dean/CEO in strategic planning. The Dean/CEO leverages the Division-wide vision, and in the process shapes the vision, by identifying opportunities for growth and development across all facets of the Chicago Biology and Medicine enterprise.

c. Facilitation of the Strategic Agenda
It is the Dean/CEO’s responsibility to set the enterprise-wide research agenda. However, in the current administration, most chairs and directors, as well as other faculty, reportedly have limited opportunity to discuss and develop their ideas for new programs and strategic recruitment with the Dean/CEO. In the basic science departments, for example, chairs negotiate their annual budgets with non-academic administrators rather than the Dean/CEO or the Executive Dean. In the clinical departments, a mixed model is operative, but it remains one in which the direct involvement of the Dean/CEO is reportedly limited. To address this, we recommend that the DRGE serve on both the Budget Oversight Committee and Dean/CEO’s Resource Group (or cabinet) to ensure that research and educational initiatives across the Division fit appropriately with the priorities outlined in the overall Divisional strategic plan. Just as it is essential to consider budgetary implications when making major academic decisions, it is equally important that the impact of individual budgetary decisions on the academic mission be taken into account as those decisions are made. Seeing that that is done is a key responsibility of the Dean for Research and Graduate Education.


d. Strategic Fund Account
As leader of the strategic planning process in research and education, the DRGE is ideally positioned to advise and facilitate strategic planning across the departments. To further empower the DRGE in this critical role, the Committee has adopted an idea that has been broached at the last two BSD Leadership Retreats, namely the notion that the Dean/CEO should withhold a fraction of Divisional funds for the purpose of facilitating, augmenting, or complementing the chairs’ role in strategic recruitment and program building. The Committee proposes that the Dean/CEO commit to funding and sustaining a Strategic Fund Account (SFA) that the DRGE would use for this purpose. While the details will necessarily be worked out over time, the Committee feels that funding for even 3-4 critical faculty hires per year (or the equivalent in critical core infrastructure, for example), together with a more coordinated and effective strategic recruitment strategy, could begin to yield dividends in only a few years.

Whereas funding for a SFA is obviously constrained in the current economic climate, the Committee strongly recommends that the Dean/CEO commit to a specific annual stipend upon recruitment of the DRGE, and then commit to defining a process that will lead to a base-line SFA with the equivalent of at least 3-4 faculty hires per year. The Committee views this level of support as the minimum base-line for the SFA. The SFA should not be funded at the expense of existing commitments to departments and their chairs. However, the more rapidly the SFA reaches an effective funding level, the more effective it will be in accelerating strategic change. To this end, chairs may be willing to cede a portion of their unfilled current commitments to the SFA, and to endorse significant future allocations to the SFA from incremental revenues. The rapidity with which we can reach the goal of an adequately funded SFA will depend on how rapidly the economy and the fortunes of the Medical Center rebound, and how rapidly departments and institutes buy into, and endorse the proposed plan.

e. Role of the DRGE in Graduate Education
One of the three major subthemes that emerged from the faculty interviews was the need to enhance graduate education and to integrate the division-wide research efforts with the graduate, undergraduate, and medical education missions. The importance and timeliness of these concerns was illustrated by the fact that two additional BSD committees were addressing overlapping aspects of the educational issues simultaneously with our own subcommittee investigation. Currently, responsibilities for the medical, graduate, and undergraduate missions of the BSD are vested with the Dean for Medical Education, the Dean for Graduate Affairs, and the Master of the BSD Collegiate Division, respectively. A significant number of faculty expressed the concern that the graduate education mission has become undervalued and underserved throughout the past few administrations. The Committee felt that this situation could be rectified at least in part by including advocacy for graduate education at the Dean/CEO’s resource group meetings. Considering the high degree of interdependencies of the graduate education and research missions, the Committee proposes that the Dean/CEO delegate responsibility for graduate education to the Dean for Research; henceforward the Dean for Research and Graduate Education (DRGE). Importantly, the DRGE should be charged with working collaboratively with the Dean for Medical Education, and the Master of the BSD Collegiate Division to insure integration across missions, and most importantly, to help insure that the education and training missions of all our faculty have appropriate advocacy. The Committee does not view this proposal as a diminishment of the previous role of the Dean for Graduate Affairs; on the contrary, it is hoped that by advocating for graduate education at the highest levels of decision-making, the DRGE can strengthen the role of the Deputy Dean for Graduate Affairs and his/her associated office as recommended in a recent BSD report.
f. Relationship between the DRGE, Dean/CEO, Education Deans and Chairs
The Committee acknowledges that it will take some time for department chairs and institute directors, who are recruited by the Dean/CEO, to develop the same confidence in the DRGE, but to be effective the DRGE needs to wield delegated authorities on behalf of the Dean/CEO. Chairs are not going to invest critical time and resources negotiating with the DRGE if the DRGE cannot carry his/her end of the bargain. Thus, the Committee recommends the following relationship between the Dean/CEO and the DRGE: The Dean/CEO establishes the policy for management and allocation of Divisional research funds, notably including allocations to the department chairs, who then have broad discretionary power for the use of such funds. With the constraint that alteration of the departmental allocations will require approval by the Dean/CEO, the DRGE will exercise the Dean/CEO’s full authority in these matters to implement the Division’s strategy for research. The Committee notes that our educational missions provide critical support for the research mission. The Dean/CEO delegates responsibility for these missions to the Dean for Medical Education and the Master of the BSD Collegiate Division, in addition to the proposed DRGE. The DRGE will work in coordination with these leaders to insure integration across missions, and most importantly, to help insure that the research, education, and training missions of our faculty have appropriate advocacy.

g. The Academic Mission and Enterprise-level Decision-making.
Perhaps the single most widespread and passionate message from the 24 faculty interviews was that decisions regarding patient care, organizational restructuring, and UCMC administration are being made without due consideration to downstream consequences on the academic missions. The Committee found this to be the prevailing issue underlying faculty discontent and demoralization.

The Committee proposes that the Dean for Research and Graduate Education be appointed as a standing member of the Dean/CEO’s resource group, or equivalent cabinet-level position, where he/she is positioned to advocate for the academic mission and for academic values at all decision junctures. The Committee further recommends that the top-level advisors to the Dean/CEO be kept to a small group with balanced representation of academic and non-academic expertise and interests. We recommend that the DRGE also be appointed as a standing member of the Budget Oversight Committee.

h. Future Budget Planning
Just as it makes sense to propose one Dean and one strategic plan for all types of research, a desirable goal would be a single budget for all research activities, and one that is integrated with and in service of the strategic plan. The Committee notes the process of tracking research dollars distinct from patient care and operational costs is a complex undertaking (and beyond the purview of this Committee) that is several years from completion. This scenario exemplifies the dynamic and evolving processes that the merger has set into motion and serves to illustrate the broader principle that, particularly in the clinical departments, the research and education missions are intricately intertwined with hospital operations and patient care. For this reason the Committee deems it impractical (and perhaps unwise) to delegate authority too quickly. Consequently, the implementation of our goal, namely a Dean for Research and Graduate Education with significant delegated authority over its management and allocation, is by necessity a conditional time-dependent process.

i. Summary
In summary, in view of the constraints outlined above, the Committee recommends that an appropriately empowered Dean for Research and Graduate Education would have some or all of
the following characteristics: (1) the DRGE is selected by the Dean/CEO from candidates vetted by a faculty-selected search committee; (2) the DRGE would be the single Dean (other than the Dean/CEO) whose responsibility would be to advocate for all types of research within the BSD; (3) the DRGE would lead the faculty in the generation and constant refinement of a strategic academic plan for the entire Division. While this would depend heavily upon the contribution of the individual departments and their chairs, the DRGE would be held accountable for the progress and success of the long-term strategic plan, and would be delegated with sufficient decision-making and budget allocation authorities to shape and control the process; (4) the DRGE would participate in all budgetary processes (including the Budget Oversight Committee and the Resource Group) and would have management and budgetary authority to implement the Dean/CEO’s research policies (while holding the Dean/CEO-chair/director agreements inviolate); (5) the BSD would commit to a process that will result in a sustained annual budget (Strategic Fund Account) that the DRGE would use to facilitate the implementation of the Division’s priority strategic goals, and finally (6) the DRGE would be appointed for renewable 5 year terms, although in practice, the term would likely be co-terminus with that of the Dean/CEO. It is the opinion of the Committee that these basic job descriptors and delegated authorities, responsibilities, and accountabilities—accrued over a reasonable period of time—are required to attract the caliber of talent this position requires, and are necessary to arm the DRGE with the independence, authority, and resources required to address the advocacy issues articulated by the faculty and to effect the type of changes that will enrich the academic mission of the BSD.

2. Faculty Council
The Committee anticipates that the BSD will increasingly find itself in the role of arbitrator as we strive to balance the demands of a complex health care system alongside the atmosphere of independence and creativity that is essential for discovery in academic research. The Committee recommends the formation of a BSD Faculty Council as a means to engage the Dean/CEO and his leadership team with the faculty in a constructive two-way communication as they work together to balance the inevitable pull and tug between: (1) collegial governance practices best suited for education and discovery and line management practices best suited for hospital administration and patient care decisions, and (2) financial decisions that determine the health and sustainability of our profit-generating hospital and patient care facilities, and academic decisions that are the bedrock of our resource-intensive, brand-generating research, educational and training missions. The BSD Faculty Council provides a forum for elected faculty to follow major decisions affecting all aspects of academia and to make their voice heard.

Because of his or her proximity to the faculty, the Committee views the DRGE, along with the Education Deans, the Faculty Dean of Academic Affairs, and others, as primary advocates for the faculty and the faculty/administrators (chairs, institute directors, sub-deans). In this sense, these Deans become an important voice for a Dean/CEO whose daily discussions are often remote from the day-to-day life of academics. The BSD Faculty Council is a forum to provide access and communication between faculty and the administration.

The Committee also recommends that the Dean for Research and Graduate Education reconstitute a Research Advisory Committee to include several rotating faculty members who are knowledgeable, passionate, and judicious in matters related to research administration and governance. Whereas the Faculty Council focuses primarily on issues such as general academic policies and governance, the RAC will focus more on issues like research strategy, program building, and resource allocation. Placing experts in academic administration and governance on the RAC provides an early detection strategy to minimize misunderstandings related to issues like management or governance. Faculty participation and good communication between
faculty, their department chairs, and administration, will be critical to the success of the proposed measures.
IV. Proposal for a BSD Faculty Council

We propose that an elected body of faculty members within the Division of the Biological Sciences (BSD) in the Research Scholar, Clinical Scholar, and Academic Clinical tracks (“BSD Members”) be constituted, parallel in structure to the Council of the University Senate. This Council will meet twice per quarter with the Dean/CEO and University Vice-President for Medical Affairs and the BSD Dean for Research. The Council will serve as a forum in which the Deans and the faculty can discuss major issues and impending decisions, and their impact on research, teaching, and scholarship can be weighed. The Council will be a venue in which the Deans and the faculty can each bring matters of interest or concern to the attention of the other.

Composition. The Council will consist of 27 members (“Councilors”). The elected members will be formed into three classes of nine members each. Councilors will serve for terms of three years, so that nine Councilors will be elected each year in overlapping three-year terms.

All members of the BSD faculty are eligible to vote in the election of Councilors and, with the exception of incumbent members of the Council, are eligible to stand for election.

Voting for Council members shall use the Hare System of Proportional Representation.

At each election there shall be three ballots, labeled A, B, and C. It is intended that ballot A will contain nominees whose interests and expertise encompass patient care and the training of medical students, residents, and fellows. Ballot B is intended to represent faculty members whose work encompasses basic biological research. Ballot C is intended to represent faculty members whose work encompasses clinical and translational science. Nominees for any ballot must be nominated by three eligible voters, and the nominee must consent to being placed on that ballot. Each voter may select any one of the three ballots, but may not vote on more than one ballot. The choice of which ballot is left entirely to the discretion of each voter. The three ballot types do not correspond to particular departments, and they do not correspond to particular faculty tracks; each BSD faculty member is eligible to be nominated for any of the three ballots. In the event that an individual is nominated to more than one of the ballots, he or she will select the single ballot on which to appear.

Of the nine members to be elected, three members shall be elected from each of the three ballots. For each ballot, a list of runners-up, in order, shall be maintained.

The initial composition of the Council will consist of the three top vote recipients on each ballot, who will serve a three-year term, the three next highest vote recipients on each ballot who will serve a two-year term, and the three subsequent highest vote recipients on each ballot who will serve an initial one-year term.

The BSD Dean/CEO and University Vice-President for Medical Affairs, the Dean for Medical Education, and the Dean for Research and Graduate Education are ex officio members of the Biological Sciences Faculty Council.

Terms will begin on July 1 of each year.

Vacancies. Vacancies that arise among members elected on any of the three ballots will be filled by the runners-up on the same ballot from the most recent election.
Meetings. The Council will hold regular meetings twice per quarter during Autumn, Winter, and Spring Quarters. The Dean/CEO may convene additional meetings of the Council. Meetings may also be called upon the request of one-fourth of the elected Councilors.

Powers. The Council will be advisory to the BSD Dean/CEO and University Vice-President for Medical Affairs and the Dean for Research and Graduate Education. In addition, the Council will exercise any Statutory powers that the Faculty of the BSD delegates to the Council to exercise in its behalf, in accordance with the Statutes of the University.

Council meetings will be chaired by the Dean/CEO and University Vice-President for Medical Affairs. In his or her absence, the Dean for Research and Graduate Education will chair the meetings.

The Council will have the authority to set its own procedural rules, and may empower an elected subcommittee to meet more frequently with the Dean/CEO to prepare for and to set the Council’s agenda. The agenda for each meeting will be determined jointly by the Dean/CEO and the Council’s elected Spokesman or Spokeswoman.

Communication. The agenda for each Council meeting will be posted one week in advance on a Divisional website accessible to all faculty members. It is intended that the agenda will be a public document. This is intended to allow BSD members to communicate with their elected Councilors with opinions concerning any topic that is to come before the Council.

The minutes for each meeting will be recorded by a Council Secretary, and will be made available to all BSD members.

Responsibilities. Council members are expected to attend meetings regularly and engage in council deliberations. Members are expected to review materials and, on occasion, to share workloads.

Review. Initially at 12-18 months, and subsequently every 5 years, a faculty committee should be constituted to review the Council and its procedures, and to make any recommendations for change in its form, structure, policies, or operations.

Implementation: The Committee urges the Dean to submit the following resolutions to the entire BSD faculty for their approval by secret ballot:

Resolved, A Biological Sciences Division Faculty Council be elected immediately in accordance with the report of the Faculty Science Review Committee.

Resolved, The Biological Sciences Division Faculty Council will exercise the Statutory powers of the Faculty of the Biological Sciences Division in their behalf, with the exception of election of BSD Faculty Council members and the election of the committee to advise the President when the Dean is to be appointed. A majority vote of the Faculty can supersede any contrary action of the Council.

Commentary: The proposal here mirrors the structure of the Council of the University Senate, the primary Ruling Body of The University of Chicago established by the University Statutes. This statutory body has served the University well, particularly in being available as an existing, functioning, constituted body that can be called on in difficult times. Particularly when rapid
action is needed to respond to an external or internal crisis, having such a body in place can be a
valuable means not only of drawing on faculty expertise, but also of ensuring that academic
values are explicitly considered in decision-making.

We have made explicit the role of the Council with respect to the Dean, Faculty, and University Statutes. Specifically, Statute 12.1 asserts that “All advisory, legislative, and administrative powers in the University concerning its educational work, except those vested in the President by the Board of Trustees, shall be exercised by, or be under the authority of, the Ruling Bodies specified in §12 ... .” (emphasis added). Statute 12.2(c) indicates that one such Ruling Body is “The Faculty of the Division of the Biological Sciences, including the Pritzker School of Medicine.” Finally, Statute 12.3.2.1 provides that “Each Faculty shall have general legislative power over all matters pertaining to its own meetings, ... .” The purpose of the second resolution in the Implementation section is for the faculty to exercise the powers of Statute 12.3.2.1 by delegating them to its elected Council, under the Faculty’s authority.

The resolution that a majority vote of the Faculty can override any action of the Council is intended to make it clear that the Faculty as a whole does not relinquish any of its Statutory powers to the Council, but that the Council exercises those powers in behalf of the faculty on a day-to-day basis.

The three ballot groupings (A, B, and C) are meant to insure that the breadth of academic concerns in the BSD are continuously represented on the Council. It is recognized that individual faculty members could easily be represented on any (or even all!) of the ballots. It is also recognized that there are basic scientists in clinical departments, clinical and translational scientists in nonclinical departments. For this reason, it was felt that defining eligibility for specific ballots should not be made in terms of track or departmental membership, but rather identification by nominators of appropriate representatives, coupled with confirmation by the proposed nominee of appropriateness and willingness to serve.

Councilors are expected to represent the faculty of the BSD as a whole, in the context of both the Medical Center and the University, and not any specific constituency. Faculty members are encouraged to communicate with the Deans through the Council. The Dean/CEO and University Vice-President for Medical Affairs is expected to keep the Council informed on matters of interest to the Division, and to seek advice on the academic impact of major initiatives. The function of the Council is two-way communication, and it is incumbent on members of the Council to communicate well-considered initiatives of the Deans to the faculty, and important faculty priorities to the Deans. The Dean for Research and Graduate Education will work with the Council to facilitate communication with the faculty at large.

The Hare System of Proportional Representation (http://sof.uchicago.edu/hare/overview.html) to be used for voting, coupled with the size of the Council, is intended to make it possible for constituencies to be represented in proportion to their numerical strength.

The incumbent-member rule on eligibility means that outgoing Councilors will need to wait one year before standing for election for a subsequent term. All faculty in the three principal tracks, regardless of rank or time in service, will be eligible for election and voting.

It is the intention of this proposal that each meeting’s agenda, listing the topics expected to be addressed, be publicly available, not only to BSD faculty members, but to anyone—students, post-docs, research associates, clinical associates, and faculty outside the BSD.
It is not our intention to make the minutes of Council meetings public, but to make them available to all those faculty eligible to vote for Councilors. As with minutes of the Council of the University Senate and the College Council, it is expected that BSD members will hold Council minutes in confidence.

We recognize that from time to time the Dean/CEO may seek advice from the Council concerning sensitive matters whose broad disclosure would be inappropriate or detrimental. The expectation that Council minutes be provided to the faculty is not intended to preclude such discussions—indeed, such discussions are particularly valuable. When these circumstances arise, it is appropriate for the portion of the meeting dealing with sensitive matters to be held in executive session (in which minutes are not recorded) and for the published minutes to reflect that fact.
V. Proposal for a Dean for Research and Graduate Education

**Reporting Structure:** The proposed Dean for Research and Graduate Education would report directly to the BSD Dean/VP for Medical Affairs/CEO of the University of Chicago Medical Center (hereafter, Dean/CEO).

**Role of Dean/CEO:** As BSD Dean, sets vision and broad direction for research and education at the enterprise-level (BSD and UCMC); identifies themes and signature programs; determines policy for the management and allocation of resources for the academic mission.

**Role of Dean for Research and Graduate Education:** The DRGE is charged with overseeing and implementing the Dean/CEO's research policy; leading development of a long-term academic plan; building programs of academic excellence; advocating for ALL types of research and education; engaging faculty in academic decision-making; and, helping to insure that all enterprise decisions are considered in the context of our core academic values.

**Main Charge**

- Responsible for the strategic planning and quality control of research and graduate education throughout the BSD, and the integration of the research, education, and training missions; create vision, establish priorities, and raise budget for a division-wide, long-term academic plan; work with chairs and institute directors to maximize the matching of resources with priority strategic aims; the DRGE is accountable for the progress and success of the research and graduate education missions and is delegated decision-making and budget allocation authorities by the Dean /CEO to shape and control these processes

- Advocate for the academic³ (research, education, and training) mission of ALL⁴ faculty in the Biological Science Division; assess impact of major enterprise decisions on the academic mission and advocate for policy decisions accordingly

- Promote policies and practices to engage faculty in academic decision-making and work to insure that management and governance policies/practices throughout the CBM enterprise are consistent with the core academic values of the University
NOTE: Vertical lines represent “primary reporting relationships”, or “hire-fire” authority, and as such, do not capture other essential types of relationships outlined in the proposal (delegated authorities, oversight responsibility, advocacy responsibilities, etc.). See footnote “1” for further explanation. Also, we have depicted the pre-January 2009 BSD model for administration with a central level reporting to the Associate Dean for Administration and a departmental level reporting to the department chairs.2

**General Duties: Dean for Research and Graduate Education**

1. Oversee, and assume responsibility for, the strategic planning and quality control of research and graduate education throughout the Biological Science Division
   - Lead a division-wide, inclusive process to develop and continuously refine the long-term academic plan for the BSD
     - Create a vision that defines and distinguishes research throughout the BSD, including the integration of research, education, and training division-wide
     - Map infrastructural and programmatic interdependencies, opportunities, and weaknesses, and build faculty consensus to guide strategic program building and faculty recruitment
   - Assist department chairs and institute directors in the coordination of faculty recruitment and retention throughout the Division
     - Facilitate joint recruitment efforts across departments or divisions

---
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Employ funds from the DRGE’s Strategic Fund Account to fill gaps in the Strategic Plan, or ‘tip the scale’ in a priority recruitment

- Lead the planning and deployment of space for research and graduate education; develop a rational, division-wide plan for the utilization and growth of academic space
- Oversee the development, evaluation, and governance of the research support infrastructure, including shared research facilities, core facilities, and research support activities, such as Research Computing
- Plan and facilitate intra- and inter-institutional research collaborations
- Lead the current Research Advisory Committee, or re-constitute a new advisory committee
- Devise and oversee a plan to promote communication between the proposed BSD Faculty Council and the faculty at large
- The Committee recommends that the President of the University appoints the DRGE to sit on the President’s Science Council.
- The Committee recommends that the Provost of the University appoint the DRGE to sit on appropriate Council(s) with other divisional deans.

In addition, it is proposed that the Dean for Research and Graduate Education advise the Dean/CEO on:

- All faculty promotions
- Appointment of committee chairs, center, and institute directors
- Recruitment and/or appointment of Department Chairs within the BSD
- Communication of faculty opinions to the University of Chicago Medical Center (UCMC) Board of Trustees
- External reviews of the research component of Departments on a regular basis and as necessary

2. The Dean for Research and Graduate Education will plan, justify and advocate for the appropriate investment of CBM resources to fund research and graduate education throughout the BSD; work to insure that budget allocations are aligned with priority strategic investments in research, education, and training; and work with the Dean/CEO to raise funding for research.

- The Committee recommends that the DRGE be appointed as a standing member of the two critical budget allocation committees: the Dean/CEO’s Resource Group, and the Budget Oversight Committee. The DRGE would be charged with leading the discussions, and provide advocacy for and analysis of the Divisonal and departmental research and graduate education priorities on these committees.
- The Committee supports continuation of the current model whereby the majority of Divisional funds to support research are allocated to department chairs and institute directors, who in turn exercise broad discretion over expenditure of the funds. It is proposed that the DRGE plays a major role in helping chairs/directors match their resources with priority strategic investments in new hires and research infrastructure.
- The committee recommends creation of a stable, predictable Strategic Fund Account (lines, space, set-up, equipment, etc.) to be used by the DRGE to fund priority
programs of academic excellence. We recommend that the Dean/CEO commit to the following support:

- A minimal base line stipend sufficient for 3-4 faculty recruitments (or the equivalent) per year
- A doubling of this commitment over 3 years through mutually agreeable investments from individual departments and incremental funding made available if and when revenues increase as the financial position of the medical center improves and the economic crisis eases

3. Given the broad impact of clinical initiatives on the research and education missions, the Dean for Research and Graduate Education should work closely with the department chairs, Dean/CEO, Dean for Medical Education, Dean for Clinical Affairs and the UCMC President on the initial deliberations, assessment of impact, and final decisions regarding such clinical initiatives. Specific activities include:

- Serve on committees with the Dean /CEO, UCMC President, and Dean for Clinical Affairs involved in the planning, deliberation, and implementation of clinical initiatives
- Direct impact study of proposed clinical initiatives on research and education programs via consultation with department chairs and research and teaching faculty
- Direct needs assessment for research and education programs affected by proposed clinical initiatives
- Utilize results of impact study and needs assessment in deliberations with the Dean /CEO, UCMC President, and Dean for Clinical Affairs
- Provide ongoing feedback to chairs and faculty regarding deliberations and decision-making processes
- Assist in the development of appropriate research infrastructures at partner institutions or clinical care organizations, and the integration of said infrastructures with campus resources

4. Responsible for the integration of all research, training, and educational missions. With assistance of the Deputy Dean for Graduate Affairs, the DRGE will work closely with the Master of the BSD Collegiate Division to insure that the following domains are maximally configured and integrated to support programs of academic excellence.

- Graduate Training Programs
- MSTP program
- Postdoctoral Training Programs
- Graduate teaching
- Undergraduate teaching

5. Administratively, the DRGE should be the equivalent of a ‘cabinet member’ on the Dean/CEO’s staff (as depicted in the Org Chart and Footnote 1). In this capacity, the DRGE (together with the Dean/CEO and Dean for Medical Education) will advocate for the academic mission and for academic values at all decision junctures involving research, education, or clinical operations. Specifically, the DRGE will:

- Participate in any discussions among senior leaders that could lead to significant changes in research, education, or clinical operations
6. It is recommended that the Provost of the University charge a group of faculty to review the Dean for Research and Graduate Education position at the end of the third year of appointment.

**Candidates for the Dean for Research and Graduate Education**

Candidates for the position of Dean for Research and Graduate Education should have outstanding research accomplishments, be internationally renowned, and have experience or interest in leading broad-based research, education and training programs in a combined University and Hospital setting. The successful candidate should have demonstrated abilities in building consensus and in academic administration. Internal or external candidates will be considered.

**Terms of the Position**

1. This individual will be a tenured Professor of the University, with a primary appointment in a BSD department.
2. This is a full time appointment for a five year term. The candidate may choose to simultaneously conduct a research program.
3. The successful candidate will be provided with a competitive recruitment package.

**Appointment Process, Review and Term**

Initial consideration and vetting of nominees will be accomplished by a committee selected by, and consisting of, faculty. It is recommended that the committee consist of seven members. Four members should be elected by Research Scholar and Clinical Scholar faculty. One individual should be elected by the Academic Clinical faculty. One faculty member should be elected by the basic science chairs, and one individual by the clinical chairs. Department chairs may serve on this committee either as representatives of the faculty at large or of the clinical and basic science departments. The chair of this committee will be selected by its members.

The committee should be charged by the Dean/CEO. The committee will provide a small list of nominees to the BSD Dean/CEO who will make the final selection.

As previously mentioned, the DRGE will undergo a review by the end of the third year of appointment by a committee constituted and charged by the Provost of the University.

**Footnotes:**

1. In proposing the Organizational Chart the committee is mindful of the need to vest the DRGE with sufficient authority (and resources) to be an effective advocate for research and education, while simultaneously keeping the BSD Dean/CEO sufficiently engaged with faculty and faculty leaders to insure that our academic mission and our academic values permeate all aspects of the Chicago Biology and Medicine (CBM) enterprise.
As depicted in the chart all department chairs continue to report formally to the Dean/CEO and in practice for any issues regarding their recruitment, renewal, and retention packages. The proposed day-to-day reporting relationship between chairs and the DRGE differs among basic and clinical department chairs in alignment with the chairs’ mission responsibilities. The chairs of basic science departments deal primarily with academic issues, whereas clinical chairs typically must deal with a complex array of patient care and hospital administration issues in addition to academic issues. In the case of the basic science departments, the Committee proposes that the Dean/CEO delegate the majority of responsibility (and authority) for oversight, direction, and implementation of the research and education policy to the DRGE. Because the Committee did NOT include clinical chairs, and because the distinction between academic mission and patient care is not always straightforward, the Committee strongly recommends (rather than proposing) that the Dean/CEO delegate responsibility for academic issues to the DRGE, leaving the details to be negotiated among the clinical chairs, the Dean/CEO and the DRGE. The goal is to insure that ALL faculty in the BSD, regardless of departmental affiliation, have equal and effective advocacy for their research, education, and training missions.

The Chart depicts four mission leaders who report directly to the Dean/CEO: the Dean for Research and Graduate Education, the Dean for Medical Education in the Pritzker School of Medicine, the Dean for Clinical Affairs, and the UCMC President. Together, these four individuals, along with the Dean/CEO, represent the critical mission responsibilities of the enterprise. Because the hospital administration, patient care, and the academic missions are highly interdependent, the Committee proposes that these four individuals, two representing primarily the academic missions and two representing primarily the essential non-academic missions, are critical for balanced decision-making at the enterprise level. The Committee recommends that direct reporting relationships to the Dean/CEO be kept small with a balanced representation of academic and non-academic expertise and interests.

The Org Chart depicts all Faculty Deans, Associate Faculty Deans, and the Associate Dean for Administration reporting directly to the DRGE rather than to the Dean/CEO. This change reflects Committee opinion, and a strongly expressed faculty sentiment, that a DRGE who competes with too many ‘equals’ for the attention and resources of the Dean/CEO will be ineffectual.

The proposal of a new position as Dean for Research and Graduate Education necessarily implies that the previous position of Dean for Graduate Education will change to Deputy Dean for Graduate Education (or the equivalent). The Committee’s intent is to strengthen and empower the Office of Graduate Affairs and the Deputy Dean of Graduate Education rather than to diminish these offices in any way. We further note that the BSD representative for the undergraduate education mission, the Master of the BSD Collegiate Division, is not shown in the Org Chart due to the complex reporting relationships of this position.

2. The Org Chart depicts the pre-January 2009 model for administration within the BSD with two interacting levels: a larger, central administration reporting to the Associate Dean for Administration; and a departmental administration reporting to the individual department chairs. A number of faculty and department chairs, and a majority of Committee members, feel that the January 2009 decision to centralize all administrative support was emblematic of the type top-down, non-transparent governance practices that have contributed to faculty discontent. It is beyond the purview of the Committee to judge whether the January 2009
decision has proven effective, or whether the decision affects basic and clinical departments differently; rather, the Committee, and a significant portion of faculty, object to the process whereby this decision was made. Consequently, the Committee recommends that the interim Dean/CEO consider, as a matter of high priority, reversal of the decision and a return to the pre-Jan 2009 model as depicted in the Org Chart.

3. The committee recognizes the seminal roles that the Dean of Medical Education, the College Dean, and the Master of the BSD Collegiate Division play in education and training throughout the BSD. The use of the term “academic” is not meant to convey any infringement of these responsibilities. Rather, this bullet point is meant to insure there are no gaps in the advocacy of research, education, and the training of students or health professionals throughout the BSD.

4. “All” research programs is meant to convey the full spectrum of research conducted throughout the BSD, including, but not limited to basic, clinical, translational, and community-based research.

5. The committee firmly believes that the broad power of recruitment and retention stays with the department chairs. The department chairs, or institute directors, in collaboration with their faculty, are the Divisional experts in their specific domains. It is this relationship that the Division entrusts with the single most important mission of the Division; the selection and retention of faculty. The DRGE is charged with coordinating recruitment and retention in alignment with the Division’s long-term strategic research and education goals.

6. We address the distinction between the Research Advisory Committee and the Faculty Council in the Narrative and Overview section. The Committee recommends that the RAC should be inclusive with a rotating membership composed of department chairs, institute directors, committee chairs, and other faculty members.

7. The Committee views this as a major and empowering role for the DRGE and notes the DRGE will be at the center of all major research initiatives throughout the BSD including inter-departmental and inter-divisional research collaborations. On the other hand, the Committee notes that the DRGE would sit across the table from the individuals with full authority to represent the Physical Science Division, Argonne National labs, etc. Ideally, both the DRGE and the Dean/CEO would sit on the council.

8. The Committee was divided in its opinion as to whether the Faculty Dean position should report directly to the DRGE rather than the Dean/CEO. There was general consensus that, under Dr. Feder this office performs well and the committee is reluctant to impose an additional level of hierarchy. There was consensus that the DRGE would benefit greatly from reviewing each promotion case since this is a unique opportunity to understand the faculty member’s research from the perspective of his/her peers. For simplicity, we do not reflect these discussions in the Org Chart, but duly note them here.

There was sentiment that the Dean for Research and Graduate Education should not be seen as “interfering” in the evaluation of an Academic Clinician whose distinguishing merits are not research-related. The Committee recognizes this concern, but based on the feedback from the faculty interviews, believes that it is important for the DRGE to also advocate strongly for the academic interests of each Academic Clinician.

9. The committee is aware of the logical inconsistency of proposing that the Graduate Training Committees, and non-degree bearing committees, report directly to the DRGE while the
Dean/CEO is responsible for appointing or replacing the committee directors. Our main goal is to propose practical means for the Dean/CEO to delegate the appropriate authorities such that the DRGE can effectively advocate for, and build academic programs of excellence.
VI. Proposal for Graduate and Undergraduate Education: A System for Assigning Value to Graduate and Undergraduate Teaching

**Summary:** We propose that financial value be assigned to essential didactic teaching of graduate and undergraduate courses. This will allow the administration to distinguish three types of salary: that recovered from external funding, compensation for essential teaching, and unrecovered salary. This plan is similar to one that is already being developed in the medical school referred to as “the funds flow model” for essential teaching. To allow for this accounting and to make information on teaching more accessible, we propose that spreadsheets on all teaching effort be developed and that these spreadsheets be updated and distributed to faculty on a regular basis. We further recommend that the Dean of Graduate affairs hold quarterly meetings with graduate program directors to develop and implement program standards.

**Overview:** Our subcommittee took the responsibility to make recommendations designed to improve graduate and undergraduate education in the division. Two other faculty groups had been formed previously and were working concurrently on related issues. A “Graduate Program Review” group is working on evaluating existing graduate programs and a “Graduate Administrative Review” group is working on administrative organization. Members of both groups were represented in our subcommittee with the hope that we would benefit from work already done and not duplicate effort. The work of these two groups was not completed at the time that this report was sent to the full membership of the “Ad Hoc BSD Faculty Science Committee.” As a consequence of time constraints and the separate on-going efforts, our subcommittee decided to focus its attention on one specific area not being addressed by the other groups: the development of a system that assigns value to teaching.

There is no system in the BSD that attaches specific value to teaching effort at the undergraduate or graduate level. This situation is antithetical to the division’s academic mission. To correct this problem we propose that a value be placed on a full quarter non-laboratory course (previously defined in the Getz 1996 report as “1 fq”) of $15,000 + $1,000 for the course director. We propose that this teaching fee be included as a line item on the budget of the instructor’s primary department. This mechanism is very similar to the recently implemented “Teaching Funds Flow Model” for the Pritzker School. For courses taught by multiple instructors, the proportionate fee will be allotted to each instructor’s primary department. We recommend that this system be initiated for all current courses that are considered to be essential to the Division’s teaching mission. Determination of essential undergraduate courses is to be made by the Master of the Biological Sciences Collegiate division. Determination of essential graduate courses is to be made by the Dean of Graduate Affairs. In order to put this plan in place and to make all teaching effort transparent, we advise generation of spreadsheets for undergraduate and graduate teaching effort for all courses, including courses that are not deemed essential. We recommend that these spreadsheets be generated and that teaching funds flow models be put in place for both undergraduate and graduate teaching before the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year. We further recommend that these spreadsheets be accessible to all members of the faculty.

We are not proposing that teaching fees increase departmental budgets. Divisional allocations for faculty salaries remain unchanged. However, under this plan, it will be possible to divide the source of an individual faculty member’s salary support into three categories: external grant support, fees for essential teaching, and divisional support (for research, scholarship, administration, and “non-essential” teaching). At present only two sources are distinguished: external grant support and divisional support.

**Development of Essential Teaching Lists:** The Dean’s “Aims I” process recommended a “reward” system for teaching. The Dean’s budget office did develop a method to track teaching effort through “Effort Allocation Reports” filed by department chairs. However, while some departments used this information in determining their budgets, this information was not translated into monetary values by
the BSD. In addition, there was no method in place to oversee the accuracy of the information provided. As a consequence, departmental budgets, which might use such teaching information to generate their budgets, appear funded by the BSD without any apparent consideration for the value of that department’s teaching portfolio. Dean Humphrey made progress toward this aim with respect to medical school teaching. Dean Humphrey compiled a list of teaching effort in the medical school for individual faculty. She is in the process of implementing an accounting mechanism that is referred to by Dean Madara’s office as the “teaching funds flow model.” This model assigns a value to individual teaching effort in “essential” courses and creates a line item in the budget to specifically compensate relevant departments for that teaching effort. However, there has been relatively little effort with respect to development of a plan for recognition of undergraduate and graduate teaching. We recommend immediate development and implementation of a plan, similar to that developed by Dr. Humphrey, which would recognize and account for essential undergraduate and graduate teaching. This plan can and should be carried out by existing administrative staff in the offices of the Biological Sciences Collegiate Division (BSCD) and the Office of Graduate Affairs (OGA).

Implementation of a funds flow model for essential undergraduate teaching can take place as soon as a list of teaching effort is compiled by the Master of the BSCD, because a list of essential courses has already been developed. For graduate teaching, a list of essential courses must be developed before a funds flow model can be put in place. We propose that OGA immediately use the recently compiled information on Ph.D. program curricula to compile a list of essential courses to allow for implementation of a teaching funds flow model. The essential course list should be developed by the Dean of Graduate Affairs with the assistance of the Ph.D. program chairs, just as the Master of the College should update and maintain the undergraduate list of essential courses with the advice of the BSCD Governing Council. As is the case for current undergraduate courses, we anticipate that the majority of current graduate courses will be determined to be essential. However, specific standards for determining what constitutes an essential course will need to be further developed by the DGA and the Master with the help of their advisory groups. Particular attention will need to be paid to developing standards for determining if a new (or proposed) course is to be considered essential. We anticipate that assigning specific value to teaching will be associated with an increase in the number of courses offered.

Accounting for Faculty Effort in Essential Teaching:

1. Each essential course should be assigned as the responsibility of a single primary department or, in some cases, shared equally by two or more departments. For example, BIOS20184: Biological Diversity ought to be assigned to the Department of Organismal Biology and Anatomy as that department has staffed the course for many years. Going forward, the chair(s) of the responsible department(s) will be expected to staff the course with qualified faculty. A responsible department must maintain teaching quality as judged by student ratings and by consensus of department faculty. Consistent low student ratings should be considered problematic. The Master and the DGA are empowered and expected to re-assign responsibility for an essential course if they feel such a change would provide the opportunity to improve the course.

2. An Excel spreadsheet should be constructed that accounts for all individual teaching effort for all essential courses. This work should be done by the BSCD Master and DGA and should be completed in the Spring quarter of the preceding year. This work should be completed in time for annual budget preparation. A draft of the list should be circulated to relevant faculty and administrators to check for accuracy prior to submission of the list to the Dean’s office. This spread sheet should include information on the fraction of the course taught by each instructor and on the number of students completing the course.

3. The spreadsheet should be used by the office of the CFO to implement the teaching funds flow model as follows:
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• Essential courses for undergraduate (and graduate) teaching should be worth a “full FQ” (not 0.3 FQ or 0.2 FQ or any other such downgrade that has been suggested previously).
• 1 FQ per full essential course. We recommend the following specifications for an FQ. Full course = 1 full academic quarter = no less than 30 in-class hours (this includes hours spent in didactic lecture, leading Socratic discussion, or engaging in critical evaluation of formal in-class student presentations).
• Activities that do not “count” as formal teaching include: attending lectures given by other lecturers, leading scientific group meetings or other academic meetings that are not approved by the BSCD master or DGA, teaching elective (non-required) courses that have registered enrollments of less than 5 students a year (with a 1 year grace period if enrollments drop to less than 5 students), and leading “reading” courses.
• As a starting point, teaching is to be valued at $100/hr. Each lecture hour is awarded 4 hours prep time per hour of lecture. Thus, a 1 hour lecture is valued at $500. A full 30 hour course = $15,000. The fee for serving as course director = $1000. If there are multiple course directors, the director fee is divided among them as appropriate. Thus, total budget for each non-laboratory essential course is not to exceed $16,000 total. These numbers should be adjusted for cost-of-living increases going forward from the date of implementation of the model. If an instructor prepares and leads laboratory exercises, that effort should be acknowledged at a rate of $500 per laboratory section per week. The Master or DGA will determine if the role of an instructor in the laboratory component of a course justifies this compensation.
• For courses taught by more than one faculty member, the $16,000 is to be divided by the relative proportion of effort. Thus, if two faculty members contribute equally to a course, their respective departments would both receive $7,500 and the course director's department would receive an additional $1,000.
• Funds to compensate for teaching effort are to go to the faculty member’s primary department even in cases where a course is listed under a different department's initials.

4. The BSCD Master and the DGA are to be responsible for providing an updated annual teaching spreadsheet in time for preparation of departmental budgets. This information should also be available to the budget office to confirm faculty participation in essential teaching. Subsequent annual updates should highlight changes in the staffing of essential courses and/or changes in primary departmental affiliation of teachers of those courses.

5. Budgets will include line items for individual faculty teaching effort in undergraduate courses just as planned for medical school courses.

6. Some essential courses are currently taught by faculty in clinical departments who are compensated for their efforts by funds originating from the college. These funds traditionally have been allocated by the BSCD Master to clinical departments to ensure staffing of essential courses when basic science departments have been unable to do so. During implementation of this plan, the current situation will continue for all essential courses as available funds allow.

7. The BSCD and OGA should make teaching spreadsheets available online to all BSD faculty. This will help ensure the accuracy of the list and make differences in teaching effort transparent to all.

8. CFO annual reporting should include a description of the fraction of departmental salary recovered in essential teaching.
9. Cross-listed courses may only be considered as essential at either the graduate or the undergraduate level as determined by agreement of the Master and the DGA.

**Conclusion:** The main thrust of this report attempts to outline a number of specifics regarding how to implement a “teaching fund flow model” for undergraduate and graduate education. We appreciate that some of the specifics outlined may require revision during implementation. We strongly argue that revisions should retain the proposal’s critical principle; teaching has real value and therefore budget allocations should reflect that value. Good teaching can only be done by highly qualified academics who are paid for their unique and rare expertise. BSD faculty members are currently compensated at levels determined by the market place. However, there is no connection between compensation and teaching. This situation creates disincentives to teach essential courses and rewards those who avoid such teaching assignments. Furthermore the current situation limits the central administration’s role in a key aspect of BSD’s mission. Our discussions with Dr. Humphrey lead us to believe that current levels of compensation are adequate to allow implementation of a funds flow model for graduate and undergraduate teaching without allocation of any additional funds. We understand that the total number of courses designated as “essential” will need to be consistent with current salary allocation. Establishing such a financial connection for essential teaching effort represents a first step toward accounting for all “important” formal teaching. To help ensure that unforeseen pitfalls are corrected and that the proposed plan is functioning as intended, we recommend that the plan be reviewed after 3 years in a joint effort organized and led by the DGA and the Master.

It is also important to acknowledge that different members of the faculty should and do play very different roles in formal teaching. These roles vary from lecturing to classes of over 100 students to doing no formal teaching at all. Faculty should be judged on the sum of all their contributions to the BSD’s mission and not on the extent to which they are engaged in formal teaching. Clearly, engagement in clinical, translational, and basic research is as central to the Division’s mission as is training the next generation of scientists. With this in mind, we are proposing to improve the mechanism that acknowledges one particular form of faculty effort, the teaching of courses that are deemed “essential” to the division’s mission.

**Additional Recommendations involving the Office of Graduate Affairs:**

1. **Completion of the Graduate Program Review Committee.** The Graduate Program Review process that began 2 years ago should be brought to completion immediately and the review committee’s report made available to all graduate program chairs. Action should be taken based on the findings of the review process to direct improvements in the overall quality of the graduate program.

2. **Quarterly meetings with the Dean of Graduate affairs and the heads of training grants as well as heads of the Ph.D. granting programs and Committees.** Although the diversity of Ph.D. programs in BSD has many benefits, our organization also results in uneven and inefficient development of policies affecting critical issues that impact the quality of graduate education and fair treatment of students. Currently these issues are addressed by different programs and program clusters independently. These independent efforts result in significant disparities between programs. Thus, as a first step towards improving the development and implementation of division-wide standards for “best practices” in Ph.D. education, we recommend that the DGA hold a meeting with all Ph.D. program chairs on a quarterly basis. Because development of graduate policy needs to be done in the context of our funding, training grant directors should also attend these meetings. The goal of these meetings would not be to promote a “one size fits all” model for graduate programs, but rather to enhance the strengths of programs, to solve problems, and to ensure uniform standards for education and fair treatment.
Addendum to the Education Subcommittee Report: The Biological Sciences Division Faculty Science Review Committee fully endorses the report of its Education subcommittee and adds the following recommendation: The Subcommittee's report focused on graduate and undergraduate education because a funds-flow model was previously established for essential courses in the medical school. Dean Humphrey is planning to develop a similar funds-flow model for essential (in class) teaching of medical residents. The Ad Hoc Science Committee strongly supports the medical school plan and also recommends that other forms of essential in-class clinical teaching, such as faculty, resident, and fellow training, be similarly acknowledged. Some modifications of the model used for medical school teaching may be required for teaching at these advanced levels, but the general principle that essential in-class teaching be compensated should pertain.
VII. Proposal for BSD Core Facilities

Executive Summary: While many core facilities at The University of Chicago are of high quality, others require improvement and there is a significant need for regular evaluation, integration, and long term planning of core services and resources. The Subcommittee therefore recommends that, in order to develop overall core service excellence, a permanent faculty oversight committee be reestablished.

Extended Summary: Overall, core facilities (both within and external to OSRF) at The University of Chicago are of high quality. However, while some cores operate at a high level, others are in need of significant improvement. There is also need for better integration of cores and long term planning of core services and resources. This includes a need to better support core equipment acquisition by rewarding faculty who write shared equipment grants, coordinating purchase of large equipment by departments or private faculty groups regardless of the funding source, regular faculty assessment of current services, and vision with regard to future needs. A variety of specific administrative issues also require solutions, and this will be a continuing issue. The Subcommittee therefore recommends that, in order to develop a level of overall core service excellence that will make The University of Chicago a leader among peer institutions, a permanent faculty oversight committee that supervises all cores (within and external to OSRF) be reestablished.

I. Continuing issues

A. There is a need for faculty oversight of research services including, but not limited to, OSRF cores. While the individual faculty oversight committees for each OSRF core do an excellent job with regard to management of that core, there is no faculty-level integration of resources. This limits integration of core services between individual cores as well as long term planning for and prioritization of new services and technologies.
   1. This committee should include faculty members representing diverse interests.
   2. Representatives from Centers (e.g. Cancer Center) that support the cores should be included as committee members.
   3. Department chairs should not be members of the committee.
   4. The Chair of the committee should be appointed as a member of RAC.
   5. The committee should have oversight roles in three key areas
      a. Administrative, including regular reviews of individual cores and faculty oversight committee activities. This will include determinations of whether some cores are no longer relevant and should be discontinued (an example is real time PCR, which was once done primarily in cores).
      b. Financial, including oversight of fee and billing structure (more on this below) and resource allocation.
      c. Strategic planning, including coordination of ‘big ticket’ purchases (within the BSD/UCMC and with local institutions) and development of new cores.
   6. The committee should be represented on university cores in which the BSD has interests (particularly those shared with PSD).
B. The current structure of the OSRF cannot support long term excellence without continued financial support beyond the current OSRF budget.
   1. There must be a plan for replacement and upgrading of equipment. This can include:
      a. \textit{Shared instrumentation grants}. These should be reviewed by the committee in the planning stage to assure coordination of different applications within and external to the BSD/UCMC. Included in this coordination will be a designated person from ORSF to assist in grant preparation (not necessarily a new FTE). Built-in incentives should be established to reward faculty who participate in the SIG planning and implementation, increasing the number (and quality) of such applications. The use of SIG funding should become a larger part of core equipment acquisition programs, however must be balanced with funding directed to long-term maintenance of equipment, such as service contracts, repair funds, etc... There should be a fund established, either through core fees or divisional support (see below) to accommodate this critical aspect of equipment maintenance.
      b. \textit{Divisional support}. Whatever the level of divisional support, it should be budgeted as a multi-year commitment to allow strategic planning. This will allow planning as well as support for new cores as well as special cores that require subsidies. This funding could come from a variety of sources, such as a fixed percent of gifts to support infrastructure (e.g. new buildings). This makes some sense as new buildings will trigger increased needs for core services. Alternatively, a fixed percent of the previous year’s extramurally-funded core use could be credited back to the cores. This would reflect some fraction of the indirect costs associated with core use.

C. OSRF needs regular and long-term commitments regarding space. In the past, cores have had space taken to make room for new recruits. While recruitment adds to the overall community, it should not do so at the expense of services on which we all depend. In addition, as the physical plant of the BSD/UCMC grows and spreads among new and old buildings, it must be recognized that many cores will need to establish satellite facilities in order to effectively serve all faculty.

II. Issues that may require new administrative mechanisms
   A. \textit{Financial policy}. Because unspent funds cannot be carried from year to year, there is no means by which individual OSRF cores can save to plan for equipment replacement and/or enhance services.
      1. \textit{Integration of core resources external to OSRF}. There are valid reasons for some cores to exist outside of OSRF as well as for some faculty to have “privately-owned” high-end equipment. These may include a few independent cores (e.g. some within radiology using equipment that is shared with clinical efforts) as well as some cases of individual faculty members who require the entire capacity of a single instrument. However, two primary OSRF policies have resulted in some high-end equipment being developed as cores outside of OSRF. This decentralizes strategic planning and may impair the availability of instruments to the general faculty. In addition, no matter what the source of the funds used to
purchase such equipment, their presence impairs the ability of OSRF to acquire similar resources by shared instrumentation grants and thereby has the potential to negatively impact the overall research environment.

a. Some faculty see the inability to acquire recharge fees to compensate for equipment depreciation as an absolute barrier to incorporation within OSRF. There must be a mechanism for equipment replacement through recharge fees (without setting rates so high that equipment is not used). While profits are prohibited within NIH-supported cores, there should be a process for depreciation of equipment that allows accumulation of funds for replacement.

b. Faculty are reticent to “donate” equipment to OSRF cores without compensation. While NIH policy prevents preferential access or differing use rates for NIH-funded projects, there should be mechanisms whereby faculty who donate equipment (e.g. that purchased with startup funds) to have an account established that can be spent against use of that equipment. This should probably not be $1 for each $1 of equipment cost (as OSRF will maintain the equipment), and specific arrangements will need to be established. Such a system is likely to reduce redundant purchases and increase the overall resources available to faculty with high volume, regular, and limited use needs.

c. Billing has been delayed and inaccurate in the past. This appears to have improved somewhat, but is still in need of work.

2. **Service contracts.** Has self-insurance throughout OSRF been considered as an alternative to individual service contracts? This is akin to self-insurance for malpractice, which UCMC does.

3. **Fee structure.** Ideally, fees are set to maximize science rather than ensure that every core is revenue neutral. Some cores may run at a deficit (perhaps those with relatively high personnel costs). This would require faculty prioritization and accounting mechanisms that allow this to occur. The latter might include allowing some cores to run profitably (perhaps those that are user-driven but have been given large amounts of equipment) and consideration of the entire OSRF as a single large core facility (for budgetary purposes). Ongoing divisional support of some cores may be necessary to assure the continuing existence of cores deemed critical to the overall research and education mission within the BSD/UCMC.

a. This requires recognition of different types of cores. Some simply provide service (e.g. DNA sequencing), while others require users to be intimately involved (e.g. microscopy, biophysics, NMR). The latter provide both research and educational support and this should be factored into decisions regarding such cores.

b. Conflict of interest policies (e.g. exclusion of those who use specific cores from discussions of those cores) will be essential to the effectiveness and fairness of these recommendations.

### III. Other research and education support services

A. The proposed committee should evaluate and make recommendations regarding services needed that are either:

1. not effectively provided by existing cores
2. require development of new cores

B. There should be a concerted effort to bring most non-OSRF cores into OSRF. This should include discussion of new big ticket purchases (should they be included within cores or privately managed).

C. Services required for successful research, but not specifically research tools, should be considered.
   1. Computer support is one of our weakest services. Considering that almost all research activities, from data collection and analysis to grant and manuscript submission depend on computers, this is a serious deficiency that is in dire need of improvement.
      a. At least one direct contact, reachable by faculty, should be appointed to each department or institute. This contact should have means to accelerate service requests and call for additional support when appropriate. Importantly, Service Desk calls should be routed to this individual within minutes to avoid delays that impact productivity.
      b. Separation of network support from desktop support may be helpful; many support engineers seem unfamiliar with details of desktop support and separation would allow employment of those with desktop-specific expertise.
      c. The integration of medical center and BSD technical support has had benefits, but many faculty noted that this has often resulted in research support being given low priority. One example is the accelerated telephone support for physician users of epic.
      d. CBIS policy that denies support to computers attached to equipment and computers older than 3 years must be amended. This is a particularly serious problem for individual investigators who do not need and cannot afford to replace their computers every three years.
      e. In general, desktop support is in serious need of improvement. This need not require a financial investment as many models could be considered, including a simple preferred vendor arrangement with an external desktop support company.
   2. Increased assistance with preparation of competitive grants and manuscripts would enhance the overall research and education missions. This could include a variety of new services at little or no financial cost that would yield significant benefits to faculty and the BSD.
      a. Seminars from external grant writing consultants should be supported to complement guidance already provided by individuals within the university.
      b. Formal groups to review certain types of awards (e.g. career development awards, applications by new assistant professors, etc.) to provide guidance and increase overall success rates.
      c. The university-wide Arete initiative (arete.uchicago.edu) that assists investigators with project development should be better publicized; many faculty are unaware of their services.
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