



FACULTY OF MEDICINE, **FACULTY COUNCIL**
Minutes
April 6, 2016

Minutes of the first Steering Committee meeting of the Faculty Council held on April 6, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. in the Holmes Hall meeting room (Room 100, 3605 Mountain)

PRESENT

Brown, Karen
Filion, Françoise
Kafantaris, Demetra

Colby, Diana
Gilbert, Lucy
Kornisch, Myriam

Eidelman, David (Chair)
Hamad, Doulia
Robaire, Bernard

REGRETS: Melanson, Philippe

1. Review and Approval of the Steering Committee draft Terms of Reference, Dean Eidelman

The Dean began by welcoming everyone to the first Steering Committee meeting of the Faculty Council and thanked all in attendance for their involvement and participation. He then went on to ask that all present introduce themselves:

Ms. Françoise Filion- Ingram School of Nursing;

Dr. Bernard Robaire- member of the Departments of Pharmacology & Therapeutics and Obstetrics & Gynecology;

Dr. Karen Brown- Paediatric Anesthesiologist at the Montreal Children's Hospital;

Dr. Lucy Gilbert- Oncologist, representing Obstetrics & Gynecology;

Dr. Myriam Kornisch- postdoctoral fellow at the MNI;

Doulia Hamad- 2nd year medical student, President of the MSS and incoming student representative from CACMS for AFMC;

Diana Colby-Director of Communications for the Faculty of Medicine;

Demetra Kafantaris-Senior Advisor to the Dean and Vice-Principal (Health Affairs);

David Eidelman-Dean and Vice-Principal (Health Affairs), Chair of the Steering Committee.

Dean Eidelman began with a brief description of his Deanery executive team (Vice Deans) responsible for horizontal, transverse topics: Dr. Mara Ludwig as the Vice-Dean, Academic Affairs, ensures all policies are met when hiring, Dr. Samuel Benaroya, Associate Vice-Principal and Vice-Dean (Health Affairs), deals with hospital affairs and Dr. Philippe Gros, Vice-Dean, Life Sciences acts as the strategy lead on research. The Deanery structure includes a layer of Associate Deans

responsible for specific “vertical” operations (e.g. Dr. Shari Baum deals with research operations, running the Research Office; Dr. Anita Gagnon leads the Ingram School of Nursing).

Draft Terms of Reference (ToR)

Steering Committee members were invited to comment on the draft ToR presented.

Dr. Bernard Robaire indicated that with regards to the Faculty Council agenda, we do not want to set it up in such a way as to discourage people from expressing their opinions. All members agreed.

The Dean asked the group to think about suggestions for the Faculty Council and its needs. For instance, he believes it would be useful to have a Nominating Committee, to facilitate and keep track of committee membership across the faculty.

Dr. Karen Brown inquired about formal structure, whether such a committee would be ad-hoc or a Standing Committee, the latter of which she was in favour of. The Dean indicated that the Faculty Council would need to agree in order to name it as a Standing Committee.

The Dean further indicated that a Nominating Committee is a standard one. Another one would be a Policy Committee, to review major policies (e.g. Admissions, Student Code of Conduct). Such a committee should ensure a proper process and review of policies.

Dr. Robaire suggested that we should first perhaps begin by creating an ad-hoc group to review a policy infrastructure for the Faculty, which the Dean strongly agreed with.

Doulia Hamad spoke to the point about a 3-year term membership on the Steering Committee, stating that with student turnover, this should be adjusted. Dr. Robaire suggested a 3-year term for academics with staggered, 1/3 rotation for each academic member and a 1-year renewable term for students; this was well-received by the group.

The Steering Committee noted the need for a graduate student representative (PGSS) to complement the current membership which includes a postdoctoral student.

ACTION: A graduate student rep from the FC will be asked to join the Steering Committee.

Dr. Robaire asked for more clarity regarding tenure track and clinician representatives, and mentioned the need to stipulate “2 clinicians” instead of “1-2 clinicians,” as currently stated in the Terms of Reference. All agreed.

The Dean mentioned a link between this committee and the Faculty Council and asked who would be the Secretary. He indicated that at present, Demetra Kafantaris and the Dean’s Office are heading this effort, however concluded that in order to do this right, we will need to look into having a single person dedicated to doing this activity in the future.

Ms. Françoise Filion asked if we could make changes and whether there is a possibility for the Steering Committee to decide to add new items to the Faculty Council. The Dean responded that the Faculty Council is in a provisional state for two years, for the very purpose of adjusting things to better meet our needs which will be clearer over time.

Dr. Robaire suggested that any documents sent to the Steering Committee be dated at the end of the document with a note to the effect of “last updated on (insert date).” All were in agreement.

Frequency of meetings:

It was mentioned that members of academic staff, who may have felt “voiceless” until now, finally have some way through the Faculty Council of representing their individual departments and are wondering how to make it more of a reality. Dr. Brown suggested that we should create another (perhaps ad-hoc) committee whereby we really get to the crux of concerns or issues. The Dean replied that students have their own governance group, as does Nursing, while others such as Basic Sciences and Clinical Sciences, do not. Dr. Brown expressed the need for a forum to allow such a consultation process, perhaps an ad-hoc committee, to explore and suggest processes that would give a clear clinical or basic science voice.

Dr. Robaire spoke to the frequency at which Chairs meet with their departments, concluding that it is at most 1-2 times per year. The Dean indicated that an ad-hoc committee might be useful to look at the mechanisms necessary to ensure proper consultation and communication.

Diana Colby mentioned the possibility of creating a clinical caucus within the Faculty Council. Dr. Lucy Gilbert further spoke to the important role of two representatives from each department, but agrees with Dr. Brown with regards to the clinical process. Ms. Fillion mentioned the Nursing Faculty Council meetings were essential, holding important discussions and votes. For clinicians, each department is quite different. The Dean indicated that he is invited to the Department of Pediatrics Town Hall meetings each spring to answer questions. This is a great forum and his attendance is much appreciated. Such forums are very useful.

Dr. Robaire suggested that guidelines be adopted for Chairs in terms of running their departments (including communication obligations/expectations). Dr. Robaire further promoted the idea that when a new Chair comes in, they be given such guidelines for best practices and for how to manage.

The Dean pointed out that some departments are broader in scope than others, and each requires, to a certain extent, specific mechanisms of operation.

Dr. Brown spoke to the guideline for a Chair to meet with their staff at least once per term. The Dean reconsidered the notion of creating an ad-hoc committee to assess this need and offered up for discussion whether one or two committees would be needed. It was deemed that Clinical and Basic Science departments would each require specific attention, so consensus was for two committees, including an overarching Task Force to consult on how this would work overall. The Dean suggested that the creation of a Task Force on communication and consultation for Clinical departments and Basic Science departments would be a good first step. He further asked for volunteers to sit on that Task Force committee, noting that some representation from Basic Sciences and Clinical may be considered under both umbrellas. Karen Brown and Bernard Robaire agreed to act as Co-chairs of the Task Force.

ACTION: Propose Task Force suggestion to the Faculty Council.
--

2. Review of the Minutes from the Faculty Council meeting of February 16, 2016

Dr. Robaire complimented the accuracy and detail of the minutes which are very helpful for Faculty Council members who then relate the specific issues discussed to their constituency. He raised the topic of listing non-member attendance, noting that if the Faculty Council is open to the public, perhaps this category does not need to be included in the minutes. While the value of knowing which non-voting members attended was not clear, he felt that inclusion of names on the broadly distributed and publicly posted minutes would have a negative effect on their future attendance as they may perhaps not wish nor be able to attend every meeting. Dr. Gilbert conversely stated that non-voting members should still sign-in as guests. It was decided that non-voting members would still be asked to sign-in but their names would NOT be included in the Minutes. This list would serve as a way to keep track of overall attendance for our own internal records.

3. Next Faculty Council meeting agenda: topics and process for building agenda

Dr. Robaire asked whether we wanted to invite anyone from the Faculty Council to suggest topics for the next meeting. The Dean stated that the Steering Committee should suggest the topics for the next one (June 1st), and topics from the broader Faculty Council membership will be sought for all subsequent meetings.

Dr. Brown spoke to the process for building an agenda and how we need to ensure the inclusion of interesting topics and not focus solely on procedural issues, to hold the audience's interest. The Dean noted that Clinical, Basic Science and Education are interesting topics raised at each meeting and this approach would allow each participant to feel that at least one topic is of relevance to them.

Dr. Robaire mentioned that Associate Deans' reports discussed at former Faculty meetings did not hold audience attention. Demetra Kafantaris agreed that the Faculty Council meetings needed to be an interactive forum. To this end, the Dean suggested the following topic for the next meeting: CIHR, junior faculty members and career building. This could include a discussion about modifying clinical models to take advantage of new clinical reforms.

The Dean further mentioned the topic of the RVH re-use proposal. During an informal conversation with Principal Fortier, the Dean learned that the Faculty of Medicine's proposal was deemed too practical and not very exciting (particularly to potential third party public and private investors/partners). The Dean indicated that regardless of whether our proposal is selected or not for the RVH, this articulated vision is one we will strive for, hence a pertinent topic for further discussion.

Dr. Robaire mentioned the CFREF project, stating that no one knew the final outcome. The Dean indicated that the Vice-Principal, Research heads this initiative, with Anne McKinney as the Faculty of Medicine lead. The Dean indicated that he would follow-up.

ACTION: the Dean will follow-up with VPRIR to suggest communication of the CFREF project.
--

Dr. Brown then mentioned the MUHC CIM Centre as a possible topic, a Center she thinks should be presented to Faculty Council in order to provide a venue to describe how to best use it. Dr. Papadopoulos would need to be invited to that meeting for proper discussion.

Dr. Myriam Kornisch indicated that post-doctorals from various departments speak about funding, something everyone struggles with. The Dean mentioned a Researchers meeting with the Principal that proved useful for discussion, hence another important topic for the next FC meeting.

Doulia Hamad commented that within UGME, communications is a hot topic, mentioning that students are not efficiently kept apprised of all the changes taking place. Diana Colby met with students and is developing a communications strategy.

The prospect of how to do this within the Faculty Council was then raised. Doulia replied with a “best practices for student communication” across the Faculty of Medicine as a possible solution. Diana further mentioned an initiative currently in progress in UGME, with the establishment of a focus group; others could be invited to join this effort.

The Dean stated that we need to properly frame this discussion. Dr. Robaire suggested that every couple of months, a short update be sent with news on what is happening in the Faculty, as things occur, such as putting Accreditation updates on the website. Diana confirmed this is already being done. Dr. Robaire was unaware and mentioned this should be made more evident on the homepage of the faculty website. Diana said that with the website, she did not think students went to the main page often, unless directly affected through Accreditation. It was then mentioned that Facebook is much more useful a venue for student updates. Ms. Filion indicated that with Nursing Accreditation, she was concerned that social media, issues might be raised too publicly and inappropriately. Dr. Brown suggested both topics be combined in the broader topic of Communication. The fundamental question remains however, how do we inform? We need more data on the real problems as well as what are the common issues across the Faculty? The Dean then opened the floor for suggestions.

- Diana suggested mechanisms (survey) and content. Dr. Brown suggested the creation of an ad-hoc committee regarding Communications. Ms. Filion raised the issue that with social media in the 21st Century, Facebook accounts remain popular and social events are organized this way. Doulia further added that platforms like MyCourses are not streamlined enough, so students resort to Facebook for clarification, also raising an MSS concern on how to streamline information.
- Dr. Kornisch mentioned that she looks up information on McGill’s website. It helped that the postdoctoral homepage includes useful information but it covers all the different departments, hence difficult to learn specifics. With communication between her department and Family Medicine for instance, she mentioned not knowing who to approach for information. Diana mentioned that such communications could perhaps be administered as part of orientation, including operational communications. It was suggested that it would be helpful to find this type of information on the Faculty of Medicine homepage.

Doulia mentioned that perhaps the Faculty Council could get each department to perform an internal review. The Dean agreed to add this topic to the next Faculty Council meeting’s agenda, stating that recommendations for what has already been done should be provided to members, in addition to identifying any gaps in order to build a coalition to address this.

Ms. Filion noted that communications is huge in scope, and suggested to break it down within each school/unit. Diana confirmed the need to properly scale such an initiative.

Dr. Brown mentioned that she appreciated the moment of silence that was observed during the first Faculty Council meeting for departed faculty members. After some discussion on how much information to include, it was decided that listing their names would be sufficient. Demetra Kafantaris will ensure condolences are extended to their families on behalf of the Faculty Council.

Recapitulation of the discussion and actions:

- Some adjustments to be made to the Terms of Reference;
- We need to request a graduate student rep for the Steering Committee.
- Two main topics were confirmed for the next FC meeting: 1) CIHR reform to include the report from the meeting that took place with Principal Fortier on March 31st and 2) the RVH project presented as: “Toward a Future Health Science Campus”.
- We will propose the creation of a Nominating Committee to be entitled the “Committee on Committees,” to keep track of all committees was put forth;
- We will propose the creation of two ad-hoc task forces: 1) to assess policy infrastructures and 2) to address communication issues;
- Diana to develop a mechanism via survey to yield responses regarding communication issues, to then be presented to Faculty Council;
- It was decided that the CIM Centre would be discussed at a future meeting (not June 1st) due to the need to invite Dr. Papadopoulos to attend and offer his expertise on the subject;
- Questions/topics from Faculty Council members will be sought for September’s meeting;
- The Dean will follow-up with VPRIR regarding CFREF communication