



HMS/HSDM Faculty Council

Faculty Council Minutes
November 13, 2024

Present: Aguayo-Mazzucato, Agudo, Astley, Bauer, Becker, Biddinger, Chen, Cluett, D'Amore, Daley, Drachman, Fregni, Gehrke, Goodman, Greenberg, Harris, Hedt-Gauthier, Henske, Huang, Ingelfinger, Jena, Kaban, Meyerson, Morton, Murray, A. Nazarian, R. Nazarian, Parangi, Shih, Shin, Song, Stern, Struhl, Treister, Tsai, Wagers

Guests: Drs. Chang; Mss. Bittinger, DeCoste, Lewis

Staff: Mss. Hecht, Ryan, Spearman

This Faculty Council meeting was held virtually, via Zoom.

Faculty Council (FC) Chair, Dr. Lisa Henske called the meeting to order at approximately 4:02pm. She mentioned how wonderful it was meeting with the FC at the welcome dinner in October. Dr. Henske explained that there will be multiple other opportunities for the FC to meet in person this year at two of the joint meetings with the Faculty of Medicine (FoM). This will include the December meeting, which will be held in person in the Joseph B. Martin Amphitheater on December 11th, 2024, from 4:00 – 6:00 PM. She added that at this meeting the FC will hear from Harvard University Provost, John Manning, and recognize newly appointed professors and recipients of the McNeil Faculty award. The FC will also celebrate the Program Award for Culture of Excellence in Mentoring (PACEM) recipients and will have the opportunity to network at a reception following the meeting. Dr. Henske added that each year the Harvard University Provost meets with the FC and discusses various topics and questions which he receives in advance. She urged the FC to send any specific questions for the Provost to Ms. Lorien Hecht. The Dean's Office will compile the list of questions and send them to the Provost's Office in advance of the meeting. She added that, if time allows, Provost Manning will also hold a brief Q&A session at the meeting.

In advance of receiving approval for the minutes, Dr. Henske noted the FC attendance policy. All members are expected to attend a majority of the meetings. Attendance is tracked by pulling data from the Zoom meetings or collecting name tags at in-person meetings. Dr. Henske explained that it is important for the FC members to check the attendees listed in the minutes to make sure they were marked down. This is especially important for those who may call into Zoom without a name associated with their phone number.

Dr. Henske then asked for and received acceptance of the minutes from the June 12th, 2024 meeting and the October 10th, 2024 meeting, as presented.

Then, Dr. Henske reviewed the agenda of the meeting. She explained that the FC will be asked to vote to approve the changes to the FoM by-laws. She added that the Dean for Faculty Affairs, Dr. Grace Huang, will go through the various edits that were sent in advance and there will be time for the FC to ask questions, before they vote. Following Dean Huang's presentation, the FC will receive their first HMS Standing Committee report. Many aspects of the FC's work, and many of the meetings, are prescribed by the FC by-laws and to comply with the accreditation body for the Medical School, the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME). Moreover, there are meetings and discussions the FC must have, and their role is very important in the governance of the school.

The role of the FC during reports is to understand the content of the presentation and ask clarifying questions. The engagement of the FC ensures that the policies are sound and considerate of the multiple dimensions and perspectives that comprise the council. Dr. Henske added that the FC will also hear from the Dean of Medical Education, Bernard Chang, who will give updates on the Education Policy and Curriculum Committee (EPCC). After that, the FC will transition to a fireside chat with Bernard. Topics for the fireside chat were collected by Ms. Hecht, following the June FC meeting.

Next, Dr. Henske introduced Dean Huang to review the proposed changes to the by-laws. She began her presentation by sharing the background on the by-laws, followed by minor changes, clarification changes, and substantive changes. The by-laws define the governance of our school and the role of our faculty in participating in discussions that then may lead to changes in policy. Dean Huang explained that the by-laws are refreshed every couple of years and that changes must be voted on by the FC as elected representatives of the FoM. She added that this is especially important as we are looking into LCME accreditation in a few years. Dean Huang explained that her slides were a combination of the by-laws and what was actually changed. Dean Huang explained that the by-laws are a set of rules that govern an institution's internal operations and management that are represented by Section 2 of the FoM Handbook.

Next, Dean Huang walked the FC through the changes to the by-laws. She quickly touched on minor updates, including changes around the composition of the FoM, specifically the consolidation of information that was previously in Section 1. There was not a substantive change here; the information from Section 1 was simply moved to Section 2. Then she touched on Program in Medical Education (PME) changes, where they simply updated the language of the by-laws to reflect the structure of the PME. Finally, Dean Huang noted a minor change in the by-laws regarding the Office for Graduate Education, namely updating the language to reflect the current list of masters and PhD programs. She explained that the goal here was simply to make the content factually accurate. Dean Huang paused for questions.

Then, Dean Huang delved into clarification changes explaining that these by-law updates are not changing a practice or policy, but making sure we have by-laws that reflect the evolution of the FoM. Dean Huang introduced Dr. Anne Becker, Dean for Clinical and Academic Affairs, to comment on nomenclature of the by-laws, which overrides the rationale for some of the edits.

Dean Becker began by giving some background, explaining that there has been interest expressed by a number of clinical faculty and leadership in establishing new clinical academic departments at HMS. She explained that they are currently in the process of reviewing HMS best practices, since this has only been done 3 or 4 times in the last 3 decades. She stated that they wanted to be sure that the best practices were up to date. As a working group at HMS, they are revising the criteria and processes and they would like to give more details to the FC when there is space on the agenda.

Dean Becker explained that people have been using various terms to convey the same idea, leading to inconsistencies. Their group is working on standardizing the nomenclature across departments at HMS. Dean Becker presented the two revised terms: "HMS Clinical Academic Department" and "Affiliate-based Academic Department." "HMS Clinical Academic Department" is the appointing department that represents all of the affiliate-based appointing departments in that field. "Affiliate-

based academic department” represents those who are on the clinical faculty and based at the hospitals or the “home base” department. Dean Becker confirmed that these two terms have been introduced into the by-laws text which will mitigate inconsistencies.

Next, Dean Huang addressed the clarification of the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine’s role. She mentioned the addition of the Professor of Clinical X to the list of other appointments that are advisory to Dean Daley and that are submitted to the University for final approval. Another change is an update to the language regarding the involvement of the Dean in the Department Chair selection process. The final change is the requirement that decanal roles appointed by the Dean must adhere to best search practices.

Then, Dean Huang explained the substantive changes to the by-laws. She touched on Senior Administrative Leadership, which are strategic, school-wide roles recognized by LCME. HMS has defined these roles as chairs, chiefs, decanal roles, and Dean’s Leadership Council. Dean Huang emphasized that Senior Administrative Leaders need to be chosen through best search practices, supporting the school’s mission of inclusive excellence. This is reflected in the by-laws under the section on Senior Administrative Leadership. Dean Huang explained that this change aims to prevent deans from being appointed solely at the discretion of a single individual. The final change to the by-laws related to executive committee chairs. Dean Huang explained that the process of adding at-large members to executive committees is now included in the by-laws.

In advance of the vote to approve the by-laws, Dean Daley commented on the changes that Dean Huang and Dean Becker discussed. He wanted to speak specifically to the changes regarding the Dean’s involvement in selecting the leaders of the HMS departments. Dean Daley explained that this was outlined in the previous version of the FoM handbook; however, the new language solidifies it to a greater extent. He gave an example. The integration of the Massachusetts General Hospital and the Brigham and Women's Hospital (BWH) involved the merging of departments into single departments. This decision was made without any involvement of HMS, and it led to uncertainty about leadership and mentorship of academic departments. Dean Daley explained that he has been active in conversations with Mass General Brigham (MGB) leadership and this reinforcement of the importance of the HMS involvement in the selection of academic leaders at the affiliates is something that HMS wants to assert. Historically, HMS has deferred to the affiliate leadership on the organization of their communities. Dean Daley also emphasized that, given the shared mission of HMS and its affiliates, HMS should play a role in major, higher-level decision-making processes. He also mentioned that he will be updating the FC periodically on affiliate relations. A discussion ensued regarding the issue of equity surrounding chair jobs and individuals who are underrepresented in medicine.

Next, Dr. Henske asked for and received acceptance of the proposed changes to the HMS by-laws. 27 individuals voted in favor of approving the changes to the HMS by-laws, 0 opposed, and 4 abstained. In advance of Dean Chang’s presentation, Dr. Henske gave some background on the EPCC. Reporting to the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and chaired by the Dean for Medical Education, Bernard Chang, the HMS EPCC is a faculty standing committee and representational deliberative body that has collective responsibility for the oversight and conduct of the four-year MD curriculum and educational policies for the MD program at HMS. Dr. Henske went on to explain that the EPCC and its subcommittees include student representation. She stated the Committee Charge: “The

Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee (EPCC) has responsibility for the oversight and conduct of the four-year MD curriculum (including both pre-clerkship curricula – Pathways and HST) and educational policies for the MD program at HMS.” Dr. Henske also stated the committee selection: “Prospective candidates are solicited via self-nomination, recommendations from current committee members, department and/or executive committee chairs across institutions, academic deans, program leaders, committee outreach to partners and stakeholders, and/or committee administrative search.” She added that faculty member nominees are vetted by the EPCC and names are submitted to the Faculty Council Docket Committee for formal vote. Dr. Henske then introduced Bernard Chang and encouraged the FC to engage with him via the raised hand feature or in the chat.

Dean Chang addressed the FC and introduced himself. He explained that this is a timely report because he has updates from an LCME meeting that he had last week. Dean Chang first addressed these questions: what is this committee and why does it exist? Dean Chang reiterated the charge. Its creation was approved by the FC about 7-and-a-half-years ago in May of 2017. This is the highest-level governance committee of the MD program. Next, Dean Chang shared the 6 curriculum working subcommittees, including: the Pathways Pre-clerkship Subcommittee, the HST MD Curriculum Subcommittee, the PCE (Principal Clinical Experience) Subcommittee, the Post-PCE Subcommittee, the Assessment Subcommittee, and the Anti-Racism Subcommittee. There are also four other committees that the FC will hear about (the academic advising and performance committees), which include the Council of Academic Societies (CAS) and the Promotion and Review Board (PRB). Dean Chang also explained that there are two other standing committees of the faculty that are related to medical student education: the Committee on Admissions and the Learning Environment Steering Committee (LEC).

Next, Bernard explained why we have the EPCC and how it aligns with what we need to do to be an accredited medical school. He touched on each of the three LCME elements for curricular governance and educational policy oversight.

- First, the (1.3) Mechanisms for Faculty Participation, which states: A medical school ensures that there are effective mechanisms in place for direct faculty participation in decision making related to the medical education program, including opportunities for faculty participation in discussion about, and the establishment of, policies and procedures for the program, as appropriate. Dean Chang explained that the interpretation of these LCME elements and their application to the medical school curriculum ultimately rest with the broader faculty. He clarified that a representational faculty body must make decisions regarding the HMS curriculum, not just one individual.
- Second, the Responsibility for Medical School Policies, which states: At a medical school, the dean and a committee of relevant medical school administrators and faculty representatives determine the governance and policymaking processes within their purview.
- Lastly, the Curricular Management, which states: A medical school has in place a faculty committee that has responsibility for the overall design, management, integration, evaluation, and enhancement of a coherent and coordinated medical curriculum.

Then Dean Chang explained the EPCC consists of 22 members. He listed the EPCC voting membership, including the Dean for Medical Education, who chairs the Committee, five teaching faculty representatives, five student representatives, a Faculty Council representative, the Dean for Students and Chair of the Council of Academic Societies, Chairs of the working

subcommittees reporting to the EPCC, a Society Advisory Dean representative, HMS Director of HST, and the PCE Director representative. Dean Chang explained that for the past 6-7 years, even though the wording of the LCME element hasn't changed, there has been a move by the accrediting agency toward insuring more strongly that when the curriculum is in the hands of the faculty, it should be in the hands of the faculty. The current structure of the EPCC is no longer considered acceptable. Simply put, there's too many faculty members who are chairs, directors and advisory deans and too few faculty members who are truly representative of the faculty "at large."

Dean Chang reviewed work the EPCC did last year. He explained that we don't always spend enough time in the medical field reviewing outcomes and he would like to change that. The EPCC focused on student educational outcomes including: the annual course and clerkship reviews, the USMLE results, the match results and the Resident Readiness Survey. Dean Chang explained that he wants to make a change in mindset and he is focusing on quantitative outcomes to gauge how students are doing. He also touched on students' satisfaction, including the AAMC Year 2 Questionnaire, the graduation questionnaire, and the annual course and clerkship reviews. Dean Chang also addressed the handling of student mistreatment cases and outlined a new process involving a rapid response team. He highlighted the concerted efforts made to improve in this area. The team ensures that student reports are received and followed by a detailed action report, which is shared with the student to explain the steps taken to address their concerns. He also touched on additional curricular programs and offices, including scholarly engagement and MD-MBA and MD-PhD programs. Dean Chang highlighted several teaching faculty-related areas that the EPCC prioritized last year, including the Teaching Faculty Experience Task Force and the AI for medical educators. In conclusion, Dean Chang provided an extensive overview of the EPCC's work this year, highlighting a wide range of initiatives related to curricular review and policy development. These included societal and longitudinal curricular themes, adjustments to the stopping point in the Pathways pre-clerkship curriculum, the introduction of new BRIDGES courses, ongoing efforts in continuous quality improvement, the 4-year curriculum review, refinement of competencies and program objectives, a revised phase review schedule, updates to the oral and maxillofacial surgery calendar and curriculum, innovations in the HST curriculum, a pilot program in longitudinal primary care education, and the development of a qualified multilingual assessment policy for students. In conclusion, Dean Chang offered his email for feedback, questions and advice.

Dr. Henske thanked Dean Chang and opened the floor for questions. Dr. Pat D'Amore asked a question regarding where in the curriculum professionalism is addressed. She wondered if professionalism is reinforced throughout. Dean Chang explained that professionalism is one of the 6 core competencies of the curriculum. It is also repeatedly addressed throughout the curriculum. Dr. D'Amore touched on the idea that some faculty could also use a refresher on professionalism. A discussion ensued.

Following the discussion, Dr. Henske transitioned into the fireside chat. She requested that Dean Chang address the two main categories of concepts that the FC had brainstormed for prioritization during the June meeting. One concept was the teaching of our medical students. and the second concept was AI in medicine. Dr. Henske asked Dean Chang to address these two concepts, specifically to speak to the abilities of the faculty to be generous teachers. Dr. Henske also asked Dean Chang to address whether everyone should teach and, if so, how that could be measured. Dean

Chang addressed the FC and mentioned that it is not to anyone's surprise that they have not solved all of these questions, however, they have thought about them. He explained that he convened a Teaching Faculty Experience Taskforce which spoke about how we alleviate the clinical burden, to make space for faculty to teach. It has 16 members from across the HMS ecosystem. They were charged with clarifying key problems that the FC rose and to explore what other peer institutions are facing. This group drafted up some proposals and recommendations for Dean Daley. Importantly, the task force divided itself up into 5 subgroups including: professional development, community of practice, recognition and respect, promotion and academic advancement, and one subgroup on support and compensation. There are very good recommendations coming from each of the subgroups and he gave some examples. One example he mentioned is reinvigorating the HMS academy which was founded around 2001.

Dr. Henske thanked Dean Chang and opened the floor for questions. Dr. Henske asked for updates on practices that may have come out of our March 13th, 2024 FC meeting. Dr. Matthew Meyerson posed two questions for HMS to consider: What is it about the Harvard affiliation that strengthens the research and the reputation? How can HMS reward the affiliates without money, using incentives and encouragements? Dr. Dough Drachman touched on the role of education, specifically the dedication and commitment, but also the opportunity cost. He explained that the time spent teaching takes away from what else faculty could be doing to create revenue. He added that dedication to teaching does not seem to be reflected in promotion. Dean Chang noted that these sentiments are stronger than they had been before. He asked Dean Huang to give advice on how to make the strongest case for themselves. Dean Huang explained that teaching is taken into account during the promotion process and she asked Dr. Jennifer Shin, Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs at HMS, to speak to this as well as its effects on assistants and associate professors.

Dr. Henske used the remainder of the meeting to address the use of AI in medical education. Dean Chang broke down his thinking about AI in medical education into three buckets:

- The first, and most robust, bucket is AI as an educational tool.
- The second bucket, which is unique to medical education, is the way AI is transforming the delivery of medical healthcare. He explained that AI must be added into the curriculum, because it will be used in residency.
- The third bucket is for a subset of students who will focus their scholarly project on AI.

A discussion ensued regarding the use of AI in medical education. Dr. Ted Stern asked about promotion and peer observation/feedback from master educators. Dean Chang responded to this question by touching on a personal experience where he received unbelievable feedback. Dean Daley chimed in and mentioned how timely this conversation is, explaining that the Teaching Faculty Experience Taskforce is a huge priority of Dean Chang's and that it will change our promotion process. The final question came from Dr. Christina Astley, who asked how Dean Daley and Dean Chang are going to support the faculty as they interact and assess students who are AI enabled. She wanted to know how bringing AI into the classroom will challenge or impact the faculty. Dean Chang explained that his question speaks not only to AI, but also to faculty development in general. He added that there will always be a generational gap between the teachers and the learners and that this is why we need to focus on the development of our faculty.

Dr. Henske thanked the Council and the speakers for their thoughtfulness and dedication. She reminded the Council that the December 11th, 2024 FC meeting will be held jointly with the Faculty of Medicine, in person. Dr. Henske adjourned the meeting at 5:27 pm.