



HMS/HSDM Faculty Council

Faculty Council Minutes
November 12, 2025

Present: Aguayo-Mazzucato, Babitt, Bauer, Becker, Bi, Bonds, Chen, Cluett, D'Amore, Drachman, Franklin, Galvin, Gehrke, Giannobile, Golby, Goodman, Goralnick, Gori, Greenberg, Harris, Huang, Ingelfinger, Kaban, Mathis, Morton, A. Nazarian, R. Nazarian, Park, Patel, Royce, Sabatine, Song, Stern, Topor, Wagers

Guests: Drs. Chang, Muto, Reede, Segal; Mss. Bittinger, DeCoste, Lewis, Tan, Williams

Staff: Mss. Hecht, Ryan, Spearman

This Faculty Council meeting was held virtually, via Zoom.

Faculty Council (FC) Vice Chair, Dr. Rosalynn Nazarian called the meeting to order at approximately 4:01pm. She welcomed attendees and noted it was wonderful to meet members at the October welcome dinner. Dr. Nazarian shared that there would be additional in-person opportunities this year, including the final meeting in June featuring the Harvard University Provost, John Manning. She said there would also be a late winter or early spring in-person meeting, and that the date would be confirmed next month.

Dr. Nazarian informed the Council that HMS was using Zoom AI Companion to assist with drafting meeting minutes. She clarified that the feature does not record or store meeting content and can be paused for closed sessions. Questions could be directed to Ms. Lorien Hecht.

She announced that the Faculty of Medicine meeting would be held via Zoom on December 3rd, 4–5:15 PM. Faculty are expected to attend the December and May Faculty of Medicine meetings per the HMS Faculty Handbook. After piloting joint meetings last year, the December meetings of the Faculty of Medicine and Faculty Council would be held separately, while the May meeting would remain joint.

Then Dr. Nazarian shared that at the next Faculty Council meeting, Dr. Bernard Chang, Dean for Medical Education, would provide updates on the Educational Policy & Curriculum Committee (EPCC) and updates under the Program in Medical Education (PME). Members of the Faculty Senate Planning Committee would also present.

Dr. Nazarian then asked for and received acceptance of the minutes from the June 11th, 2025 and October 8, 2025 meetings, as presented. She reminded members to verify attendance records for accuracy.

Next, Dr. Nazarian introduced the master's degree candidate vote and explained the process for conferring degrees, noting that the Faculty Council votes to approve off-cycle degree candidates verified by the Registrar. Four master's students were recommended for degree conferral. After a motion and second, members voted via poll and approved the candidates. The HMS Registrar was notified immediately following the vote.

Dr. Nazarian then introduced the year's theme of Open Inquiry and Constructive Dialogue, referencing the President and Provost's committee report that had been shared in advance. She welcomed Dr. Roz Segal, Dean for Graduate Education at HMS; Tari Tan, Assistant Dean of Educational Innovation, HMS Graduate Education; Dr. Bernard S. Chang, Dean for Medical Education at HMS; and Dr. Joan Y. Reede, Dean for Culture and Community Engagement at HMS, shared perspectives on how HMS is promoting open inquiry and constructive dialogue across its educational and community programs.

Dr. Segal introduced herself and Ms. Tari Tan. She noted that their shared goal was to ensure that students were trained to engage in civil discourse, to keep open minds, and to discuss contentious matters constructively. Dr. Segal explained that Ms. Tan served as the lead person in their office for this work. She also described an orientation event during which the need for civil discourse, particularly when discussing political issues as well as scientific topics, was appropriately emphasized. Then, Dr. Segal highlighted the use of Chatham House Rules within both the PhD and master's programs to support open and respectful dialogue.

Ms. Tan then elaborated on several of the points Dr. Segal had introduced. She explained that their office was working to implement university-wide recommendations and reported that HMS had formed its own Open Inquiry Working Group (OIWG), in which she and Dr. Reede are currently actively involved. The group had been discussing how the Harvard University report could be expanded and adapted for medical-school applications. Ms. Tan also noted that the eleven master's programs had incorporated explicit questions about open inquiry into their admissions processes because they viewed this as an essential skill for students entering those programs. She added that the Constructive Dialogue Institute (CDI) would be offering trainings and that Dr. Chang would speak further about this later in the meeting. She described ongoing efforts to expand faculty development opportunities and increase training for teaching fellows.

Ms. Tan also shared that a set of asynchronous resources, available through Canvas Learning and the Teaching Essentials site, included a module focused on open inquiry. In addition, she announced that a new series of synchronous trainings for teaching fellows, centered on diffusing conflict and facilitating dialogue, was being offered to both teaching fellows and teaching assistants. She explained that the office was also working to strengthen and expand guidelines related to confidentiality. She concluded by asking how they might gather meaningful feedback from faculty about their experiences facilitating open inquiry in the classroom, the laboratory, and clinical settings, and emphasized that their office remained open and eager to receive that input.

Dr. Chang spoke about the central role of learning through discussion in both Harvard-MIT Program in Health Sciences and Technology (HST) and the Program in Medical Education (PME). He explained that the curriculum was not lecture based and relied heavily on small-group discussions, which required students to engage respectfully with peers who brought different backgrounds and perspectives. He emphasized that this ability was essential to their professional formation and noted the expectation, reinforced through the use of Chatham House Rules, that both students and faculty participate in ways that support open dialogue. He also mentioned that students were able to rate professors on how well they encouraged open inquiry.

Looking ahead, Dr. Chang observed that many external experts specialized in this work and shared that the school had chosen to partner with the CDI to bring more structured training to the community. He explained that the institute, a nonprofit that originated at the New York University business school, Stern, had worked with many institutions to provide training and online resources that strengthen community culture around constructive dialogue. He reported that programming from the institute would begin in January 2026 and that faculty, staff, and students would take part as the first group. He added that a broader launch was planned before the matriculation of the class arriving in the summer of 2026.

One faculty committee member asked whether links were available to any of the asynchronous modules used for student education in this area. They noted that it would be valuable to review the materials in order to understand how these skills were being taught and how the lessons might be incorporated as students rotated through clinical services. In response, the group referenced the [Constructive Dialogue Institute website](#), where several modules could be viewed with a free account, as well as the [Teaching Essentials site on Canvas](#), which houses additional open inquiry resources.

Next, Dr. Reede explained that the name and direction of her office had been updated in June 2025 to reflect a renewed focus on culture. She emphasized that collaboration and community building served as a central pillar of the office's work. She also provided additional background on the OIWG, describing its role in shaping school wide approaches to open inquiry. In closing, she encouraged the FC to consider whether the institution's diversity statement was consistent with its practices and whether its values were being fully reflected across the community.

Then, Dr. Nazarian noted that the Council would continue learning more about Open Inquiry and Constructive Dialogue throughout the year and thanked Dr. Segal, Ms. Tan, Dr. Chang, and Dr. Reede for their introduction to the topic.

Dr. Nazarian reminded attendees that everyone had been assigned specific discussion questions along with the reading material for the Authorship Guidelines and suggested having those materials accessible during the discussion. She then introduced Dr. Grace Huang, Dean for Faculty Affairs, to provide a brief overview of the Authorship Guidelines before members moved into breakout groups.

Dr. Huang explained why the committee was revisiting the authorship guidelines, noting that they had last been updated in 1999. She shared that the revision was a required action for accreditation by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) and emphasized the need to ensure that faculty had clear resources to understand the expectations around publishing and to access appropriate career support. She acknowledged the five doctoral level program directors who had completed most of the work and deserved recognition for their efforts, and she added that the guidelines had also undergone an internal vetting process.

Dr. Huang described the companion documents that accompanied the guidelines, noting that the primary authorship guidelines were intended to be enduring and were grounded in external standards such as those from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) and the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). She explained that the second document, which

outlined authorship resources, would evolve over time to address contemporary issues. She concluded by stating that the adjudication process for authorship disputes fell outside the scope of this project.

After Dr. Huang's remarks, Ms. Hecht opened three pre-assigned breakout groups based on participants' assigned reading groups. Members spent approximately 20–25 minutes discussing their questions. Each group was asked to identify one representative to summarize their discussion and report back once the breakout rooms closed.

- Group 1 – discussion questions focused on whether the authorship guidelines are clear and aligned with norms.
- Group 2 – discussion questions focused on whether the authorship resources are practical and helpful across faculty ranks, what could be included in the future.
- Group 3 – discussion questions focused on whether the authorship guidelines and the authorship resources are complementary, and whether there are topics not covered by either.

Dr. Nazarian welcomed everyone back and invited each group to summarize their discussions, beginning with Group 1. She allotted approximately three minutes for each group to report.

Group 1 addressed the clarity and practicality of the definitions and criteria for authorship, acknowledgments, and unethical practices, as well as whether the language might unintentionally create confusion or misinterpretation and whether the material aligned with institutional norms and widely recognized external standards such as those from the ICMJE and COPE. The group agreed that the document was concise and largely aligned with external expectations. They offered several recommendations for additions and clarifications. They suggested refining the section on unacceptable practices and discussing the frequency with which certain issues arise. They emphasized that conversations about authorship could evolve over time and that ongoing discussion throughout the project was important. They noted that such conversations did not need to occur only at the beginning, but that transparency was essential, particularly between researchers and the principal investigator, to prevent private side agreements. They recommended clearer expectations around the acknowledgment of resource use and also pointed out that website links included in the document needed to be verified.

Group 2 had been asked to examine a set of questions related to defining authorship early in a project. They raised concerns that individuals might become anchored to early authorship assignments and noted the challenges created when mentees entered a project with expectations already formed. The group supported the idea of sharing expectations at the beginning but believed that any system should include flexibility to account for the evolving nature of research. They also discussed the suggestion that contributions should be assessed rather than described as contributions that may be assessed. Members reviewed the click through section on roles and responsibilities and felt it could be more clearly organized. The largest portion of their discussion focused on material related to artificial intelligence. They noted that the first link did not work and agreed that the document should be treated as evolving. They observed that the most recent reference was from 2023 and felt that updating the material regularly would be beneficial. They recommended adding more specificity, including example language, and suggested that

expectations for medical writers should be articulated in the same way as other roles. They also supported greater clarity around fairness and ethical considerations.

Group 3 reported that they found both documents to be excellent. They discussed the extent to which the two documents were interconnected and reflected on how useful these materials would be for scholarship. They emphasized that broad dissemination would be important and suggested that reviewing the documents when a trainee joined a laboratory could serve as a meaningful educational opportunity. They recommended strengthening the phrasing that the school supports the stated criteria, proposing language that conveyed a more definitive endorsement. The group also noted that, for promotions, co first authorships were already treated as equal and suggested that the guidelines include a dedicated section explaining who should be considered an author. They raised questions about implications for patents and whether significant intellectual property should be addressed in the document, while acknowledging that patent related matters belonged in a separate policy. Finally, they discussed considerations related to artificial intelligence, including the need for transparency, the question of whether certain uses of artificial intelligence might fall under research misconduct, and how to address situations in which one coauthor used artificial intelligence during the research or writing process.

Dr. Huang expressed her admiration for the faculty's thoughtfulness, balance, and wisdom, noting the value of hearing about real challenges in practice. She raised a question regarding dissemination of the guidelines, highlighting the need to reach junior faculty and trainees effectively. FC members suggested several approaches, including distributing the guidelines from the Dean's Office, integrating them into institutional onboarding at hospitals, or including them in required compliance modules. Dr. Huang stressed that the rollout should target division heads and chiefs to ensure the guidelines receive attention, noting that this is not a compliance issue but one that resides with the principal investigator. Another member noted their reservations with sharing the guidelines via the Dean's Office, as those emails often aren't paid the most attention.

Dr. Nazarian thanked the Council and the speakers for their thoughtfulness and dedication. She adjourned the meeting at 5:27 pm.