

**USF College of Medicine  
Faculty Council Meeting  
Minutes**

**Tuesday, May 24, 2011 - 5:30 p.m.  
MDC 2301**

**Videoconferencing at  
South Tampa Center for Advanced Healthcare, Room 5051C**

Faculty President Bryan Bognar called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

**Minutes**

The President asked if there were any comments regarding the minutes of the February Faculty Council meeting. There were none and a motion was made for approval. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved as submitted.

**AIMS/HART Distribution**

Joann Strobbe, Vice Dean for Administration, Finance and Technology, presented an update on distribution of individual AIMS/HART reports to faculty. She reviewed the history of AIMS (Asset Investment Management System), which is a pay-for-performance system that is used to recognize and reward faculty for their performance and contributions to the three missions of the College of Medicine. HART (Health Analysis Reporting Tracking) is a data warehouse with management reporting tools that provide data related to pay and budgeting metrics.

Ms. Strobbe reported that, up until now, individual faculty HART reports have been distributed semi-annually to the Department Chairs. Upon the recommendation of the Financial Oversight Committee, it was decided that the reports will instead be emailed directly to each faculty member. The first individual reports will cover the fiscal year ending June 30. That information is slated for distribution to faculty in August, once the data is finalized. Town Hall meetings will be scheduled in August and September. Updated information will be sent to faculty semi-annually in October and February. Ms. Strobbe distributed a sample report and an explanation sheet that explains the various metrics. It was suggested that IS create hyperlinks on the explanation sheet that will link to a glossary of terms. In response to a question regarding possible reporting errors or other concerns, Ms. Strobbe indicated that the contact person will be Adam Tobias, Assistant Director of Data Analysis.

**Pharma III Draft Policy Recommendation**

President Bognar provided background on the Pharma III Draft Policy Recommendation, which was the topic of a Faculty Council Town Hall meeting that was held on May 10 with Dean Klasko. The proposed policy is the third iteration of a policy that limits conflicts of interest in interactions with the pharmaceutical, medical device and biotechnology industries. It was developed by a working group chaired by Dr. John Curran, Senior Executive Associate Dean for Faculty and Academic Affairs, and has been available on the Faculty Council Website for faculty review.

The Pharma III recommendation was developed in response to the “C” grade that the College of Medicine received on the American Medical Student Association (AMSA) scorecard, which grades medical schools on their conflict of interest policies. President Bognar displayed the scorecard on the AMSA Website ([www.amsascorecard.org](http://www.amsascorecard.org)), which shows the various rating categories as well as grades for medical schools in Florida and across the country. Dean Klasko would like for USF to receive an “A.” President Bognar said that the proposed policy will be reposted to the Faculty Council Website in a format that uses line numbers, to facilitate faculty comments. A side-by-side comparison of Pharma II and Pharma III will also be posted, along with a comment form for faculty.

The floor was opened up for comment, and a lengthy discussion ensued. The opinion was expressed that USF should not be compelled to make changes just because of a grading system that was developed by medical students and, furthermore, AMSA does not represent all medical students. Some faculty voiced concerns that the proposed policy is too restrictive and would inhibit collaboration and research. A number of faculty expressed the opinion that achievement of a “B” rating would be sufficient. A comment was made that USF should not be compared with the University of Florida or University of Miami, which both received “A” ratings, as those schools have more endowment money and it is an uneven playing field. Following the discussion, a motion was made that the Faculty Council develop an alternative proposal to bring to the faculty as a whole. The motion was seconded and approved by the Faculty Council.

### **Adjourn**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:42 p.m.