Coordinating Committee
Daniel Bikle, M.D., Ph.D., Chair

Minutes
Meeting of October 10, 2001


The minutes of the meeting of June 19, 2001 were unanimously approved.

Announcements from the Chair

- The first lecturer in the newly-established distinguished clinical research lecture series is Steve Cummings, MD, selected by the Committee on Research. The lecture will be given on Friday, November 9, 2001 in Cole Hall at 3:30 p.m.
- The first Division meeting of the year will be on October 30, 2001 in HSW 300 from 2:30 - 4:00 p.m.
- The major issue facing the Long Range Development Planning Committee (LRDP) is consideration of where to put the hospital. Five scenarios are being considered in depth, with the possibility of more being added. The LRDP Committee is dividing itself into five sub-committees to consider various issues involved in the move. Of importance to faculty is the long-range academic planning committee, which will have three Senate officers (Daniel Bikle, Leonard Zegans and Jeaneine Weiner-Kronish) among its membership. The committee will consider the academic concerns of splitting the campus or moving most if not all of the hospital/medical center to Mission Bay.
- A Conflict of Interest Policy Task Force is in the process of being formed. The creation of this Task Force arose from two issues:
  1) A number of clinical investigators would like to re-examine current policy relating to instances where for example, faculty are involved in pharmaceutical-sponsored drug trials while at same time owning stock in that drug company, serving on its board, serving as consultants/speakers for the drug company, etc. The question is whether or not this represents a conflict of interest and at what level it should be a concern for the campus.
2) Last summer UCSF signed an agreement with the Burrill Seed Venture Capital Fund (a venture capital company funded by CALPERS to provide seed money for projects in UCSF faculty laboratories that have promise for commercial development. Projects would have been funded for $250,000 initially but, if they showed signs of maturity, i.e. closer to being developed into a commercial product, funding could be increased to $500,000. The agreement was signed with limited faculty review, particularly by the Senate. Concern has been expressed over potential conflicts of interest that could arise and ways they could be avoided. The Task Force will examine current UCSF policies together with policies on other campuses to see if a consensus can be reached as to what is appropriate.

- The Office of the President created the Health Sciences Retirement Task Force in response to concerns being raised about the retirement system. Retirement is currently based only on the X factor and there is concern that this is insufficient and that all of the salary of a faculty member should be covered by retirement benefits. The Task Force will include three representatives from UCSF (Larry Pitts, Warren Gold and Jackie Boyden) along with administrators and faculty from the five health sciences campuses involved in this program.

- Shared Governance Working Group. A number of faculty met with the Deans of the four Schools and the Dean of Graduate Studies, along with Vice Chancellor Bainton to discuss concern over trends in distribution of faculty, specifically the growth in the Clinical and Adjunct series, while two of the series that provides Senate membership, Ladder Rank and In Residence are definitely not growing. Currently the non-Senate faculty outnumbers the Senate faculty. The bulk of new recruits are at the assistant professor level, with a marked decrease in those in the ladder rank and residence series and a marked increase in those in the adjunct and clinical series. A Task Force has been formed, Chaired by Martin Bogetz, with membership including the Associate Deans and members from the Shared Governance Working Group to explore faculty recruitment, retention and promotion issues

- State revenues are in trouble. The Office of the President has asked campuses to provide alternative budgets for next year, which include 3%, 5%, and 10% cuts. The Senate will have input into the cuts made by UCSF.

**Reports from Standing Committees**

Chair Bikle asked that Chairs of all of the Standing Committees provide the Coordinating Committee with brief reports summarizing the activities of their Committees at each meeting. Reports should be brief and when issues require more in-depth discussion they will be put on the agenda as a separate item.

**Academic Freedom** – no report

**Academic Personnel – Donna Ferriero**

In addition to the Committee’s weekly review of files for faculty, CAP is reviewing the policies and procedures related to the stewardship review process, which will be discussed later in the meeting, and the career review concept. Academic Personnel have also contributed to Guidelines for Review and Promotion of Faculty in Clinical Professor series.

**Academic Planning and Budgeting – Stan Glantz**

Academic Planning and Budgeting is continuing the process of becoming more formally involved in the campus planning and budgeting process. The Committee is actively working with Bruce Spaulding’s office. Within approximately a month, it will have a specific protocol for involving APB members on each of the Long Range Planning and Budget (LRPB) subcommittees as well as
identifying other parts of the planning process where faculty should be involved. Progress with involvement in the budgeting process continues.

The Committee has formed a task force, in coordination with the Graduate Council, to examine the fifth school concept. The task force will consist of three members of the APB Committee and two from the Graduate Council. APB will be the lead Senate committee, until a concrete programmatic proposal is put forward, at which time the lead will shift to the Graduate Council. Dr. Glantz is also the representative to the University Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

Clinical Affairs – Susan Janson
The major mission of this Committee is to examine the academic impact of changes within the medical center system. Changes that occur in the medical centers (e.g. Moffitt-Long, Mount Zion, ambulatory care clinics, etc.) are usually very rapid and their impact on academic programs is not usually considered. The Committee is trying to move from a less reactive to a more proactive planning agenda.

Committee on Committees – John Kane
The Committee on Committees attempts to make appointments to Committee membership so that representation exists on every Committee from all the schools, and when possible, among clinical and academic appointments. This year the Committee assigned individual members of the Committee on Committees to serve as liaisons to specific Standing Committees in order to maintain better contact and feedback. COC members are expected to attend at least one meeting of the standing committees to which they are liaison in order to better understand their concerns and the actual work performed by the committee and to maintain good liaison with chair and members. The issue of the COC considering replacement of members who miss three consecutive committee meetings was discussed. The concern was raised that absenteeism affects the workload of other members of the Committee who do show up to meetings and the point was made that there are many faculty who want to participate on Senate Committees and who should be appointed when there are instances of non-participation by faculty appointed to serve on Senate Committees. Dr. Kane also reported on the Committee on Committees continued consideration and limited appointment of Clinical and Adjunct faculty to Senate committees. With the majority of faculty no longer in the Senate, this a major issue for consideration during the appointment process. Dr. Bikle indicated that he will be addressing this issue at the November 28th Academic Council meeting, making a case for greater involvement of non-Senate faculty. Dr. Bikle would appreciate any additional input from Committee members on this matter.

Rules and Jurisdiction Committee
Parliamentarian Jean Olsen reported on behalf of Chair Julia Faucett and indicated during the past year, Rules and Jurisdiction Committee has carefully reviewed bylaws and analyzed recommendations from each committee on how it wishes to operate. Once the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee has completed their revisions, they will be reviewed by the systemwide Rules and Jurisdiction Committee. UCSF’s Rules and Jurisdiction will then submit its recommendations to the faculty at a Divisional meeting.

Courses of Instruction – Noreen Facione
The Committee’s function is to review course changes and new courses that have been developed, reviewed and approved by program councils and administrators within each schools and evaluate course descriptions, workload for credit units given and the identification of learning objectives for students for each course. Last year, there were problems in streamlining this activity because of
different timelines, insufficient lead time to evaluate courses, lack of administrative sign-off, no learning objectives for courses that were student learning focused, etc. The Committee is addressing those problems through communication back to program councils and by making sure everyone is using the form preferred by the Registrar’s Office. Another issue from last year centered on whether the Committee received sufficient information to understand what the student workload would be for web-based instruction courses. The Committee is looking at the standard course form to see if additional information should be requested to supplement their understanding of web-based instruction. The goal in all of this is to have fewer courses returned to faculty because of missing information.

The question arose about integration of courses and why the different schools teach the same or similar courses. It was suggested that given shrinking resources and faculty overload, the Senate should look at how many courses there are on a given subject in the different schools with an eye towards consolidating or modifying a course to be appropriate for different schools. This could also provide an excellent opportunity to enhance cooperation across the professions. However, because the Committee does not see the entire curriculum, they would have no way of evaluating or determining duplication across the schools.

Another question was raised as to why schools have different calendars, which was discussed at length last year by the Educational Policy Committee. Representatives from the schools explained how each school has its own concept of curriculum, ways of handling courses, and means of developing curriculum over the years. Part of the rationale for scheduling has to do with licensing examinations, residency programs and post-graduate programs beginning at different times during the year. The issue was also raised about having a common day for elective courses, which would facilitate cross-school teaching, rather than each school choosing a different day.

**Education Policy – David Teitel**

- The Committee will review three draft policies on copyright and will formalize its recommendations at its meeting on October 12 and submit them to Chair Bikle and Systemwide Senate by the November 9, 2001 deadline.

The Committee has discussed the following issues and considered possible ways to become more proactive:

- Crisis in clinical teaching-- volunteer faculty are decreasing and junior faculty are so overburdened, that they are taking fewer clinical teaching activities. The question is whether there is something that can be done on a coordinated across-school basis to try to define the problem and respond to it.
- Distance learning issues will be addressed by the Task Force and has representation from EPC.
- The fifth school concept - -the Committee felt was not within their purview until there is an actual curriculum or program or until something arises that would affect educational policy.
- A symposium of leaders to address cross-school curriculum and programs appears to be the most promising work ahead for the Committee.
- The Committee felt that several other committees were already addressing education policy issues around Mission Bay.

**Equal Opportunity – Betty Ann Hoener**

Last year the Committee developed a Search Committee Ambassador proposal. This involved a staff coordinator who would gather information and the development of a training program for faculty members who would work with search committees and assist them with ways to make ensure integration of equal opportunity and diversity of candidates for jobs. Since there was no budget
allocation for this proposal, the Committee is now developing a pilot project to work with the sixteen on-going searches in the Ladder Rank and In-Residence series, all of which are very strong in membership of women and under-represented minorities. The project will look at these committees to see where in the process women or minorities are, or are not included. If the search committees were including women and under-represented minorities, then the question would remain as to why more women and minorities are not appointed into these series at UCSF. The project will look at where the invitations go, the number of people on the short list who are direct invitees versus those who answered ads, etc.

Updating the faculty handbook is another major project for this year, and Diane Wara has agreed to take the lead on this project.

Faculty Welfare – Norman Oppenheimer
Major issues this year include:
- A written policy regarding disability coverage for all schools.
- The Health Science Faculty retirement issue -- specifically how much of the faculty salary can be covered by retirement.
- Housing -- particularly the implementation of ideas in the Chancellor’s report on housing.
- Transportation -- especially regarding faculty who will have bases both here and at Mission Bay.
- The Committee will have a member of the new UC Health Care Facilitator Committee to assist faculty and staff in obtaining maximum benefit from their health plans.
- The issue of tuition waivers for faculty and staff who have family members who are going to UC was approved by the Regents, but will not be considered further at this time because of funding issues.

Graduate Council – Nancy Stotts
The Graduate Council continues to review programs and is currently reviewing programs in Medicine and Nursing. This year’s issues are: Post Doctoral fellowships; participating in the review of the proposal for the 5th School and the Center for Health and Community.

Library – Janice Humphreys
The Library Committee is working on four inter-related subjects:
- Concerns raised across the UC System about shrinking library space. Since there are no protocols for how library space might be used, an ad hoc committee was created to examine the strategic plan as a framework for determining policy and procedure for allocation of library space.
- Mission Bay Library. As costs increase at Mission Bay, space allotted for the library shrinks. A sub-committee has been created to review the various possibilities on the purposes of a library at Mission Bay and the amount of space allocated for it.
- Communicating information about the Library to the faculty. Many things are happening very quickly at the library, e.g. Digital Library renovation, Pub Med taking the place of MELVYL by the end of this year, etc. To help faculty keep track of the latest occurrences, various means such as flyers, newsletters, bulletin boards are being used.
- The Committee on Academic Computing overlaps with work the Library Committee is doing. There is now a liaison from the Library Committee to the Academic Computing Committee.
Research – James Cleaver
The Committee on Research has traditionally had two primary roles: 1) reviewing internal grants and allocating funds and 2) choosing nominees for various junior faculty fellowships and faculty lecturers. The Committee has now taken on third role: reviewing research policy. For the fall cycle of Individual Investigator Grant Funding, the Committee received 22 grants, totaling $770,000. Given the available budget, there will probably be a 58-70% approval rate. Awards are given on the basis of research projects that are either new faculty start-ups; new projects for established faculty, or hardship cases. Over the summer, the Committee provided representatives to the selection committees of the Vice Chancellor for Research for several fellowships (e.g. Packard, Burroughs-Wellcome, Pugh, etc.). The Committee also selects the Faculty Research Lecturer and this year solicited nominations for the first “Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture”. The Committee received a number of outstanding nominations and has encouraged the re-submittal of those who were not selected this year.

The Committee has reviewed the new policy to increase the salary scales of professional research series to equity with tenured faculty. The document is complete, is currently going through the final review among members and will be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The Committee has completed a preliminary review of the non-ORU Center for Health and Community. The next step is for a task force to be assembled by the Vice Chair of Research Committee with members from APB and Graduate Council. The Task Force will produce a single, coordinated report by the end of this month.

School of Dentistry Faculty Council – Deborah Greenspan
The School of Dentistry Faculty Council has had two meetings this academic year. The Council will revise its bylaws, which have not been done in about 15 years, and will examine and update the School’s strategic plan. They will also re-examine the faculty mentoring program to determine whether it should be done again and, if so, in what format.

The Council is also concerned about web education. The School of Dentistry does not do distance learning per se, but it would like to start identifying suitable courses that could either substitute or augment, but not duplicate, what is being done in lecture format.

School of Medicine Faculty Council – Linda Ferrell
The School of Medicine Faculty Council has met twice this year. The Council responded to an early request from the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs to review criteria put forth for clinical faculty. This discussion has generated some potential agenda items. The Council also will be involved with on-going review of the new School of Medicine curriculum.
School of Nursing Faculty Council – Sally Rankin

The School of Nursing Faculty Council has met once and will meet again this Friday. The major issues are:

- On-going access to clinical sites for nursing students.
- The impact of the Fifth School on the School of Nursing. So many of the faculty who might naturally be a part of the proposed Fifth School are already in the School of Nursing and are already involved in that kind of research.
- The Council is looking at ways to speed up the business of the school and to find ways to move the business along at a more rapid rate because there is so much of it.

School of Pharmacy Faculty Council – no report

Report from the Task Forces

Distance Learning – Janice Humphreys

The Distance Learning Task Force has been charged with:

- Academic issues, such as providing guidance regarding proper crediting of time and effort required as well as developing methods of evaluating effectiveness of web-based instruction;
- Compiling a list of the resources currently available and developing specific recommendations for other resources that are needed.
- Ownership issues

The Task Force has some new faculty members as well as the Chairs of the Library Committee, Courses of Instruction, Educational Policy, the Co-Chair of the previous Task Force, and Gail Persily have been invited to join the Task Force. The Task Force will consider some of the recommendations of the previous Task Force. The Task Force will begin its work after January 2002.

Mentoring – Mary Croughan-Minihane

The Task Force Co-Chairs attended a retreat given by Carol Ashenbrenner who was invited here by the Supportive Work Environment’s Blue Ribbon Working Group on Mentoring. This was an effort to coordinate the multiple groups on campus working on faculty mentoring. The retreat brought together many elements on the campus and generated good ideas in the area of mentoring.

The Task Force is waiting to receive information from the faculty survey, which got a 60% response rate and included many questions about mentoring.

The Co-Chairs are reviewing mentoring programs and models and developing lists of questions and ideas to present to the Task Force.

Senate Director Maimon indicated that the Senate Office continues to foster mentoring around the research grant application process. When applicants are not funded, the staff office works with the Committee on Research to identify a member to assist in the development of an improved proposal. Several faculty members have had success in achieving funding following these efforts.

Health Sciences Retirement Committee – no report

Stewardship Review Process – Donna Ferriero
CAP has been examining Stewardship Review procedures and is in the process of developing a letter to Vice Chancellor Bainton that outlines the Committee’s areas of concern. Presently there are approximately twenty Stewardship Reviews that are ongoing. Some of the issues of concern are:

- Timeliness
- Lack of deadlines
- Difficulty in recruiting faculty
- Confidentiality
- Stewardship Review Committee representation
- Integrity of the overall process
- CAP input on final report recommendations

The sentiment in CAP is that if faculty donate time and effort toward a stewardship review process, it is important that everyone involved believes the process is worthwhile and that communication is shared among the appropriate parties. CAP would like to see the creation of a procedures manual to spell out in more detail how faculty should go about participating in this type of review.

**School/Campus Budget Review Process – Stan Glantz**

Dr. Glantz indicated that last year the Senate Academic Planning and Budget Committee began the process of looking at how it could become more engaged in academic planning and budgeting issues of the campus. The Committee continues to work with the deans and other responsible administrators to develop a protocol for faculty being involved in the budget review process and planning efforts in a more systematic way. Most of discussion last year focused on budgeting issues; planning issues were discussed later and are now moving forward. Within an estimated two months, the long-range planning process will have protocols in place and decisions will have been made as to which sub committees are to be involved. Regarding the budgeting process, there has been discussion on the role of Faculty Councils. Faculty Councils have indicated that they are working with their deans to identify systematic ways in which the Councils can become active in school budgeting issues and mechanisms for that information to be relayed to the APB Committee of the Senate. The Committee will focus more on campus-wide issues, but will maintain active liaison with Faculty Councils.

One additional issue that was considered by APB was how to take into account the Medical Center planning and budget process, which Clinical Affairs was engaged in and which has a great impact on academic programs. Since Clinical Affairs is already involved, it would be duplicative to have APB involved. Clinical Affairs will continue to be the lead and APB will maintain active communication with Clinical Affairs.

Opening up the process is an issue that was being raised throughout the system, and is being supported by the Office of the President. By the end of this year Dr. Glantz believes there will have major change in way faculty are engaged in the planning and budgeting process.

**New Business**

Several members commented on the appalling condition of teaching spaces on campus relating to both the condition of classrooms as well as the continued problems with scheduling rooms for teaching (e.g. light bulbs missing, rooms double booked, blackboards that don’t slide, rooms changed at the last minute, etc.) One faculty member has written to the Student Affairs Office and
Registrar, but is not sure if this is how to solve the problem. The Committee on Courses of Instruction indicated that it would consider these problems.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.