The School of Medicine Faculty Council enjoyed a productive year during which it met nine times. Issues reviewed and acted on by the Council during 2004-2005 are summarized in this report.

Report of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion

UCSF Academic Senate Chair Leonard Zegans, MD requested that each Faculty Council review the Report of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion and prioritize the recommendations outlined within. Council members expressed broad and enthusiastic support for the recommendations detailed by the Report. Following discussion of general issues related to faculty recruitment, retention and promotion, Council members agreed to highlight the following:

1) *Implementation of a Multifaceted Educational Program* – Council members emphasized the need to ensure the implementation of the academic checklist described in Appendix 9 of the Report and will request that it be required as a first priority. The Council further recommended that a structure be created within the Academic Senate to ensure disclosure of this educational material prior to the applicant’s appointment and that a mentor be assigned to the applicant in the initial stages of negotiation.

2) *Establishment of General Guidelines for New Appointments* – Council members agreed that applicants should be hired into the series most appropriate for their expected career plan and concurred with the recommendation of the Task Force that department chairs be discouraged from hiring faculty into a generic series and then later obtaining a series change.

3) *Systematic Review of Existing Faculty in the Adjunct and Clinical Series* – Council members strongly supported the recommendation to review existing Clinical and Adjunct series faculty to ensure that they are in the correct series and that there is recourse to transfer to an Academic Senate series appointment where appropriate.

4) *Identification by Campus Administration of Ways to Minimize the Financial Liability of Appointing Faculty to the In-Residence Series* – Despite the likely difficulty in implementing this recommendation, the Council agreed that chairs should be encouraged to appoint faculty to the In-Residence series where appropriate.
On October 15, 2004, Chair Smith conveyed these priorities in a communication to Academic Senate Chair Zegans (Appendix 1).

**School of Medicine Leadership Retreat**

The School of Medicine Leadership Retreat took place in January 2005. Participants gained insight into campus planning issues surrounding the campus expansion to Mission Bay and planning related to Parnassus Heights. The Retreat helped to lend transparency to the planning process and allow for better understanding of the collective needs of the School of Medicine, including clinical departments.

No decisions were made at the Retreat. Town Hall meetings were conducted in the months following the Retreat to continue the discussion and gain additional input. The Dean’s Office also distributed periodic newsletters to all faculty in the School of Medicine, updating them on recent decisions, developments and the status of ongoing issues.

**Space Planning Issues**

The Faculty Council had ongoing discussions with School of Medicine Dean David Kessler, MD regarding space planning issues. Space allocation remains a critical factor in the recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty and space is, despite new development at Mission Bay, extremely limited. Both the Faculty Council and the Dean recognized the need to provide a forum for the voice of the clinical faculty in the campus planning process and to make a greater commitment of space to clinical research.

In March 2005, Dean Kessler provided an update on departments likely to be relocated from Parnassus to other campuses. The Department of Epidemiology will likely move to China Basin and the Cardiovascular Research Institute (CVRI) to Mission Bay. In addition, the Department of Ophthalmology may be relocated to China Basin in order to accommodate a stem cell research facility at Parnassus. Departmental relocation will benefit UCSF in a number of ways, including: 1) creating more bed space at Parnassus, which will generate income; 2) helping to define Mission Bay as something more than a basic sciences campus; and 3) increasing the potential for stem cell research at UCSF.

**Faculty Recruitment and Retention: Options for Part-Time Work**

The Faculty Council invited two speakers to present on options available to faculty for flexible or part-time work. Such options assist in ongoing faculty recruitment and retention efforts.

In December 2004, Mary Croughan, PhD of the Committee on Academic Personnel outlined to the Council that several mechanisms are in place to allow faculty to achieve a balance between having a family and maintaining a career at UCSF. However, many faculty remain uninformed about the availability of options such as part-time work in the Senate series or accelerated promotion. Such options are often of particular value to women faculty, yet few women request accelerated promotions and only an estimated 10 – 15% of UCSF women faculty currently work less than 100% time. Council members agreed that faculty need to be better educated as to the promotion and part-time work options that are available.

In March 2005, Joseph Guglielmo, PharmD, Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel, joined the Council to further discuss advancement opportunities for part-time faculty members. Dr. Guglielmo presented materials summarizing systemwide proposals to amend the Academic Personnel Manual (APM)
to make UC a more “family friendly” institution. The proposed APM revisions suggest, in part, that campuses should develop methods to promote part-time appointees that are commensurate with promotion schemes for full-time faculty. Council members held discussion regarding the desire to balance support for faculty who choose to work part-time to raise a family with fairness to those faculty who have worked full-time while raising a family. The Council also expressed concern that the proposed APM revisions only apply to the tenure-track Professor series and should benefit faculty across the board.

In May 2005, Divisional Senate Chair Zegans convened a task force to Review the APM Policies Related to Work and Family on which Chair Smith served as a representative of the Medicine Faculty Council. The Council’s comments and concerns were thus included in the task force’s final communication to Chair Zegans, which was transmitted to the Academic Council for review (Appendix 2).

Parity between Clinical and Basic Research at UCSF

The Faculty Council invited two guests to present on efforts to achieve parity between clinical and basic research at UCSF.

Lee Goldman, MD, MPH, Chair of the Department of Medicine, attended the December 13, 2004 meeting to provide the Council with an overview of the indirect costs generated by basic and clinical researchers at UCSF. He noted the following:

- Different funding sources generate different levels of indirect costs.
- Approximately 50% of indirect costs fund facilities and maintenance and 50% fund administration; indirect costs are distributed between the University Office of the President (UCOP), the Chancellor, the department and the principal investigator.
- Indirect costs generated by clinical research at UCSF are primarily dedicated to the development of the Mission Bay campus.
- Individuals are not allocated space based on the amount of indirect costs they generate.

Council members noted that a separate issue related to parity between clinical and basic research concerns space allocation at Parnassus, as space that is being vacated by researchers moving to Mission Bay is not being filled by faculty currently renting space off-campus. The Council could not identify an immediate solution to this issue because free space at Parnassus is largely wet-lab and inappropriate for clinical research. Funds do not exist for the building of new clinical research facilities.

In January 2005, Executive Vice Chancellor A. Eugene Washington, MD joined the Council to discuss the challenges associated with creating more clinical research space at Parnassus. He noted that issues surrounding the creation of more “dry” space for clinical research include the cost of refurbishing wet-lab space and financing development of new facilities. EVC Washington further noted that department chairs have historically played a key role in the allocation of space and the promotion of clinical research. He encouraged the Council to discuss clinical research space needs with both department chairs and Medical Center leadership.
UCORP Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources

At the request of UC Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal, PhD, each of the ten UC campuses provided feedback to the Academic Council regarding the University Committee on Research Policy Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources. UCSF Senate Chair Zegans established a task force to provide recommendations relating to the Resolution. This task force was comprised of members from the committees on Academic Freedom, Academic Planning and Budget, and Research and the faculty councils of each of the four schools. Hugo (Quinn) Cheng, MD served as the representative of the School of Medicine Faculty Council.

At the request of the task force, the Medicine Faculty Council also considered the Resolution and deliberated whether to recommend that it be accepted, modified or rejected. The Council identified a couple of key issues:

1) The Resolution prohibits any unit within the University from adopting a policy restricting funding from a particular source. Should the Resolution be rejected and individual units allowed to restrict research funding sources, the academic freedom of faculty members could potentially be compromised in instances where a faculty member’s only appointment is with a single department as opposed to faculty members who might also have appointments in a center or organized research unit (ORU).

2) If a center or ORU were to adopt a policy to restrict funding from a particular source, a faculty member would be able to terminate their relationship with the center or ORU and still retain their departmental affiliation. The reverse would not be true, as it is impossible to renounce departmental membership. Faculty who may not be in agreement with such a policy would not have recourse to remove themselves from the department and would be obliged to accept a policy with which they do not agree.

Following extensive discussion of these issues, the Council agreed to recommend that the Resolution be approved. However, Council members will recommend that investigators considering accepting funding from the tobacco industry be provided with a white paper detailing the past history of the industry’s interaction with universities. On March 1, 2005, Chair Smith transmitted a communication to Catherine Chesla, RN, DNSc, FAAN, Chair of the Task Force Reviewing the UCORP Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources, that conveyed this recommendation (Appendix 3).

Granting of Posthumous Degrees

The Council considered a proposal to award a posthumous medical degree to Farhad Naji, who passed away in August 2004. Mr. Naji was a student in good standing in the MD/DDS program. Following extensive deliberation, the Council agreed to approve the granting of the posthumous degree pending approval from student representatives from Mr. Naji’s class.

Prompted by the Naji case, the Council voted to adopt a Policy on the Posthumous Award of Degrees (Appendix 4) in order to provide a formal mechanism for the Medicine Faculty Council to approve candidates for posthumous degrees. The Council felt that a written policy would help to ensure consistency and maintain the academic integrity of a medical degree. While the policy sets minimum criteria and
mandates completion of certain courses and/or clerkships, it also allows for exceptions to be made under extenuating circumstances.

Senate staff will work with the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction during the 2005-2006 academic year to codify the posthumous degree policy in the School of Medicine regulations.

**Bylaws Amendments**

The Council submitted proposed bylaw revisions to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction in order to update bylaw provisions related to departmental representation on the Faculty Council and the relationship between Council leadership and the Senate Office. Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed the request and suggested modifications to clarify intent and ensure consistency with the revised Divisional bylaws and the bylaws of the Systemwide Academic Senate. The Council reviewed the suggestions from Rules and Jurisdiction and agreed on minor changes. The Council sent a formal response to Rules and Jurisdiction outlining these changes ([Appendix 5](#)), which will be considered during the 2005-2006 academic year.

**Electronic Medical Records**

Michael Blum, MD, Associate Clinical Professor in the Department of Information Technology (IT), provided the Faculty Council with an overview of the status of implementing a single electronic medical record (EMR) system at UCSF. UCSF is about 15 years behind peer institutions in utilizing existing EMR technology in its clinical enterprise.

UCSF has purchased a software suite known as UCare, and the implementation of an EMR in acute care will unfold in three phases, beginning in July 2005. UCare will replace STOR, and eventually integrate the perioperative system. The goal is to have a broad, integrated system in a single EMR that will optimize access to patient records and charts. Currently, IT has completed a workflow redesign, prototyping and testing. A hardware roll-out, pilot activation and a full roll-out are to follow. Ambulatory implementation is also anticipated in the plan, and the timing of such will be developed upon the successful roll-out of UCare in acute care.

**Cost Sharing and Program Income Policy**

Charles Taylor, Director of Financial Analysis in the Department of Budget and Resource Management, gave a dual presentation on UCSF Cost Sharing and Program Income policies.

Cost sharing occurs when a principal investigator shifts funding for committed effort or materials on an award to another source but does not formally reduce the commitment with the sponsor. It is important that UCSF focus on this issue now because cost sharing and effort reporting are major compliance issues and high audit priorities for the Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Inspector General. In addition, major legal settlements related to effort reporting violations at Harvard, Johns Hopkins and Northwestern University have totaled over $10 million in the past few years.

Program income is gross income earned by the University that is directly generated by a sponsored project or earned as the result of a sponsored project. New UCSF policies require that program income be correctly accounted for, used and reported. This is important to comply with federal regulations and the terms and
conditions of the sponsored agreement, as well as to avoid audits and sanctions by the National Institutes of Health.

The Department of Budget and Resource Management recently finalized its Cost Sharing and Program Income polices and is currently conducting departmental trainings to educate the campus about these issues. Budget and Resource Management will also develop clear directives for identifying, utilizing and reporting cost sharing.

Issues for 2005-2006

In June 2005, Dan Bikle, MD, PhD was elected Chair of the Faculty Council for a one year term beginning September 1, 2005. Wade Smith, MD, PhD was elected as Vice Chair. The Council will continue to respond to issues brought before it and will address the following ongoing issues:

- Address limitations to UCSF’s malpractice coverage plan by inviting speakers from administration and the Office of Legal Affairs.
- Submit Policy on the Posthumous Award of Degrees to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction for incorporation in the School of Medicine regulations.
- Continue discussion of proposal to have an ex officio member from UCSF Fresno serve on the Medicine Faculty Council.
- Facilitate advocacy for educational space
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