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During the 2006-07 academic year, the School of Medicine Faculty Council met ten times, during which the Council actively engaged with issues both at UCSF and UC Systemwide. This year the primary foci of the Council included maintaining an ongoing dialogue with the UCSF Medical Center Administration, participating in the revision of the Student Grievance Procedure, responding to the UCSF Strategic Planning process and addressing the concerns of clinical faculty.

Medical Center and Clinical Issues

Following up on the May 8, 2006 town hall-style meeting with Medical Center CEO Mark Laret, CMO Ernest Ring and presentations from selected faculty, the Faculty Council continued the ongoing dialogue with Medical Center administrators and the Clinical Affairs Committee. The Faculty Council invited CEO Laret and CMO Ring to their December 13, 2006 and January 17, 2007 meetings for follow-up discussions. On April 6, 2007, the Department of Medicine held a retreat to discuss issues related to ambulatory care at UCSF. The Faculty Council discussed the retreat planning with Mary Ellen Kleinhenz on February 21, 2007, and several members of the Council including the Chair and Vice Chair attended the retreat. The results of the retreat were subsequently discussed with the Department of Medicine Vice Chair Robert Wachter on May 16, 2007 and with Department of Medicine Interim Chair (now Chair) Talmadge King on June 20, 2007. The latter meeting was also attended by the Medical Center CEO Mark Laret.

The discussions included the following key themes:

- Ambulatory patient care at UCSF needs to be improved.
- Operating ambulatory care clinics is inefficient and too costly.
- The inability of faculty to garner adequate salary support for time spent treating patients needs to be addressed.
- The challenges faced by clinical care-focused faculty for promotion need to be addressed.
- Existing funding structures, including departmental and Dean’s taxes, need to become more transparent.
- UCSF needs to determine the patient population it will serve.
- The Medical Center would like to move to a patient-centered model for clinical care, while meeting the needs of faculty and students.
- Changes to improve the patient care at UCSF need to include substantial changes in the delivery care system that will benefit our patients, the Medical Center and the faculty in its entirety, not simply as a collection of units.
Faculty Council Actions

Issues reviewed and acted on by the Faculty Council included:

- Proposed Changes to the Student Grievance Procedure ([Appendices 1 & 2](#))
- UCSF Strategic Planning Process ([http://strategy.ucsf.edu/](http://strategy.ucsf.edu/)) ([Appendix 3](#))
- Department of Otolaryngology Name Change Request ([Appendix 4](#))
- Response to the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget regarding Core Campus Research Facilities and Bridge Funding ([Appendix 5 & 6](#))
- Proposed Changes to the University of California Technical Standards for Medical School Admissions and Graduation ([Appendix 7](#))

In addition, members of the Faculty Council served on UCSF committees and participated in conjunction with members of other Academic Senate committees on Academic Senate Task Forces reviewing campus-wide or system-wide initiatives. Such external committees or task forces included:

- Review of the Joint UCEP and CCGA Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction – Nancy Byl ([Appendix 8](#))
- Review of the Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees – Philip Rosenthal ([Appendix 9](#))
- Review of the Proposed Modification to Academic Personnel Policies (APM) 220-18b, (4) {Advancement to Step VI and Above Scale} – Elyse Foster ([Appendices 10](#))
- Review of the Proposed Policy Regarding Pharmaceutical Vendor Relations - Daniel Bikle ([Appendix 11](#))
- Task Force on Residency Requirements and Electronic Instruction for Graduate Programs – Patricia Robertson ([Appendix 12](#))

Presentations to the Faculty Council

The Committee benefited from a number of presentations given throughout the year. These presentations included:

- Monthly Reports from the Clinical Affairs Committee
  
  H. Quinn Cheng, SOM Faculty Council-CAC Liaison
• Chancellor’s Allocations of Discretionary Funds (November 11, 2006)
  Patricia Robertson, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

• Department of Medicine Retreat to Discuss Ambulatory Care (February 21, 2007)
  Mary Ellen Kleinhenz, Department of Medicine Retreat Planning Committee and (May 16, 2007)
  Robert Wachter, Professor, Hospital Medicine

• School of Medicine Dean’s Budget (March 21, 2007)
  Jed Shivers, Vice Dean, Administration and Finance, School of Medicine

• Campus Core Research Facilities (CCRF) (March 21, 2007)
  Keith Yamamoto, Executive Vice Dean, School of Medicine

• Bridge Funding (March 21, 2007)
  Keith Yamamoto, Executive Vice Dean, School of Medicine

• Proposal for $35 million from Proposition 1D Funds for TeleMedicine and PRIME-US (March 21, 2007)
  Doug Levy, Special Assistant to the Dean, School of Medicine

• Presentation and Discussion of the UCSF Comprehensive Cancer Center as a Model for Patient Care
  (March 21, 2007)
  Peter Carroll, MD, Director of Clinical Services and Strategic Support, UCSF Comprehensive Cancer Center and Margaret Tempero, MD, Deputy Director for Clinical Sciences, UCSF Comprehensive Cancer Center

• Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accreditation Steering Committee Institutional Proposal (March 21, 2007)
  David Irby, Vice Dean for Education, School of Medicine and (April 18, 2007) Sally Marshall, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs and Sergio Baranzini, Assistant Professor, Neurology

• Presentation on Global Health Initiatives at UCSF (May 16, 2007)
  George Rutherford, Director of the Institute for Global Health

Issues for the 2007-2008 Academic Year

School-wide Issues
  1. Monitor the implementation of campus programs and initiatives according to the priorities established in the UCSF Strategic plan.
  2. Identify existing gender issues and develop a plan to address these.
  3. Work to revise existing UCSF funding structures, including Medical Center strategic support to academic departments.
  4. Continue discussions related to conflicts of interest as related to tobacco funding and pharmaceutical vendors.
5. Discuss the role of Adjunct Professor series for UCSF faculty, including the implications of non-Senate status.

6. Improve understanding of UCSF Fresno programs and structures.

7. Participate in the budget review process for the School of Medicine and advocate for the incorporation of its priorities into the Academic Planning and Budget recommendations for the campus.

Clinical Faculty Issues

8. Continue the dialogue with Medical Center Administration, Dean’s Office, and Department Chairs regarding the ambulatory clinics and clinical faculty.

9. Continue to address the concerns of UCSF clinical faculty, in conjunction with the Clinical Affairs Committee.

10. Improve efficiency in staff and space resource allocation in the clinics.

Medical Education Issues

11. Discuss faculty teaching time and allocation of FTEs across departments.

12. Discuss the School of Medicine curriculum including areas of concentration and links with Pathways; evaluation of early experiences in the new clerkships; trainee evaluation; as well as existing and new models for clinical education.
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Communication from the School of Medicine Faculty Council Chair
Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Chair

April 23, 2007

Jean Ann Seago, RN, PhD
Chair, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: School of Medicine Faculty Council Response to the Proposed Student Grievance Procedure Revisions, Version 5

Dear Chair Seago:

As requested in your letter dated March 21, 2007, the School of Medicine Faculty Council has reviewed version five of the proposed Student Grievance Procedure revisions. During its review of the document, the Faculty Council also considered the changes circulated by Vice Dean for Education David Irby to the Associate Deans of the Schools on April 13, 2007.

1. Appeal Procedure 1.4
Since the Standing Order of the Regents 105.2 (a) deems Academic Senate Faculty responsible for determining conditions for admission, recommending candidates for degrees, and developing coursework, it follows that the Academic Senate Faculty should also bear the responsibility for participating in the student dismissal process. The minor changes proposed by the Faculty Council reflect our interest in Senate consultation in the grievance procedure. We do not feel that this will unnecessarily prolong any procedure, and will provide involvement of a third party (the Academic Senate) in addition to the primary parties to the dismissal action (student and administration). We feel that Senate involvement in a consultative role will improve management of the student grievance procedure. Therefore, the Faculty Council recommends the removal of section 1.4 (Appeal Procedure) from the Procedure document.

Furthermore, to ensure that the grievance process is not solely under the jurisdiction of the School Administration, we recommend that the School Faculty Council participate in the process, as indicated below in italic type.

A. Formal Procedures 1.3 C. 1. For a Dismissal Grievance
We recommend adding the following wording: The Dean or Administrative Officer will convene an Ad Hoc Hearing Committee within a reasonable time in consultation with the School Faculty Council Chair.

B. Charge to the Ad Hoc Hearing Committee 1.31 A.
The Ad Hoc Hearing Committee shall be composed of three faculty members, one of whom represents the School Faculty Council, who are knowledgeable about student education but who have not been involved in the dismissal process or discrimination complaint, plus two students.

Although the representative of the School Faculty Council may not be currently serving on the Faculty Council, that person will be designated to communicate any aspect of the grievance process to the Faculty Council Chair as necessary.

C. Committee Report 1.33 D and E
We recommend adding a new item to this section which will read:

“D. If the student believes that the procedures were not followed correctly, s/he should so indicate in a written report to the Dean or Administrative Officer within 15 days after completion of the hearing or filing of the briefs. The Dean will then discuss the procedural complaint with the Chair of the School Faculty Council before making a final decision.”

The existing item D will then be renamed E in the Procedure.

E. Appeal Procedure 1.4
With the above additions in the document, the Faculty Council recommends removing section 1.4 Appeal Procedure.

2. Definition 1.1.E. Arbitrary and Capricious
The Faculty Council recommends that the definition of arbitrary and capricious be revised to read as follows: “Absence of rational connection between the facts and circumstances of the case and the choice made; an action not based upon consideration of relevant factors.”

The changes described above have also been indicated in the attached document using the tracked changes feature. Should you have any questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415)221-4810x3338 or Daniel.Bikle@ucsf.edu.

Sincerely,

Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD
Chair, School of Medicine Faculty Council

encl: Rules & Jurisdiction Working Draft Student Grievance Procedure v5 School of Medicine Faculty Council
Revisions 04.18.07

cc: School of Medicine Faculty Council Members
    Christopher Cullander, PhD, Associate Dean for Student and Curricular Affairs, School of Pharmacy
    Caroline Damsky, PhD, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, School of Dentistry
    Robert Day, PharmD, Associate Dean, School of Pharmacy
    Mary Engler, RN, PhD, Chair, School of Nursing Faculty Council
    Dorrie Fontaine, RN, PhD, FAAN, Associate Dean, Academic Programs, School of Nursing
    David Irby, PhD, Vice Dean for Education, School of Medicine
    Helene Lipton, PhD, Chair, School of Pharmacy Faculty Council
    Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, Chair, School of Dentistry Faculty Council
    Dorothy Perry, PhD, Associate Dean for Education, School of Dentistry
APPENDIX VII DIVISIONAL PROCEDURE FOR STUDENT GRIEVANCE IN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
(As passed by the Representative Assembly of the S. F. Division on October 18, 1977)

1.0 PURPOSE
The purpose of this procedure is to allow for the timely resolution of student grievances related to academic dismissals and allegations of unlawful discrimination.

1.1 DEFINITIONS

A. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS - broadly defined to include all the competencies (knowledge, skills, and professional behaviors) that must be mastered in order to demonstrate satisfactory performance in all the requisite standards of the curriculum.

B. AD HOC HEARING COMMITTEE – Three faculty and two students.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER – Dean or designee of the Dean to represent the School or Graduate Division and the University. If the student is registered in the Graduate Division, the Administrative Officer is the Dean or designee of the Dean of the Graduate Division. If the student is not registered in the Graduate Division, the Administrative Officer is the Dean or designee of the Dean of the School in which the student is registered.

D. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REPRESENTATION - for technical assistance to all participants in unlawful discrimination complaints.

E. ARBITRARY and CAPRICIOUS- Absence of a rational connection between the facts and circumstances of the case and the choice made; an action not based upon consideration of relevant factors.

F. BRIEF – A concise, written summary of facts and arguments in a case.

G. DAYS - The term "days" means working days based on UCSF's academic and administrative calendar.

H. EMPLOYEE - an individual employed by the University, including a faculty member.

I. GRADUATE DIVISION- encompasses all graduate academic degree programs and all graduate students in the Schools. This entity has the responsibility for the administration of graduate degree programs. The Dean of the Graduate Division is the institutional official responsible for the administration of UCSF affairs in accordance with academic policies established by the Academic Senate and the Graduate Council.

J. OPPOSING PARTY – for grievances involving unlawful discrimination, employee who is alleged to have engaged in the unlawful discrimination.

K. PARTIES – The grievant and the University's representative for academic dismissals or Opposing Party (employee) for unlawful discrimination grievances.

L. PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE - such evidence that, when weighed against that opposed, has more convincing force and the greater probability of truth.

M. PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE- a meeting of relevant parties that occurs prior to the hearing in order to agree upon the specific issues to be decided by the Ad Hoc Hearing Committee and procedural matters such as hearing schedule and duration, exchange and order of witnesses and documents, and other evidentiary matters.

N. PROVISION OF GRIEVANCE INFORMATION - this grievance procedure is designed for all student grievances except those specifically described in Section V, "Student Conduct and Discipline", in the University of California's Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students, revised 10/29/73, pages 5-7. The Student Affairs Office of the School in which the student is registered, or the Graduate Division if the student is registered in the Graduate Division, is charged with the responsibility for evaluating the nature of students' grievances and for advising students on the proper course of action. If the alleged grievance involves allegation of any kind of discrimination, the Affirmative Action Office shall thereafter be actively involved in all review processes to provide technical assistance.

O. REPRESENTATION - assistance to grievant in formal hearing process. May be of one or more of these types:
   1. NON-LEGAL REPRESENTATION - any person without legal training.
   2. LEGAL COUNSEL - includes attorneys and individuals with legal training.

P. SCHOOL-one of the professional schools.

Q. STUDENT - must either be currently registered as a student at a campus of the University, or have been enrolled at the time of the alleged infraction.

R. UNIVERSITY-University of California

1.2 INFORMAL PROCESS
Informal Process for Unlawful Discrimination Complaints that Do Not Involve an Academic Dismissal
A student who believes that the University or any administrative subdivision or employee thereof has discriminated against him/her and that such action has resulted in injury to the student is encouraged to attempt to resolve the matter informally with the party alleged to have committed the violation (e.g., course instructor), the head of the department or unit in which the alleged violation occurred, or both. An informal resolution of the grievance can occur at any time.
Informal Process for Academic Matters related to Academic Dismissal

Grievance procedures related to academic dismissal are appropriate only in cases in which the student believes bias or wrongdoing by a faculty member has occurred. Grievances are not the same as disagreements. A student cannot grieve an assigned grade, for example, merely because the student disagrees with the grade.

1.3 FORMAL PROCEDURES

Formal Procedure for Academic Dismissals and Unlawful Discrimination Complaints

In the event that informal resolution for a discrimination complaint is unsuccessful or the student has been dismissed, the student may lodge a formal grievance, as follows:

A. Within 20 days of the time at which the student is dismissed or could be reasonably expected to have knowledge of the alleged unlawful discrimination, the student may request the Dean of the Graduate Division (for any graduate student) or the Dean of the School (for non-graduate students) to conduct a formal review. This request must be made in writing. In the case of a graduate student, the Dean of the Graduate Division may request that the Dean of the School conduct the formal review. The Dean will appoint or assume the role of the Administrative Officer to conduct the formal review.

B. Within 15 days after the request for a formal review, the student will provide the Administrative Officer of the School or Graduate Division with a written complaint that includes the specific nature of the grievance, all pertinent supporting data and documents, and the nature of the action requested by the student to redress the grievance. In the case of a dismissal, the written complaint must explain concisely why the student believes the University’s decision was arbitrary and capricious, and should address each specific reason for the dismissal set forth in the dismissal notice.

C. After receiving the written complaint from the student, the Administrative Officer will take appropriate action depending upon the nature of the grievance.

1. For a Dismissal Grievance. The Administrative Officer will convene an Ad Hoc Hearing Committee within a reasonable time. The Administrative Officer will consult with the Faculty Council Chair to provide an opportunity for the Faculty Council to designate a representative to the Ad Hoc Review Committee (this representative would be one of the three faculty on the Committee).

2. For a Discrimination Grievance.
   a. The Administrative Officer will promptly provide the Opposing Party with the student's written complaint and will request a written response from the Opposing Party. Within 15 days after receiving the student's complaint, the Opposing Party will provide the Administrative Officer with a written response that will include information regarding all points raised in the student's written complaint and any other supporting data and documents.
   b. Upon receipt of the Opposing Party’s written response, the Administrative Officer will promptly provide a copy to the student.
   c. Within 15 days of the student’s receipt of the written response from the Opposing Party, the Administrative Officer will meet with the student and Opposing Party and attempt to resolve the grievance.
   d. If the grievance is not resolved within 15 days of the meeting, the student may request, in writing, that the Administrative Officer convene an Ad Hoc Hearing Committee.

D. Upon establishment of cause by either party to the grievance, the Dean of the School or the Graduate Division may grant reasonable extensions of the time limits specified in the procedure.

1.31 CHARGE TO THE AD HOC HEARING COMMITTEE

A. The Ad Hoc Hearing Committee shall be composed of three faculty members, one of whom must be from a different School, who are knowledgeable about student education but who have not been involved in the dismissal process or discrimination complaint, plus two students. These students will be selected by the Dean.

B. The Chair of the Committee is responsible for convening the hearing and informing the Parties of the procedures to be followed. The Committee Chair will handle all procedural matters during the pendency of the hearing.

C. The student and the Administrative Officer or Opposing Party must be present throughout the hearing(s), even when represented. Except for good cause, as determined by the Ad Hoc Hearing Committee, the failure of the student to appear in person at the hearing will be deemed a voluntary withdrawal of his/her complaint. The failure of the Administrative Officer or the Opposing Party to appear in person will result in postponement of the hearing until relevant parties can be present.

D. Each party is responsible for the presentation of his/her own position.

E. The student may have non-legal representation or legal counsel present during the hearing(s), at his/her own expense. (The School, Graduate Division, or Opposing Party will be represented by University counsel if the student retains legal counsel.) If the student retains legal counsel, he/she shall notify the Chair of the Ad Hoc Hearing Committee ten (10) days prior to the pre-hearing conference or twenty (20) days prior to the hearing.

F. The Committee, the student, the Administrative Officer, or the Opposing Party may request that other parties present relevant information either in writing or in person at the hearing. The Committee will determine which information is relevant.

G. The Committee may, at its discretion, request that an attorney from the Office of the General Counsel be appointed to provide independent legal counsel to the Committee. This attorney shall not vote in the Committee’s deliberation process.

H. The Hearing will ordinarily be held within forty-five (45) days of receipt of the student request to conduct a formal review (as defined in Section 1.3.A.). Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties (as defined in Section 1.1) and the Chair of the Committee, the student and his/her advocate(s), if any, will meet at least fifteen (15) days prior to the Hearing at a pre-hearing conference with the Committee Chair. The Parties and the advocates will meet to agree upon the specific issues to be decided by the Committee as well as procedural matters such as hearing schedule and duration, exchange and order of witnesses and documents, and other evidentiary and procedural matters.
Absent a showing of good cause, these issues will be limited to the reasons stated in the written notice of dismissal and the student’s written response to the notice of dismissal. If the parties are unable to reach an agreement on the issues to be decided, the Committee Chair will determine the issues to be reviewed.

I. At least seven (7) days prior to the Hearing, or at another date agreed to by the Parties and the Chair of the Committee, all documents to be introduced as evidence at the hearing and names of all witnesses shall be exchanged. With the exception of rebuttal witnesses and documents used in rebuttal, any witnesses not named and documents not exchanged seven days before the hearing may, at the Committee Chair’s discretion, be excluded from the Hearing.

J. Unless the student and all involved employees of the University agree to an open hearing, the hearing will be closed. All materials, reports and other evidence introduced and recorded during the course of a closed proceeding may not be disclosed until the final resolution of the complaint except as may be required by applicable law. The Parties and advocates will at all times have the right to attend the hearing but witnesses shall appear only during their testimony. If the grievance involves allegation of unlawful discrimination, the Committee will accept evidence and comments by a representative of the Affirmative Action Office.

K. The hearing will provide an opportunity for each party to present evidence and to cross-examine witnesses. The Committee Chair has broad discretion regarding the admissibility and weight of evidence and is not bound by federal or state rules of evidence. The Committee Chair will rule on all questions of procedure and evidence and has the right to limit rebuttal evidence at his/her discretion.

L. The hearing will be audio recorded by the University unless both parties agree to share the cost of a court reporter, or one party elects to pay the entire cost for the court reporter in order to have a transcript for its own use, in which case the other side may purchase a copy of the transcript for half the cost of the court reporter and transcription, plus any copy costs. The student may listen to the audio recording and may purchase a copy of it. The Dean will be the custodian of the audio recording and/or any stenographic records and will retain the recording for five (5) years from the time the Dean’s decision becomes final.

M. In the case of the dismissal, the student has the burden to prove by a preponderance of evidence (documentary and testimonial) that the dismissal was arbitrary and capricious. In the case of unlawful discrimination, the student has the burden to prove by a preponderance of evidence that the alleged unlawful discrimination occurred and to describe the remedy sought.

1.32 AGENDA FOR THE HEARING

   A. Review of Rules of Procedure
   B. Student will present a statement of grievance, additional remarks and desired outcome.
   C. Committee seeks clarification and more facts if necessary.
   D. Administrative Officer or Opposing Party will present a response to grievance, additional remarks and desired outcome.
   E. Committee seeks clarification and more facts if necessary.
   F. Presentation of witness(es) for student and their cross-examination.
   G. Committee seeks clarification and more facts if necessary.
   H. Presentation of witness(es) for the University or Opposing Party and their cross-examination.
   I. Committee seeks clarification and more facts if necessary.
   J. Closing statements from both parties, beginning with student.
   K. At the discretion of the Committee, briefs may be submitted. The Committee Chair will determine the appropriate briefing schedule (if any), and if appropriate, reasonable extensions to the hearing.

1.33 COMMITTEE REPORT

   A. The Committee will meet and submit a written report to the Administrative Officer no later than 15 days after the hearing is completed or briefs are filed.
   B. In the case of academic dismissal, the report shall contain findings of fact and will recommend to the Dean to uphold or not to uphold the dismissal. The report will recommend upholding the dismissal if the Committee finds that the student has not met his/her burden to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the School’s decision was arbitrary and capricious. In the case of unlawful discrimination, the report shall contain findings of fact as to whether the alleged discrimination occurred and recommendations for a remedy if appropriate.
   C. Lack of Committee consensus of final recommendation may be accompanied by a majority and a minority report. Each Committee member will sign the report to which he/she subscribes.
   D. Upon establishment of cause by either party to the grievance, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Hearing Committee may grant reasonable extensions of the time limits specified in the procedure.

1.34 DISPOSITION OF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

   A. The Committee will present its written report to the Dean. The Dean will accept the report, remand it back to the Committee for further consideration or reject the report. The recommendations of the Committee are advisory to the Dean, whose decision is final. The Dean will inform the Ad Hoc Hearing Committee of his/her decision. In the case of a student registered in the Graduate Division, the convening Dean shall forward a copy of the final recommendation to the other relevant Dean.
   B. Within 15 days of the decision, the Dean will transmit the decision and/or recommendations to the student and the person/group responsible for its implementation.
   C. The student, Administrative Officer or Opposing Party will receive a copy of the report and recommendations.
   D. Recorded grievance proceedings, the petition and other material will be kept in a locked file in the Dean’s office for five years.

---

1.4 GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE REVIEW

A grievance procedure review may be initiated by the student if he/she is not satisfied that the grievance procedures were
followed. The student should contact the Graduate Division or the Student Affairs Office of the School in which he/she is registered for counseling about the grievance procedure review. **The student shall be advised that this grievance procedure review is a procedural review to determine whether the procedure set forth in Section 1.3 was followed. This grievance procedure review does not review the merits of the grievance or the findings of the Ad Hoc Committee.**

1.40 Within ten (10) days after receiving the Dean’s decision, the student must provide the Chair of the Academic Senate with (1) a written statement specifically citing the procedures set forth in Section 1.3 that the student alleges the University did not follow and (2) all pertinent supporting data and documents. The Chair of the Academic Senate may dismiss the request for review if the student does not comply with the requirements of this section.

1.41 Within ten (10) days after receiving the written request for review and supporting data and documents, the Chair of the Academic Senate will forward a copy of the student’s written request for review and supporting data and documents to the Dean of the School or Graduate Division in which the original grievance was conducted. Within ten (10) days after receipt of the student’s written request for review and supporting data and documents, the Dean will provide a written response to the Chair of the Academic Senate.

1.42 Within ten (10) days after receiving the Dean’s written response, the Chair of the Academic Senate will provide a copy of the response to the student and request that the Chair of the Committee on Committees appoint a three (3) member Senate Ad Hoc Grievance Procedure Review Committee. The members will be selected from a list of Academic Senate members designated at the beginning of the academic year for service on such Senate Ad Hoc Grievance Procedure Review Committees. If a representative from the University's Affirmative Action Office has participated in any phase of the grievance procedure thus far, the Senate Ad Hoc Grievance Procedure Review Committee is charged with seeking continuing staff assistance from the Affirmative Action Office.

1.43 Within ten (10) days after its constitution, the Senate Ad Hoc Grievance Procedure Review Committee will meet to review and decide whether the University followed the procedure set forth in Section 1.3.

1.44 For good cause, the Chair of the Academic Senate may grant reasonable extensions of the time limits specified in the grievance procedure review.

1.45 Senate Ad Hoc Grievance Procedure Review Committee Report

   A. Within ten (10) days after meeting to review the procedures, the Senate Ad Hoc Grievance Procedure Review Committee will submit a written report to the Chair of the Academic Senate.

   B. Lack of Committee consensus may be accompanied by a majority and a minority report. Each Committee member will sign the report to which he/she subscribes.

1.46 DISPOSITION OF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

   A. Within two (2) days after receiving the report, the Chair of the Academic Senate will transmit the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Grievance Procedure Review Committee to the Dean of the School or Graduate Division.

   B. Within fifteen (15) days after receiving the report, the Dean may accept, reject, or modify the Committee’s recommended actions.

   C. Parties to the complaint and their representatives shall be immediately notified in writing of the Dean's decision and be provided a copy of the report from the Senate Ad Hoc Grievance Procedure Review Committee. The Dean's decision is final and concludes the grievance procedures.

   D. Recorded proceedings, the petition and other material will be kept in a locked file for 5 years by the Office of the Academic Senate.

[en 18, October 1977] [rev June 21, 2007]
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COMMUNICATION FROM THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
FACULTY COUNCIL
Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Chair

September 26, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: Faculty Council Response to “UCSF – Strategic Planning Phase III, Strategy Development”

Dear Chair Greenspan:

The School of Medicine Faculty Council reviewed the document “UCSF – Strategic Planning Phase III, Strategy Development” and suggests that the following issues be considered:

Campus Issues
• Concern over focus on community and global health with less attention on the research that has shaped UCSF to be the institution that it is.
• The goals need to be more specific about the mission of the Medical Center and of the University, and have an explicit link to teaching.
• Explicit statement that buildings should be built and used for the needs of the campus, rather than driven by donor specifications.
• Increase language related to inter-school communication.

Faculty
• Ensure that Clinical and Adjunct Faculty are represented in the Strategic Planning process by recommending non-Senate faculty to serve on the Teams listed in the document.
• Work-life balance issues should be addressed including campus housing, work-life balance, balance among professional missions.
• Rewards and recognition for faculty for collaborative work.
• Consideration of recognition and rewards for faculty who prefer to specialize in clinical care, education or research, rather than trying to balance all three.

Education
• No specific goal related to education. Rewrite Goal #3 or create a new Goal to include appropriate balance of effort between research, teaching, clinical activities and university service. This issue could be addressed by Team A. (Also related to Goal #9.) (See below.)
• Team C (Education) needs to better address the core values of excellence and education. Specific language should include a reference to the need for better facilities and support for teaching.

Recommended Goals
1. Balancing Faculty Responsibilities
Goal: Provide a work environment that enables and rewards the desired balance of each faculty member for research, teaching, clinical activities, and university service.
Questions:

a. How best can the needs and desires of the individual faculty person be aligned with the needs of the department, school, and campus?
b. What resources can be found to adequately reward teaching, clinical care in the non procedure oriented specialties, and university service?
c. How best can collaborative research, teaching, patient care, and university service be recognized for promotion?

2. Education Goal for UCSF Strategic Planning Process
Goal: Foster a vibrant and innovative educational community at UCSF.
Questions:

a. What educational facilities are needed to promote exceptional teaching and learning?
b. What would a futuristic learning environment (smart classrooms, simulation and clinical skills centers, etc.) look like?
c. Where should a teaching and learning commons be located (e.g., Parnassus or Mission Bay)? What should be included in such a building (e.g., classrooms, simulation center, informal gathering areas, student services, faculty services, library learning center, etc)?
d. What infrastructure is needed to create educational excellence (information technology, educational technology, wireless networks, teleconferencing, telemedicine, classroom support services, student support services)?
e. How can we create a learner-centered educational environment?
f. What incentives can be used to enhance the educational mission of the university (educational innovations funding, academy network, support for teaching and mentoring)?
g. How do we encourage interdisciplinary and interschool education, global health and health disparities?

Recommendations for Strategic Planning Team Members
Team A: Recruitment and Retention: David Wofsy, Alma Martinez, Eliseo Perez-Stable, Stan Glantz, Mary Croughan
Team B: Research: Keith Yamamoto, Dan Lowenstein, Dina Halme, John Kane, Robert Nissenson
Team C: Education: Rebecca Jackson, Susan Masters, Lowell Tong, Tim Kelley, Bobby Baron, Kevin Grumbach, Molly Cooke, Glenn Chertow
Team D: Clinical: Peter Carol, Ken Fye, Quinn Cheng
Team E: Infrastructure: Kevin Souza, Manny Pardo, Ron Arenson, Heidi Schmidt
Team F: Leadership: Nancy Milliken, Larry Pitts, Dan Bikle

Sincerely,

The School of Medicine Faculty Council
Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Chair
Elyse Foster, MD, Vice Chair
Bobby Baron, MD
Quinn Cheng, MD
Neal Cohen, MD, MPH, MS
Cynthia Curry, MD
COMMUNICATION FROM THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
FACULTY COUNCIL
Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Chair

November 20, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: Formal Name Change Request for the Department of Otolaryngology

Dear Chair Greenspan:

The School of Medicine Faculty Council reviewed the Formal Name Change Request submitted by the Department of Otolaryngology at its November 15, 2006 meeting. The Council voted to approve the new Department Name as requested, “Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery”.

Should you have any questions on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

School of Medicine Faculty Council
Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Chair
Elyse Foster, MD, Vice Chair
Bobby Baron, MD
Quinn Cheng, MD
Neal Cohen, MD, MPH, MS
Cynthia Curry, MD
Joan Etzell, MD
Harry Hollander, MD
David Irby, PhD
Rebecca Jackson, MD
Krysia Lindan, MD, MSc
Michael Peterson, MD
Lawrence Pitts, MD
Aliya Qayyum, MD
Patricia Robertson, MD
Mark Wilson, MD
### Summary

#### Chancellor Response to Academic Senate RE: 2006-07 Campus Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>APB Rank</th>
<th>Final Rank</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Final Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senate Supported Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Course Preparation, Review, &amp; Approval System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>$75,000 for one-time needs assessment and planning</td>
<td>Folded into greater OAAIS allocation. Request: $14 million over three years. Allocation: $3 million over three years. OAAIS requested $14 million for one-time and recurring costs over three years. The Chancellor allocated $1 million a year for three years in temporary support for IT staffing and planning costs, specifically inclusive of “high-priority projects such as the online course preparation, review and approval system.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Materials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>$150,000 as a permanent increase to the Library budget</td>
<td>$150,000 in “temporary, ongoing support.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Academic Senate Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$114,000 as a permanent budget increase</td>
<td>$120,000 in “temporary, ongoing support.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Fitness Facilities for SFGH and VA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Not funded. Referred to Millberry Programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Other Department Initiatives**             |          |            |                                                   |                                                                                    |
| State Utilities and OMP Shortfall            | No Rank  | 4.9        | $12,177,000                                       | $12,200,000 with additional reserves for minimum O&M costs for Mission Bay and other buildings. CP & FM will be directed to identify energy-saving programs. (APB recommended a campus-wide task force to identify alternative energy and conservation possibilities.) |
| Administrative Systems Advisory Committee (ASAC) Strategic Plan | 5        | 4.7        | $3.7 to $4.1 million                              | $4.1 million (funded as requested) |
| Academic and Administrative Information Systems (OAAIS) | 5        | 4.7        | $7.5 million for Administrative needs; Total $14 million combined over three years | Administrative: $250,000 for one-time PeopleSoft conversion and $500,000 in project and planning costs. Academic: $1 million a year for three years ($3MM) |
| A-21/CAS Relief                              | 5        | 4.3        | $1,530,000                                        | $1,530,000 (funded as requested) |
| Mission Bay Operations and Start-Up          | 1        | 4          | $8,183,000 in Chancellor’s support                | To be funded as requested pending final review by the Budget office. |
| University-Community Partnership Program     | 5        | 3.6        | $175,400                                          | Additional $175,400 allocated (funded as requested) |
| Campus Core Research Facilities              | 4        | 3.4        | $4.2 million over three years                     | Not funded. (More detailed plan required for consideration.) |
| Global Health Sciences                       | 4        | 2.7        | $1.7 million for 06-07; $4.9 million total over three years | $1 million per year in temporary support for three years ($3MM). (Consistent with APB recommendation to fund at 60% of request.) |
COMMUNICATION FROM THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
FACULTY COUNCIL
Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Chair

April 19, 2007

Patricia Robertson, MD
Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: Faculty Council Support for the Campus Core Research Facilities Initiative and the Bridge Funding Initiative

Dear Chair Robertson:

At the March 21, 2007 meeting of the School of Medicine Faculty Council, Vice Dean Keith Yamamoto presented information regarding the Campus Core Research Facilities Initiative (CCRF) and the Bridge Funding Initiative. After hearing the presentations, the Faculty Council voted unanimously to support both initiatives and recommends that the funding should be available to faculty from all series.

The Faculty Council hopes that the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget will take into consideration its support for these initiatives when reviewing the Requests to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds for 2007-2008.

Sincerely,

The School of Medicine Faculty Council
Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Chair
Elyse Foster, MD, Vice Chair
Bobby Baron, MD
Quinn Cheng, MD
Neal Cohen, MD, MPH, MS
Cynthia Curry, MD
Joan Etzell, MD
Harry Hollander, MD

David Irby, PhD
Rebecca Jackson, MD
Krysia Lindan, MD, MSc
Michael Peterson, MD
Lawrence Pitts, MD
Aliya Qayyum, MD
Patricia Robertson, MD
Mark Wilson, MD
Existent Technical Standards: All candidates for the MD Degree must have abilities and skills of five varieties including observation; communication; motor; conceptual, integrative and quantitative; and behavioral and social attributes. Technological compensation can be made in certain areas but a candidate should be able to perform in a reasonably independent manner. The use of a trained intermediary means that a candidate's judgment must be mediated by someone else's power of selection and observation. Determination of the following will be made at the Executive Board level and not preclude interviews if an applicant is otherwise found to be eligible.

Introduction

The MD degree is a broad undifferentiated degree attesting to general knowledge in medicine and the basic skills required for the practice of medicine. Essential abilities and characteristics required for completion of the MD degree consist of certain minimum physical and cognitive abilities and sufficient mental and emotional stability to assure that candidates for admission, promotion, and graduation are able to complete the entire course of study and participate fully in all aspects of medical training. The School of Medicine intends for its graduates to become competent and compassionate physicians who are capable of entering residency training (graduate medical education) and meeting all requirements for medical licensure. The avowed intention of an individual student to practice only a narrow part of clinical medicine, or to pursue a non-clinical career, does not alter the requirement that all medical students take and achieve competence in the full curriculum required by the faculty. For purposes of this document and unless otherwise defined, the term "candidate" means candidates for admission to medical school as well as enrolled medical students who are candidates for promotion and graduation.

The School of Medicine has an ethical responsibility for the safety of patients with whom students and graduates will come in contact. Although students learn and work under the supervision of the faculty, students interact with patients throughout their medical school education. Patient safety and well-being are therefore major factors in establishing requirements involving the physical, cognitive, and emotional abilities of candidates for admission, promotion, and graduation. The essential abilities and characteristics described herein are also referred to as technical (or non-academic) standards. They are described below in several broad categories including: observation; communication; motor function; intellectual-conceptual, integrative, and quantitative abilities; and social and behavioral skills. In addition to these, candidates must have the physical and emotional stamina to function in a competent manner in settings that may involve heavy workloads and stressful situations.

Delineation of technical standards is required for the accreditation of U.S. medical schools by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education. The following abilities and characteristics are defined as technical standards, which in conjunction with academic standards established by the faculty, are requirements for admission, promotion, and graduation. Individuals who are currently impaired by alcohol or other substances are not suitable candidates for admission, promotion, or graduation.

Technical Standards

Existing Technical Standards 1. Observation: The candidate must be able to observe demonstrations and experiments in the basic sciences, including but not limited to physiologic and pharmacologic demonstrations in animals, microbiologic cultures, and microscopic studies of microorganisms and tissues in normal and pathologic states. A candidate must be able to observe a patient accurately at a distance and close at hand. Observation necessitates the functional use of the sense of vision and somatic sensation.
OBSERVATION: Candidates must be able to observe demonstrations and participate in experiments of science, including but not limited to such things as dissection of cadavers; examination of specimens in anatomy, pathology, and neuroanatomy laboratories; and microscopic study of microorganisms and tissues in normal and pathologic states. Candidates must be able to accurately observe patients and assess findings. They must be able to obtain a medical history and perform a complete physical examination in order to integrate findings based on these observations and to develop an appropriate diagnostic and treatment plan. These skills require the use of vision, hearing, and touch or the functional equivalent.

EXISTING TECHNICAL STANDARDS 2. Communication: A candidate should be able to speak, to hear and to observe patients in order to elicit information, describe changes in mood, activity and posture, and perceive nonverbal communications. A candidate must be able to communicate effectively and sensitively with patients. Communication includes not only speech but reading and writing. The candidate must be able to communicate effectively and efficiently in oral and written form with all members of the health care team.

II. COMMUNICATION: Candidates must be able to communicate effectively and efficiently with patients, their families, and members of the health care team. They must be able to obtain a medical history in a timely fashion, interpret non-verbal aspects of communication, and establish therapeutic relationships with patients. Candidates must be able to record information accurately and clearly; and communicate effectively in English with other health care professionals in a variety of patient settings.

EXISTING TECHNICAL STANDARDS 3. Motor: Candidates should have sufficient motor function to elicit information from patients by palpation, auscultation, percussion, and other diagnostic maneuvers. A candidate should be able to do basic laboratory tests (urinalysis, CBC, etc.), carry out diagnostic procedures (proctoscopy, paracentesis, etc.) and read electrocardiograms and radiographs (x-rays). A candidate should be able to execute motor movements reasonably required to provide general care and emergency treatment to patients. Examples of emergency treatment reasonably required of physicians are cardiopulmonary resuscitation, the administration of intravenous medication, the application of pressure to stop bleeding, the opening of obstructed airways, the suturing of simple wounds, and the performance of simple obstetrical maneuvers. Such actions require coordination of both gross and fine muscular movements, equilibrium and functional use of the senses of touch and vision.

III. MOTOR FUNCTION: Candidates must possess the capacity to perform physical examinations and diagnostic maneuvers. They must be able to respond to clinical situations in a timely manner and provide general and emergency care. Such activities require adequate functional physical mobility and coordination of both gross and fine motor neuromuscular function. They must adhere to universal precaution measures and meet safety standards applicable to inpatient and outpatient settings and other clinical activities.

EXISTING TECHNICAL STANDARDS 4. Intellectual-Conceptual, Integrative and Quantitative Abilities: These abilities include measurement, calculation, reasoning, analysis, and synthesis. Problem solving, the critical skill demanded of physicians, requires all of these intellectual abilities. In addition, the candidate should be able to comprehend three dimensional relationships and to understand the spatial relationships of structures.

IV. INTELLECTUAL-CONCEPTUAL, INTEGRATIVE, AND QUANTITATIVE ABILITIES: Candidates must have sufficient cognitive (mental) abilities and effective learning techniques to assimilate the detailed and complex information presented in the medical student curriculum. They must be able to learn through a variety of modalities including, but not limited to, classroom instruction; small group, team and collaborative activities; individual study; preparation and presentation of reports; and use of computer technology. Candidates must be able to memorize, measure, calculate, reason, analyze, synthesize, and transmit information across modalities. They must recognize and draw conclusions about three-dimensional spatial relationships and logical sequential relationships among events. They must be able to formulate and
test hypotheses that enable effective and timely problem-solving in diagnosis and treatment of patients in a variety of clinical modalities.

EXISTING TECHNICAL STANDARDS 5. Behavioral and Social Attributes: Candidate must possess the emotional health required for full utilization of their intellectual abilities, the exercise of good judgment, the prompt completion of all responsibilities attendant to the diagnosis and care of patients, and the development of mature, sensitive and effective relationships with patients. Candidates must be able to tolerate physically taxing workloads and to function effectively under stress. They must be able to adapt to changing environments, to display flexibility and to learn to function in the face of uncertainties inherent in the clinical problems of many patients. Compassion, integrity, concern for others, interpersonal skills, interest and motivation are all personal qualities that should be assessed during the admission process.

V. BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL ATTRIBUTES: Candidates must demonstrate the maturity and emotional stability required for full use of their intellectual abilities. They must accept responsibility for learning, exercising good judgment, and promptly completing all responsibilities attendant to the diagnosis and care of patients. They must understand the legal and ethical aspects of the practice of medicine and function within both the law and ethical standards of the medical profession. Candidates must be able to interact with patients, their families, and health care personnel in a courteous, professional, and respectful manner. They must be able to tolerate physically taxing workloads and long work hours, to function effectively under stress, and to display flexibility and adaptability to changing environments. Candidates must be able to contribute to collaborative, constructive learning environments; accept constructive feedback from others; and take personal responsibility for making appropriate positive changes.

Criminal background checks may be conducted as part of the process of admission, participation, promotion, and/or graduation.

ABILITY TO MEET THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE'S TECHNICAL STANDARDS
The School of Medicine intends for its students and graduates to become competent and compassionate physicians who are capable of entering residency training (graduate medical education) and meeting all requirements for medical licensure.

Equal Access to the School of Medicine's Educational Program
The University of California does not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities who apply for admission to the MD degree program or who are enrolled as medical students. Otherwise qualified individuals shall not be excluded from admission or participation in the School of Medicine's educational programs and activities solely by reason of their disability or medical condition. The School of Medicine provides reasonable accommodation in its academic programs to qualified individuals with disabilities. A reasonable accommodation is one that does not require substantial program modification or lower academic standards. Learning disabilities are included under this policy.

Should a candidate have or develop a condition that would place patients or others at risk or that would jeopardize his or her ability to complete medical student education and pursue residency training and licensure, the candidate may be denied admission or may be dismissed from school. Should a candidate have or develop a disability that poses a significant risk to health and safety of patients, self, or others that cannot be eliminated with a reasonable accommodation, the candidate may be denied admission or may be dismissed from school.
It is the responsibility of a student with a disability, or a student who develops a disability, and who wants an accommodation to notify the Office of Student Life of the disability, and to provide adequate documentation of the general nature and extent of the disability and the functional limitations to be accommodated. A student who has or develops any chronic disease or condition will be expected to seek and continue in the care of a qualified health care provider.

The Dean's Office will work in conjunction with the Office of Student Life’s disability coordinator in evaluating and responding to all requests. In the event that additional documentation is required regarding the nature and extent of a disability, the School of Medicine may require that a student undergo an evaluation by experts for purposes of determining whether the candidate, with or without accommodation, is able to meet these technical standards.

For Completion by All Candidates:
Are you capable of meeting the School of Medicine's Technical Standards?
Yes
No

Reminder to All Candidates:
If at any time you require a reasonable accommodation to obtain equal access to the School of Medicine's educational program, as stated above, it is your responsibility to notify the Office of Student Life of the disability, preferably in writing, and to provide adequate documentation of the nature and extent of the disability and the functional limitations to be accommodated.

By signing below you certify that you have read and understand these standards and have answered the question above correctly.
(Please print full name)
(Please sign and date)
Acknowledgement

This document was developed and based upon consultation with experienced medical educators throughout the state and careful review and discussion of the technical standards and guidelines in effect at California's public and private medical schools in 2003-04.
Communication from Task Force Reviewing Joint University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction

Henry Sanchez, MD, Chair

December 1, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: Suggestions for Divisional Response to the Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction

Dear Chair Greenspan:

The Task Force to Review and Recommend Comment to the Joint Universitywide Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction, consisting of one member of the Committee on Educational Policy (Chair), one member of the Graduate Council, one member of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, and representatives of the Faculty Councils of the Schools of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy met to review the Proposal and to suggest a possible response from the San Francisco Division.

The Task Force supports the effort to clarify and strengthen the role of Graduate Students within the University of California by creating a uniform policy across campuses. This Proposal is an important step toward this goal, however, we are concerned that Graduate Students should receive adequate oversight, supervision and support while teaching at the University. To that end, we make the following recommendations for the response from the San Francisco Division:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The document should clearly define the faculty role in supporting Graduate Students in University Instruction, ensuring that the language is consistent throughout the document.
2. The document should include a process for faculty to record their supervision of the Graduate Student in their role as an instructor.
3. The document should delineate Graduate Student teaching responsibilities in their capacities as Graduate Teaching Assistants or Graduate Teaching Fellows.
4. The document should include a method to list both the Instructor of Record and the Graduate Teaching Assistant in the Course Catalog to prevent a misrepresentation of the actual instructor of the course to potential students.

5. The document should clearly differentiate the responsibilities for grading and entering student grades, particularly between the Graduate Teaching Assistant and Graduate Teaching Fellow categories.

6. The document should clarify that the Instructor of Record will have ultimate responsibility for the student grades.

7. The document should clearly state that a Post-Doctoral Fellow may not supervise a Graduate Teaching Fellow as the Instructor of Record.

8. The document should clearly state that the Academic Senate Divisions should not be able to override the need for faculty supervision of the Graduate Teaching Assistants and Graduate Teaching Fellows.

9. The document should define how the University should act if a Graduate Student becomes a Graduate Teaching Fellow without the specified qualifications.

To better understand the proposed changes, we also recommend generating a table to compare and contrast the existing criteria for Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Instructors with the proposed criteria for the Graduate Teaching Assistant and Graduate Teaching Fellow categories.

We recognize the importance of training Graduate Students as future academicians. To support both Graduate Students and Faculty Members in this process, it is essential to create a clear and uniform policy for Graduate Students in university instruction. We hope that the suggestions presented here will help strengthen the proposed document.

Sincerely,

Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Comment to the Joint Universitywide Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)
Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction
Henry Sanchez, MD, Committee on Educational Policy, Chair of the Task Force
Richard Shafer, PhD, Graduate Council
Paul Green, PhD, Academic Planning and Budget
Daniel Fried, PhD, School of Dentistry
Nancy Byl, PhD, PT, School of Medicine
Nancy Donaldson, RN, DNS, School of Nursing
Cathi Dennehy, PharmD, School of Pharmacy
Communication from the Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional Response to the Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees
Lisa Kroon, PharmD, Chair

November 20, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: Recommendations for Divisional Response to the Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees

Dear Chair Greenspan,

The Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional response to the Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees, consisting of one Member of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (Chair) and representatives selected by the Faculty Councils of each of the four schools, met on November 20, 2006 to review these Proposed Guiding Principles and to suggest a possible response from the San Francisco Division. Norman Oppenheimer served on this Task Force on behalf of the School of Pharmacy, who is also reviewing and commenting on these Guiding Principles in his role as the UCSF representative to the systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). The Task Force makes the following recommendations for a response from the San Francisco Division.

1. The first sentence of the second bullet point is currently worded to address revenue from student fee increases, but not the current fees themselves. The Task Force recommends that this sentence be modified to read as follows: “Revenue from future professional school fees and fee increases approved by the Regents should be used...”

2. Overall, the Task Force’s primary concern with these Guiding Principles is the issue of distribution. The Task Force believes that funds from student fees should not be distributed to the Chancellor, but directly and proportionately back to the Schools. The Task Force recommends that the first sentence of the second bullet point be further modified to read: “Revenue from future professional school fees and fee increases approved by the Regents should be used by the Schools to maintain and enhance...” In more practical terms, the Task Force recommends that funds not be returned to the Chancellors, but to the Deans.

3. The second overall concern the Task Force has with these Guiding Principles is the issue of transparency. The campuses, administration, faculty, and students should have an idea how these fees are being used by the University of California. Included in these Guiding Principles should be the manner in which the funds from student fees are applied—proportions used for student aid and proportions used for faculty support.
4. In bullet point five, the Task Force finds the reference to “salary and non-salary price increases” to be too vague and recommends clarification for these price increases. The Task Force considers this to be another issue of transparency. Furthermore, the Task Force recommends that the reference to “Chancellors” here be changed to “the Schools” (… “the Schools may request approval of a supplemental increase in the fee for a particular program…”).

5. In Guiding Principle bullet point three, describing the factors to be taken into account when setting professional school fees, the Task Force is again concerned with distribution of fees collected. The Task Force recommends that this bullet point include a more concrete expression of commitment to recruiting quality junior faculty and providing competitive support. Specifically to UCSF, recruitment of junior faculty is severely disadvantaged by the cost of living factor and the inability of UCSF to provide sufficient housing support for new faculty and their families. The professional school fee structure should take into account not only factors of enrollment and faculty compensation, but also competitive student-to-faculty ratios. Currently at UCSF, the student-to-faculty ratio is not comparable among the four Health Sciences professional schools (e.g., the School of Pharmacy is 11:1 and the School of Medicine is 3.5:1); this disparity further limits schools to sustain academic quality when increasing student enrollment and should be addressed.

6. Regarding the comparable nature of UC professional school fees for California residents to the in-state rates charged by peer institutions described in bullet point four, the Task Force raised concerns regarding the amount of fees returning to the students (who are applying to these schools) in the form of financial aid. Even if UC fees were set at a lower level, it would remain difficult to recruit top students who are offered a “free ride” at our competitive institutions. In the health sciences, the current fee structure has resulted in a situation in which it is less expensive for a laboratory to hire post doctoral students than to hire graduate students. Furthermore, UC fees may, at first glance of the data, appear competitive, however this does not take into account the disproportionately high cost of living in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The Task Force offers these final observations and general philosophy regarding Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees:

1. The Task Force believes that continued increases in student fees can negatively affect diversity and enrollment levels of underrepresented populations of California scholars.

2. The Task Force has concerns regarding the use of fees paid by some students to subsidize the tuition of others. While the Task Force maintains that the subsidizing of disadvantaged and underrepresented students is important and essential, it should not be the burden of other students, but such support should come from other sources, such as the State.

3. As a general philosophy, the Task Force believes that public education by the University of California for its citizens is a necessary infrastructure of the State and that faculty salaries should not necessarily be derived from student fees.

4. The comparably high fees for UC professional schools has, at least with anecdotal data, been having a detrimental effect on the recruitment of top candidates. Further increases to professional school fees will only increase the negative impact on recruitment quality and should be avoided.¹

The Task Force hopes you find this review and these recommendations helpful in forming a response from the San Francisco Division to the Academic Council.

¹ Point four was added by a vote of the Coordinating Committee, December 12, 2006, as a amendment to the original Communication from the Task Force.
Sincerely,

The Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional Response to the Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees

Lisa Kroon, PharmD, Chair of the Task Force, Member of Academic Planning and Budget
Sheila Brear, DDS, School of Dentistry
Phil Rosenthal, MD, School of Medicine
Marguerite Engler, PhD, RN, FAHA, School of Nursing
Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, School of Pharmacy
Communication from the Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional Response to Present Status of UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles and Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation and Proposed Modification to Academic Personnel Policies (APM) 220-18b, (4) - Advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale

Margaret Walsh, EdD, MS, Chair

November 21, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: Recommendations for Divisional Response to the Proposed Modifications to APM 220-18b, (4)

Dear Chair Greenspan,

The Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional response to the Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation and Proposed Modification to Academic Personnel Policies (APM) 220-18b(4) {Advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale}, consisted of one Member of the Committee on Academic Personnel (Chair), one member from the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, and Members of the Faculty Councils of each of the four schools. The Task Force met on November 21, 2006 to review these Proposed Guiding Principles and to suggest a possible response from the San Francisco Division. After extensive review and discussion, the Task Force makes the following recommendations for a response from the San Francisco Division.

Regarding Proposed Changes to APM 220
The Task Force supports the proposed modification to APM 220-18b(4). In addition, the Task Force reached a consensus that there should be some form of mid-career review of faculty, and there was some discussion as to whether or not Step 6 as a barrier step is the appropriate instrument for a mid-career review. The Task Force believes that before any decision is reached regarding the removal of Step 6 as a career review, there should be an investigation and collection of data regarding the demographic composition of faculty at Step 5 and Step 6, including number, gender, minority status, age, discipline, and campus. Additionally the Task Force recommends that data be collected and examined regarding trajectories, decelerations, and accelerations through the steps of the Professor rank. These data should be reviewed to ensure equitable advancement to Step 6 across campuses. This Task Force adds its support to the request for better data collection referenced in the cover letter dated August 28, 2006, from A. Norman, Chair of UCAP.

Regarding the Principles of UC Faculty Salary Compensation
The Task Force recommends that language be added to the first stated Principle (page 3) to read: “The UC system must set as its highest priority restoration of a competitive faculty compensation plan that is used by
all ten campuses. A competitive faculty compensation plan is necessary for both recruitment and retention of high-quality faculty.”

Regarding Principle four, the Task Force recommends that “by discipline” be stricken as that idea is contained in principle three.

Additionally, the Task Force recommends the addition of a sixth Principle: “Faculty salaries for those disciplines currently participating in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan should be covered equitably by the UC Defined Benefit Plan in a manner that is consistent and equitable with the percentage of other faculty salary scales, including off scale, Above Scale, and special scales such as Law or Engineering.”

**Regarding the Proposed Policy Recommendations**

For Policy Recommendations one and two, the Task Force recommends defining a schedule for “short term” and “long term.” This Task Force recommends two years for the short term policy and ten years for the long term policy.

**Regarding the Proposed Implementation Steps**

Implementation Step three references an ad hoc working group. If this group has not yet been formed, the Task Force recommends that such a group be formed within three months, and that this group produce a report for Academic Council and the campuses by the beginning of the 2007-08 academic year. If this ad hoc working group is already underway, the Task Force recommends that it produce a report by the end of this academic year (2006-07).

Finally, this Task Force requests that a footnote be added to the Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System: “The University of California at San Francisco was not included in the data reported regarding off-scale salaries. By the terms of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, the use of off-scale salaries is permitted only under extraordinary circumstances and only for a short term (two merit actions). At UCSF, the incidence of off-scale salaries is minimal, and the number of faculty appointments with off-scale salaries is less than ten.” According to the UCSF Director of the Office of Academic Personnel, at last count the number of UCSF faculty appointments with off-scale salaries was six.

The Task Force hopes you find this review and these recommendations helpful in forming a response from the San Francisco Division to the Academic Council.

Sincerely,

**The Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional Response to the Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees**

Margaret Walsh, EdD, MS, Chair of the Task Force, Committee on Academic Personnel
Kit Chesla, RN, DNSc, FAAN, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
Fritz Finzen, DDS, School of Dentistry Faculty Council
Elyse Foster, MD, School of Medicine Faculty Council
Robert Newcomer, PhD, School of Nursing Faculty Council
Helene Lipton, PhD, School of Pharmacy Faculty Council
Communication from the Task Force to Review the Proposed Guidelines Regarding Vendor Relations
Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Chair

May 9, 2007

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: Recommendations for Divisional Response to the Proposed Guidelines Regarding Vendor Relations

Dear Chair Greenspan:

The Task Force to Review and Recommend Divisional Response to the Proposed Guidelines Regarding Vendor Relations consists of 12 members, including one member from each School Faculty Council and one member from each of the following committees: Academic Freedom, Academic Planning and Budget, Clinical Affairs and Research. One member is from the Department of Medicine, one member is from the School of Dentistry and one member is the UCSF Conflict of Interest Officer. The Task Force met three times, on February 22, April 2, and April 30, 2007.

As requested by Chair John Oakley, the Task Force reviewed the proposed guidelines (Part I of this communication) as well as three additional proposed policies (Part II of this communication). Part III of this communication identifies issues the Task Force would like to communicate to the Academic Council for their consideration while reviewing the Proposed Guidelines.

Part I – Review of the Proposed Guidelines Regarding Vendor Relations

At the first meeting, five issues emerged from the discussion as follows:

1. *De minimis*, e.g. the magnitude of the gift,
2. Food provided for general conferences,
3. Samples for patients (other than samples undergoing evaluation),
4. Travel and lodging required for training on equipment, and
5. Patient information documents.

The Task Force drafted and circulated questions regarding these issues to the Faculty Councils of the four Schools and the Clinical Affairs Committee. Using the feedback received in response to these questions, the Task Force discussed the issues further and formulated the following recommendations. Associate Dean Neal Cohen attended the April 2, 2007 meeting as an invited guest and provided a history of UCSF’s efforts to draft a vendor relations policy which contributed to the Task Force’s discussion.
**Issue 1: De minimis, e.g. the magnitude of the gift**  
*Proposed Guidelines Section IV. B. (lines 36-38)*  
The Task Force agreed with the proposed policy that there should not be a *de minimus*, that minor gifts from vendors to individual faculty should not be distributed on campus. Whether such gifts could be accepted by faculty members off campus was not in the purview of the Task Force.

**Issue 2: Food provided for general conferences on campus**  
*Proposed Guidelines Section V. B. 2. (lines 79-89)*  
The Task Force supported the proposed language that individual vendors should not directly provide food for recipients on campus. However, the Task Force recommends that vendors could provide funds to departments or divisions for educational events, and that vendors may be invited to provide information at events on campus, but may not do so unsolicited. The Task Force agreed that it was important that the proposed policy retain the statement “These funds (i.e., for food or meetings) will be managed in accordance with national continuing education accrediting body conflict of interest standards even when the meetings are not accredited continuing education programs” (lines 85 – 87).

**Issue 3: Vendor samples for patients**  
*Proposed Guidelines Section V. B. 3. (lines 90-101)*  
The Task Force agreed that the University should discourage the use of ‘drug closets’ in clinics for routine dispersal of samples to patients. The Task Force also noted that these “drug closets” are being eliminated because they are not in compliance with California state pharmacy laws. However, the Task Force supports that drugs and devices may be used for evaluation and education as stated in proposed policy. Further, the Task Force recommends setting a limit to the evaluation/education period. The majority of the Task Force agreed that a three-month evaluation period was appropriate. Should a provider or clinic need evaluation/education time beyond three months, the provider or providers in the clinic should develop a plan with the appropriate division or department to justify the extension of the evaluation and/or education period.

**Issue 4: Travel and lodging for training on equipment**  
*Proposed Guidelines Section IV. B. 2. e. (lines 58-63)*  
The Task Force accepted the proposed policy recommendation that free lodging, meals and travel for training purposes should be restricted to equipment that has already been purchased. The provision of the free travel, meals and lodging to the trainees should be written into the purchase contract. Prior to purchase all expenses involved with the evaluation of a piece of equipment are the responsibility of the purchaser. For demonstrations or training sessions which do not require substantial travel or lodging the Task Force needed clarification on the limits for free admission, refreshments and similar non-cash benefits to be provided by the vendor for the training session. For example, free admission and light snacks at trade fairs with multiple vendors were considered appropriate, but dinners put on by a single vendor for the purpose of discussing a product prior to its purchase was considered problematic.

**Issue 5: Patient information documents**  
Although not explicitly covered by the proposed policy, the majority of the Task Force agreed that providing patient information documents to patients in the clinics was acceptable as long as such documents were judged to be free of bias by the clinic chief or his/her designee. These documents should be
accompanied by a disclaimer from the relevant department or school indicating that the information was not an endorsement of either the vendor or the specific products described in the document.

**Part II – Review of Three Additional Issues Raised by the Brennan Report**

The Task Force also evaluated three additional issues raised by the Brennan Report that were not addressed explicitly by the current UCOP Proposed Guidelines and made the following recommendations.

1. **Faculty may not publish articles or editorials that are ghostwritten by vendor employees.**
   The Task Force defines ghostwriting as writing an article but not appearing as a co-author on the article. We recommend that faculty be discouraged from this practice as we feel it is unethical. Furthermore we recommend that the authors of publications should have access to the complete, accurately reported data set and analysis for all papers on which they are authors.

2. **“No strings attached” grants or gifts directed to individuals from vendors shall be prohibited (this excludes competitive grants).**
   The Task Force recognizes and supports that gifts for research are useful. However, totally unrestricted or unconditional gifts should be prohibited. Gifts to individual faculty members from vendors must come through University channels via gift administration and development departments and be specified as to their purpose, eg. support of research or education by the recipient. This will ensure that the funds are used in compliance with existing University policies.

3. **All consulting agreements and unconditional grants shall be publicly listed (e.g., on an internet web site).**
   The Task Force applauds the effort to increase transparency for University faculty with respect to consulting agreements. We believe that the compensation plan disclosure forms provide the ability for the departments to evaluate the activities of individual faculty members for potential conflicts of interest. Other conflict of interest disclosure forms that are required of faculty provide additional University oversight. Furthermore, we encourage all faculty members to disclose their relationship(s) with the vendor(s) in publications and public lectures. However, we do not support additional public listing of such agreements. As noted in 2, the Task Force supports a policy that would prohibit unconditional grants that we interpret as “no strings attached” gifts.

   The Task Force is aware that not all consulting agreements are reviewed by the University, and we encourage the University to develop a mechanism for reviewing these for compliance with University policies.

**Part III – Other issues**

1. The Proposed Guidelines did not explicitly identify who was covered by the policy. For example, the Task Force seeks clarification about whether the policy will apply to volunteer faculty during their service at UCSF.

2. The Task Force requests clarification on how the proposed policy will be enforced.

3. UCSF does not have a consistent policy dealing with these issues across all schools, therefore we recommend that a task force be convened to develop at UCSF-wide vendor relations policy.
The Task Force hopes you will find these recommendations helpful in forming a response from the San Francisco Division to the Academic Council.

Signed,

The Task Force to Review and Recommend Divisional Response to the Proposed Guidelines Regarding Vendor Relations

Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Task Force Chair, School of Medicine Faculty Council Chair
Brian Alldredge, PharmD, Associate Dean, School of Pharmacy
Gary Armitage, DDS, MS, School of Dentistry Faculty Council
Lisa Bero, PhD, Committee on Research
H. Quinn Cheng, MD, Committee on Clinical Affairs, School of Medicine Faculty Council
Stuart Gansky, DrPH, Committee on Academic Freedom
Sharad Jain, MD, Department of Medicine
Susan Lee, DMD, School of Dentistry
Deanna Ruth Rutter, JD, UCSF Conflict of Interest Officer
Jean Ann Seago, RN, PhD, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, School of Nursing Faculty Council
Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
Communication from the Task Force Reviewing Proposed New and Revised Senate Regulations 694 and 695 Regarding Graduate Programs
Jeffry Lansman, PhD, Chair

March 8, 2007

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Dear Chair Greenspan,

The Task Force Reviewing the Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulations 694 and 695 consisted of one Member of the Graduate Council (Chair), one member from the Committee on Educational Policy, one member from the Committee on Courses of Instruction, and Members of the Faculty Councils of each of the four schools. The Task Force met on February 28, 2007 to review these Proposed Amendments and to suggest a possible response from the San Francisco Division. After review and discussion, the Task Force makes the following recommendations for a response from the San Francisco Division.

Regarding Proposed Changes to Senate Regulation 694
The Task Force supports the proposed modification to Senate Regulation 694. In addition, the Task Force reached a consensus that the term “significant participation” in regards to defining “off campus” needs to be clarified. The Task Force feels that “significant participation” is far too nebulous and can be interpreted in a myriad of different ways.

Regarding Proposed Changes to Senate Regulation 695.
The Task Force recommends that either “individual” or “collective” be stricken as both ideas are implied by “student(s)”.

Lastly, the Task Force offers these suggestions for portions of the regulations that were not specifically under review: instead of "afford distinct advantages to society," the Task Force suggests "further educational objectives of a department or school and/or facilitate access to degree granting programs."

The Task Force hopes you find this review and these recommendations helpful in forming a response from the San Francisco Division.
Sincerely,

The Task Force Reviewing Proposed New and Revised Senate Regulations 694 and 695 Regarding Graduate Programs
Jeffry Lansman, PhD, Chair of the Task Force, Graduate Council
William Bird, DDS, DPH, Committee on Education Policy
Chris Cullander, PhD, School of Pharmacy Faculty Council
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, School of Dentistry Faculty Council
Beth Phoenix, RN, PhD, CNS, School of Nursing Faculty Council
Patty Robertson, MD, School of Medicine Faculty Council
Christian Vaisse, MD, PhD, Courses of Instruction