COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Linda Chafetz, RN, DNS, Chair

Minutes
Wednesday, January 9, 2007
3:30-5:00 PM


Absent:  K. Giles, J. Humphreys

Guests:  Pilar Bernal de Pheils, Mexico-UCSF nursing program; Professor of Family Health Care Nursing
Doug Carlson, Registrar
Jessica Chan, Students for Interprofessional Learning
Dorrie Fontaine, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Nursing
Tom Novotny, Global Health Sciences Education Coordinator; Professor of Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Ashish Patel, Students for Interprofessional Learning
Dorothy Perry, Assistant Dean for Curricular Affairs, School of Dentistry; Associate Professor, Preventive & Restorative Dental Sciences
Gail Persily, Director, Education and Public Services; Associate Director, Center for Instructional Technology, UCSF Library
Janet Thelen-Lockwood, Director of Services to International Students and Scholars, UCSF

Chair Chafetz called the meeting to order at 3:40 P.M. A quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes from December 12, 2007
The minutes were approved.

Chair’s Report and Announcements – Linda Chafetz
Request to Review CCGA/UCEP/ITTP ‘Dialectic’ Paper on Remote/Online Instruction
Gail Persily, Bill Bird, Claudia West will review the document and report back to the Committee at the February 2008 CEP meeting.

Proposed Department of Emergency Medicine Task Force (Attachment III)
Joan Etzell and Joseph Rabban volunteered to serve on the task force.
Sustainability Committee
Upcoming campus efforts on sustainability will include incorporating principles of sustainability into curricula.

Update from the Registrar - Doug Carlson, Registrar
• Scheduling: The Registrar’s office is working on the web-based interface for scheduling (also known as Resource 25). The goal will be to allow people to submit schedule requests online. Currently it is a paper-based system. One idea suggested would be to mount displays at each classroom or at clusters of classrooms to list the classroom schedule, linked to the information in Resource 25.
• Online Payment: The Registrar’s office is working on a pilot project for online payments (e-checks) with Pharmacy students.
• Faculty portal for Online Grades and Course Rosters. About one third of grades have been submitted online thus far. The Registrar’s office will take on the project and is waiting for a centralized online authentication system, perhaps one year hence.
• Course Catalog and Schedule of Classes: The existing course catalog is not also a class schedule. For 2008 the Registrar’s office is working to create a schedule of classes with the goal of having it ready in 2008.

D. Carlson requested the Committee’s feedback on the implementation of an online schedule of classes. Committee members requested that it be searchable by keyword, prerequisites, restrictions, as well as geographic distance between locations and the availability of videoconferencing.

Discussion of the Responses to the UC International Education Report (Attachment I)
The Committee and the guests listed above discussed the report from the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education. The following summary was discussed and will be incorporated into the Committee’s response to the Report.

William Holzemer, RN, PhD, FAAN
Associate Dean for International Programs, UCSF; Professor of Nursing

Thank you for sharing the document. The report states that they recommend strengthening the already existing EAP model and proposes to devote significant resources in expanding an infrastructure that may not be working. The report does not address three of our concerns:

1) The high cost for students. Students are requested to pay tuition (which disappears to the State of California) and then we have to find funds to cover the entire cost of the exchange program.

2) Apparent lack of mutuality. The document does not address the importance of developing a two-way exchange. What are the benefits to those who are visited? We have initiated a few exchanges were faculty from an international site supervise our students during their visit and then we support the faculty to visit us.

3) Health professions education. Issues of international exchanges for health professions education students are not addressed. Perhaps I understand this, but there is no apparent recognition of the different needs of different types of academic programs.
In summary, rather than building a large UC infrastructure, I would propose moving the available funds down to the student associations or perhaps at the College or School level where the demand exists. It is at the school or college level where we are trying to figure out how to integrate these programs into our academic programs and we never have the funds to do this work.

**Steven Kayser, PharmD**
*Director, UCSF/Tokyo University of Pharmacy and Life Science (TUPLS) Clinical Pharmacy Education and Practice Program; Professor of Clinical Pharmacy*

There is very little on graduate education. Some of the recommendations (p20) if implemented might also serve graduate/professional students e.g. creation of a Vic-Provost-International Affairs within UCOP and Director/Dean for EAP. The needs of our students are different from the undergraduates, and also different among the students here. Global Health Science is addressing some of them but greater support and coordination systemwide would probably be a good thing.

**Tom Novotny, MD, MPH**
*Global Health Sciences Education Coordinator; Professor of Epidemiology & Biostatistics*

Thanks for the opportunity to review this document on International Education. As background, I have been a member of a system-wide ad hoc group on international education (the Senior International Leaders Council), representing UCSF for the last four years. The UCEAP program is a key member of this group, and I have had the opportunity to hear about undergraduate international education about every six months as part of the SILC meetings. I have tried to represent the professional school perspective to this group, and they have appreciated hearing about our evolving international educational programs here at UCSF; we hosted the group one year ago here in San Francisco, and each of the other 10 campuses has hosted the meetings on a rotating basis. I held two meetings of a subgroup of health professional schools, but we have not been able to sustain this activity recently. UCSF Global Health Sciences will assume representation to the SILC at the next meeting to be held in February, I believe, and Chuck Smukler will attend the meeting.

That being said, I have the following comments on the report.

1. Little to no attention is paid to graduate education and none to professional international education. Given the extensive experience UCSF has with the medical school’s office of international programs, and the current multi-disciplinary development process for the Pathways to Discovery (GH being a likely early program), and given Haile Debas’ work with Provost Hume on a system wide school of global health sciences, the report really falls short. UCSF is in better shape than the other professional schools across the system with regard to international educational and research opportunities, but nonetheless there is growing interest in global health among all these schools. As a system wide approach to improving international education for UC, the report really needs to be expanded to capture the interests of professional students, graduate students, faculty, and others in international graduate and professional educational and research opportunities. The report makes a strong case for global engagement, and clearly this should not be limited to the undergraduate clientele.
2. The value of central UC sites and offices, with faculty involvement in these is important. This is the approach we are taking here at UCSF, trying to identify solid opportunities for education of our professional students with UCSF faculty involvement and facilities to support the students. Currently, there are UC EAP offices in Mexico and Shanghai, and there are study centers in 30 or so countries with UC faculty or affiliates in each. Linkage of these sites to professional schools should be explored; the professional and graduate students have extensive educational needs in their pursuit of international experience, but the early professional students are more like undergraduates in many ways, seeking cultural immersion, language training, and modest professional exposure (usually during the first year in the summer term). These types of opportunities should be a part of this system-wider approach to international education.

3. Appointing a Vice Provost system-wide for international education is overdue. The UC Davis model, with a vice provost coordinating all international activity on that campus, is very functional and very advanced compared to the other campuses. Having an official advisory group (leadership in the report), is also a good idea, and I assume this SILC would be the natural leadership advisory group to assist in internationalization of the UC educational system.

4. The idea of having system-wide opportunities for international research (sabbaticals) for faculty is a good one; some mention of some of the existing opportunities (Pacific Rim Research Program and the IGCC faculty research grants) should be made. Just as with the idea of centralizing international educational opportunities for students, international research opportunities for faculty ought to have a central information portal.

5. It is clear that international education at UC is lagging behind other leading universities. At the undergraduate level, this process can be facilitated by many of the recommendations made by the consultant, but specific attention should also be addressed to the professional schools.

George Rutherford, MD  
Director of the Institute for Global Health; Professor of Preventive Medicine

The UC Report on International Education is extremely thoughtful and I can concur with all the recommendations. However, I think there are missed opportunities to fold in graduate and professional students and faculty into the report. While it is certainly a laudable goal to improve undergraduate access to international educational experiences, it may be even more valuable for graduate students and junior faculty to go abroad to study. I think Professors Novotny and Holzemer have laid this out succinctly for health sciences students in their comments, but I would go even more broadly to seek opportunities for graduate and professional students from beyond the health sciences.

Janet Thelen-Lockwood  
Director of Services to International Students and Scholars, UCSF

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

The UC SISS directors reviewed the Kissler report issued last spring as well as the final report issued in November. Attached are the SISS directors’ letters submitted to Provost Hume.
In addition to the points expressed in the SISS letters to Provost Hume, I have the following comments:

1. It is gratifying to see that the report affirms the value and expansion of opportunities for more UC students to study abroad.

2. Services to International Students and Scholars is very much involved in international exchange and international education, as are many other units at UCSF. This report addresses study abroad issues and EAP. However, “International Education” is not confined to study abroad programs; it is comprised of many principles, programs and functions which are not addressed in the report.

3. The report states, incorrectly, that EAP reciprocity students comprise the largest number of international undergraduates on UC campuses. UC as a whole enrolled over 3,600 international undergraduates on non-immigrant visas in fall 2006, not including the 1,300 reciprocity students.

4. The report includes no mention, nor provision for analysis of the graduate and professional student populations that will have strikingly different needs than the undergraduate study abroad programs. I would concur with this point, and all of the points, expressed by Professor Gayle Binion, in her minority report attached as the final Appendix.

5. Perhaps a thorough resource and cost analysis would shed more light on future direction. Expanding international student enrollment is a notable goal. However, it is unclear how this would be achieved without first addressing resource issues. Global competition and the high cost of non-resident tuition are considerable barriers to increasing enrollment. From where will the resources come for UCSF or UC as a system to recruit, admit, and service this group of students with specialized needs?

6. The inter-relationship of the newly proposed Vice Provost for International Education with EAP and other types of international endeavors at UC needs to be thought through more carefully. We would hope that the portfolio of this newly created position would be broadened to include all UC international endeavors, with EAP as one component.

7. While expanding credit transfer and financial aid to all study abroad programs is a laudable goal, have representatives from the Registrar and Financial Aid Offices been consulted to determine whether the recommendations are possible? This is an area that will have vastly different considerations for graduate and professional students compared to undergraduate students.

8. Ideally, UCSF would have an overall organizational structure or “International Center” comprised of all of the academic and service strands that comprise “International Education.” As the report indicates, several UC campuses have a structure in place, such as the UC Davis, UC Riverside, UC Berkeley, and UCLA models. I believe we are missing opportunities for
inter-campus collaborations as well as efficiencies without a strategic plan and coordinated effort to “internationalize” the campus and to Advancing Health Worldwide.

9. Any senior advisory groups should include the entire spectrum of international education, to include the needs of the international student and scholar population already present at UC and at UCSF, faculty services, faculty recruitment and retention, clinical service locally and globally, research, deemed export controls, degree program curriculum, inter-disciplinary programs, etc.

**Update from the Students for Interprofessional Learning (SIL) – Jessica Chan and Ashish Patel, Students for Interprofessional Learning**

SIL was started two years ago by a medical student. In the first two years, SIL was trying to generate visibility and encourage student participation through collaboration with student groups and other groups on campus, such as the Work–Life Center. Currently, about 25 students are active in SIL. SIL’s future goal is to foster interprofessionalism among incoming students. An important event for SIL is the annual Interprofessional Education Day through which SIL hopes to bring students together and introduce them to Interprofessional teamwork in training early in their educational experience at UCSF. Many students are disconnected from their peers in other schools.

An important component in improving interprofessionalism at UCSF is to incorporate the concepts into the school curricula. Currently, the most significant barrier is the scheduling differences between schools. Another important challenge for interprofessionalism is that students arrive at UCSF at different levels of education. SIL would like to see the Schools work together to create a unified curriculum. This would represent an ongoing collaborative effort so that students could come together for Interprofessional learning more than once per academic year. Faculty are key players in this process.

To increase the effort toward Interprofessional education, SIL is considering creating ‘families’ to gather students once per quarter from across the schools to talk about their education, how they are being taught and how their training is going.

**Update from School Curriculum and Educational Policy Committees**

None.

**Update from the Library – Gail Persily**

G. Persily will send the update to the Committee via email.

**New Business**

None.

**Adjournment**

Chair Chafetz adjourned the meeting at 4:50 P.M.