MINUTES


ABSENT:          Patricia Babbitt, Colin Studholm, Julie Hunkapiller

The Graduate Council was called to order by Chair Watkins on January 14, 2010 at 2:35 p.m. A quorum was present.

The minutes of December 10, 2009 were approved

Chair’s Report – Elizabeth Watkins
The Coordinating Committee’s task force on Faculty Recruitment Retention and Promotion offered a report on the use and misuse of the adjunct series. There was strong encouragement to promote only using the academic personnel manual criteria and not tying promotions to grants, which historically has been a problem for junior faculty.

There was a robust discussion about the growth of the faculty. That is to say, is there appropriate planning in terms of growth of the faculty? Should growth be restricted? This dialogue may be coming out of the growing lab space at Mission Bay. Is it fair to bring faculty on board in these adjunct series, which appear to be used in a unique way at UCSF.

Vice Chair’s Report – Michael Beattie
The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) is a group of Academic Senate leaders from each of the three segments of public higher education in California, CSU, UC, and CCC. It meets for the purpose of jointly addressing matters or academic importance to all three segments. The Committee is composed of five members from each of the three segments, including the chair and the vice chair of each academic senate.

The chair and vice chair from CSU recently came to CCGA and presented a case for cooperation with CSU; they would like to generate some professional doctorate programs. Currently, only UC can award doctoral degrees, CSU cannot. There appears to be some jealousy with respect to this and there is a continuing dynamic about who gets to award what degrees. The chair and vice chair suggest that it is in our interest to cooperate with CSU so that, as it goes forward, we can present the Master Plan for educating the state to the legislature in a unified way. This relates to a recent legislative analyst report which observed that UC currently reviews graduate programs and new schools (particularly with respect
to nursing at UC Davis and law at UC Irvine) but the analyst’s report argues that the legislature is really the body that should review whether or not the state needs a new school or eventually new Ph.D. programs! This, of course, would represent an erosion of the tradition of self-review process.

The review of the proposal for a new graduate program in Epidemiology and Translational Science is in progress. The only questions surrounding this proposal have to do with finances. There is some talk now that at the level of CCGA and potentially the Graduate Council, a financial review of program proposals should be part of the review process. This would represent a significant shift; we have always been told that our reviews should focus on academic merit and intellectual rigor. It is not clear that we are equipped to make financial assessments of potential programs.

The other program under review is the UCSF Dental Hygiene master’s program; so far the reviews have all been positive.

Dean’s Report – Patricia Calarco

Financial

We previously discussed the conclusion by many people that the support of graduate students needs to be on better footing and it was time for departments, primarily clinical, to step up to the plate and provide that support. This has culminated in a presentation to both the Dean of the School of Medicine and his department chairs and to the Deans of Pharmacy, Dentistry, and Nursing. The next step is to name a steering committee that will see this through since this new support is supposed to begin September 2010. This support will be in the form of a surcharge of $6000 for each graduate student that is in a laboratory. Our recommendation is that this charge will become the responsibility of the department to cover; to the extent that a department already contributes to expenses for graduate programs (for example, paying half the salary of an administrative assistant, contributing a third of the time for a financial analyst, etc.) residual monies that are owed will be the responsibility of the department. This has to begin now because budgetary planning for next year will be underway very soon. There is broad agreement that this needs to happen.

Consensus has been reached that the stipend for graduate students will increase (for the basic sciences/wet labs) to $28k next year from the current $27k. This allows programs that are doing their recruiting to do some advanced planning. Since the pool of money is fixed, the only flexibility is in taking fewer students or placing more of that debt onto individual PI’s RO1 grants. Neither is an attractive solution.

We are now at the point where a non-domestic student (many of our first year students) is more expensive than a post-doc. This is bad news for training graduate students because many heads of laboratories will argue that they can get more value out of an already trained post-doc. These are some of the pressures we are facing.

The replacement for Steve Barclay, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, is John Potts from UCOP; he reports on January 25th. This is noteworthy because prior to Gene Washington’s departure, Dean Calarco met with the Chancellor and noted that if there is going to be more robust and transparent support for graduate students that correlates with the Chancellor’s agenda, then it needs to happen now because graduate acceptances across the country go out by March 15th and the reply is binding on students and programs by April 15th. Given the transitions currently underway, we are unlikely to see any permanent changes that will impact this year. When Potts does report, a meeting will be held with Dean Calarco, John Potts, the Chancellor, Sally Marshall (as Interim EVC) to discuss timelines, why those dates are important in our year, and reach consensus about how best to move forward.

On November 12th we hosted the Focus on Research in the form of a panel discussion: we talked about what is going on, how can industry partner with us, what might the future be like. This generated some immediate feedback and some contacts following the event asking for more information. The event was a
set piece in our development efforts, but there was no ask associated with the event. What we would like to do is continue with this concept and sponsor something each fall. The route we chose of leveraging individual researchers to invite their former graduates was perhaps not as effective as hosting an international renowned speaker. We had close to 150 attendees.

Survey of Earned Doctorates
The institutional profile for UCSF within the newly released Survey of Earned Doctorates indicates that the time to degree “since starting graduate school” is 6.2 years; for our peer institutions (All doctoral/research universities) that time is 7.2 years.

Postdoctoral Scholars – Christine DesJarlais
None.

Graduate Students’ Association (GSA) Report – Julie Hunkapiller, GSA Representative
None.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association Report – Vuk Uskokovic, PSA Representative
The PSA has an Outstanding Faculty Mentor award that is bestowed once a year. This year the recipients are Kathleen Giacomini and Adam Gazzaley.

The PSA recently appointed three biotech Chairs; this is something we have done in the past but not recently. They have begun the process of organizing the PSA-sponsored tours of Genentech and Gilead for postdocs. Gilead develops drugs for HIV, liver disease, etc. and is the second largest biotech firm in the Bay Area behind Genentech.

We have opened a labor union affairs officer position by anonymous vote among the PSA officers; this is a new position on our Council.

We are about to start organizing the annual Practice of Science lecture series. Last year we had exciting speakers but attendance was poor so we are moving to better promote the event to increase turnout.

We designed a new PSA logo but Public Affairs has cautioned us that any subgroup within UCSF cannot have its own logo.

We are going to donate $300 to a high school outreach conference in April 2010. The PSA often makes such donations; we sponsored a conference in October on “Let’s Have An Awesome Time Doing Science.”

New & Ongoing Business
Nursing Program Review response
All review teams make the observation that the program should be hiring from outside of your graduates and your geographical area. Those of us who do searches at UCSF appreciate that this is often very difficult. It is especially difficult in Nursing because the salaries for faculty positions are lower than those for practicing nurses. The review team’s comments in this regard do not take into account the special circumstances of trying to recruit nurses onto the faculty. The program’s letter addresses the concerns raised by the external reviewers to the Council’s satisfaction.

UCSF-UCI Collaboration: HRSA Training Grant
Background, given by Mary Lynch: The Acute Care Pediatric NP program was originally a HRSA funded program for three years to develop a new specialty in the master’s program. The program has been “too successful” because we have had applicants from all over the country who want to be ACPNPs, and we are limited by the number of clinical sites; we can only place a certain number of students in the pediatric facilities we have. We are receiving a lot of applicants from Southern California who currently fly up every
week vs. not coming. What we are trying to do now with our next HRSA Grant is focusing on children in transition (age transitions, transition from pediatric to adult care, who have acute care needs). In addition to the transitions focus, we would like to open up our Southern California clinic sites. We have approximately ten additional acute care facilities in Southern California that we could access; we already have UC contracts with these facilities, but they would be populated by individuals in Southern California.

We approached our colleagues in the school of nursing at UCI to see if there was something we could do to prepare this type of student while keeping them in their own house; it is too expensive for students to fly up every week, and we do not yet have the type of technology infrastructure to turn this program into something virtual, electronic, or web based—not would that be reasonable. UCI want to partner with us in this; we have set out a curriculum where much of the first year can be completed in Southern California with the coursework that is ongoing there; with some additional seminars that we would support. In the second year, when students really need the enhanced specialty focus, then we would transmit the coursework synchronously through video teleconferencing and/or move some of our courses online. We believe that this gives us the best bang for our buck. We are keeping this within the UC system and are likely to effectively double the number of students we can enroll through this mechanism. Given that the bulk of coursework in the first year would be supported by UCI faculty (even though the students would be admitted through UCSF) the first year fees would go to UCI and second year fees to UCSF; this is a two year program.

This proposal will require a precise memorandum of understanding with UCI, detailing all aspects of this joint venture (curriculum, fees, credits, etc). The Graduate Council approves of this partnership pending a note of endorsement from the UCSF registrar and a MOU signed by both nursing deans and the Dean of the Graduate Division.

**Medical Student’s Option**

In principle, the Medical Student’s Option makes sense; some medical students may want to obtain a science degree along the way, but what and when they will study remains a question; UCSF does not have many terminal MS degree programs.

If a medical student wants to obtain an MS in Bioengineering, for example, he cannot do so without appropriate coursework and 15-18 units would not be sufficient; courses in the MD curriculum could not apply to a bioengineering degree. Our registration policies specify that credit may not be utilized toward more than one degree objective (the MD degree and the MS degree). Similarly, the MS in History of Health Sciences requires four quarters, thirty units, and a required thesis. These requirements would apply to medical students as well. As it is currently configured, the medical student’s option is not feasible. Indeed, no student has sought to take advantage of this option in the last ten years.

The Graduate Council recognizes the value of, and encourages, the clinician-scientist or clinician-humanist training, but those graduates must be at the same level as other graduates of the graduate academic programs. With that in mind, the Council is moving to remove the Medical Student’s Option language from the bylaws in the two areas where we find it. Before making a motion to the Academic Senate, we will communicate this conclusion to the medical school deans, explaining that this Option is outside the bounds of the quality of master’s experience that all of our other programs entertain. We believe this Option is a holdover from the past and is inconsistent with the standards of current degree programs.

We want to be clear that this is not a move to close off graduate study to professional school students. There are, in fact, many other ways to go down this path (certificate programs for example) and we want to contribute to developing those. Rather than the current outdated Medical Student’s Option, we want to work with the medical school to get certificate programs or master’s of advanced studies programs approved. Once we have consulted with the medical school deans, then we will go to the committee on Rules and Jurisdictions on changing the bylaws on this Option.
Chair Watkins adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.
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