The Coordinating Committee was called to order by Chair Fuentes-Afflick on January 4, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. in room S-118. A quorum was present.

The minutes of November 2, 2009 were approved.

**Chair’s Report**
Chair Fuentes-Afflick continues to participate in discussions at the campus and Systemwide levels regarding budget cuts, furloughs and related issues. She will keep the Coordinating Committee informed when new budget information becomes available.

**Post Employment Benefits**
Interim Provost for Academic Affairs Lawrence Pitts will come to UCSF on February 1, 2010 (2:00-3:30 pm in S 118) to discuss the future of UC Post Employment Benefits. Correspondence between Chair Fuentes-Afflick and Interim Provost Pitts, as well as more information about the Post Employment Benefits Task Force, may be found on this web page: [http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-currentissues/ucpostemploymentbenefits.html](http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-currentissues/ucpostemploymentbenefits.html) Coordinating Committee members requested that Chair Fuentes-Afflick send another letter to Interim Provost Pitts asking that he respond to the questions posed to the Post Employment Benefits Task Force prior to their UCSF campus visit on October 22 and 23, 2009.
Report from the Task Force to Review the Recommendations on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion, and to Review Faculty Growth at UCSF – Kit Chesla, Chair, Task Force to Review the Recommendations for Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion

Kit Chesla chaired the task force convened in March 2009 to review the recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment and Retention, which was submitted to Chancellor Bishop in July 2005 (Attachment 1). The 2005 report included a provision that its recommendations should be reviewed after five years. In addition, the 2009 task force discussed and made recommendations on faculty growth at UCSF.

K. Chesla presented the recommendations from the 2009 task force to the Coordinating Committee (Attachments 2,3 and 4).

The 2009 report supports the recommendations made in 2005, as follows:

- Faculty hiring practices in all schools need to be governed by clear, written policies, with oversight at the level of the school deans, rather than at the level of the department chairs. This is particularly important for faculty hired into non-Senate series.

- The Academic Personnel Manual should not be considered the starting point for advancement, but rather the standard for faculty advancement. The Chancellor should direct deans and department chairs to follow the APM without additional criteria.

In addition, the 2009 task force recommended the following related to faculty growth at UCSF:

1. Unrestrained growth stresses every part of the system at UCSF and must be checked by clear and enforceable policies.

2. New faculty appointments and faculty growth should, with very few exceptions, be in direct response to programmatic needs.

3. Checks and balances on growth should happen at the level of the deans, and any growth should have a clear strategic purpose, rather than simply adding promising postdoctoral fellows to the faculty because they can secure extramural funding.

DISCUSSION

Following K. Chesla’s presentation of the 2009 task force’s recommendations, Coordinating Committee members raised the following points:

- Many successful careers at UCSF have been initiated in the Adjunct faculty series. Doing away with it could limit UCSF’s ability to recruit junior faculty.

- Faculty positions at UCSF in which a junior faculty member provides their own grant funds are often mentored clinical positions. Hiring a junior colleague for a mentored relationship could not be done via an open search.

- Clinical faculty positions are useful for creating protected time for junior faculty to develop their research direction.

- Appointment in a clinical series is not helpful for those embarking on a research career.

- The task force’s recommendations on faculty growth do not seem to be conceptually related to the issues related to faculty recruitment and retention.

- The recommendations in the 2005 report and in the 2009 report should be implemented at every step in faculty hiring and promotion. Hiring faculty across the campus puts a strain on the entire system. Someone has to take the position of gatekeeper. Complication: to be competitive for a K-Award, you need to have a faculty appointment.
Unrestrained growth stresses UCSF’s infrastructure, including child care, approvals by contracts and grants, etc. However, there are other data suggesting that administrative growth has been greater than the number of FTEs on the campuses.

Neither the 2005 nor the 2009 report describe gender discrepancies in the hiring and promotion practices at UCSF.

The 2009 report lacks acknowledgement of financial implications of hiring faculty into different series. This is a serious concern for small units with grant-based salary funds.

How will the recommendations be implemented at the level of the Deans? There needs to be a check-and-balance on impact of hiring across the school (higher than the department).

The 2009 task force sought to link to its terms and definitions to the UCSF strategic plan.

It is important that the task force recommend that the APM be used as the standard. CAP has requested departmental guidelines from departments but only five departments have submitted them to date.

**ACTION**
Chair Fuentes-Afflick will work with K. Chesla and the other members of the task force to revise the 2009 report to incorporate the concerns raised by the Coordinating Committee. The final version of the 2009 task force report will be submitted to the Chancellor.

**UC Commission on the Future –**
- Mary Croughan, UC Commission on the Future and Research Workgroup
- David Gardner, UC Commission on the Future Finance Workgroup
- Deborah Greenspan, UC Commission on the Future Size and Shape Workgroup
- Kevin Grumbach, UC Commission on the Future Access and Affordability Workgroup
- Stanley Prusiner, UC Commission on the Future Research Workgroup

The UC Commission on the Future has until July 2010 to complete its work, with a preliminary report for March to be given to the Regents for budget negotiations.

**Mary Croughan and Stan Prusiner – Research Workgroup**
The Research Workgroup intends to improve the research infrastructure for UC faculty, who already do excellent research despite the poor UC research infrastructure. Recommendations will likely include recommendations to hire staff. Other areas under consideration include:
- the role and impact of graduate education on research
- opportunities and threats
- guiding collaboration with industry

**Funding Strategies Workgroup – David Gardner**
The Funding Strategies Workgroup has already held two meetings. Another five meetings are scheduled through April, 2010. To date, the Workgroup has identified ideas likely to generate additional revenue for the University, and prioritized these ideas on a scale of 1-5 based on the ability generate significant revenue, efficiency and feasibility. About 20-30% of the ideas were in the highest category and about 20% in the next highest category. The Workgroup will focus on the top 40% (items in the 4-5 range).

1. Student Fees – increasing undergraduate fees, possibly increasing graduate fees; differential fees for specific programs (e.g. business and engineering); differential fees for campuses; increasing out-of-state tuition.
2. State funding – how best to lobby the state legislature for our fair share of the state tax revenue; specific capital bond issues; specific tax for higher education.
3. Federal funding – renegotiate indirect cost rates; Yudof has proposed coming up with a new model for federal participation in higher education.
4. Administrative efficiencies – already underway at UCOP; how to leverage the participation of 10 individual campuses to promote additional cost savings.
5. Alternative sources of revenue – partnering with industry.
Retirement and post employment benefits was on the original list, but was taken off because the Post Employment Benefits Task Force is working on the issue.

**Size and Shape Workgroup – Deborah Greenspan**  
The Size and Shape Workgroup has divided itself into two groups to focus on internal and external issues. Several meetings are being held in January and February to come up with three major points by March 2010. Discussions involve review of the Master Plan. More information can be found on the web site.

**Access and Affordability Workgroup – Kevin Grumbach**  
The Access and Affordability Workgroup is primarily concerned with access and affordability for undergraduate students. The Workgroup has not yet discussed costs of professional school and graduate school.

**Discussion**  
Committee members discussed the issues raised by the UCSF Representatives to the UC Commission on the Future.
- Committee members encouraged review and consideration of the Master Plan for Higher Education in all of the workgroups.
- Workgroup deliberations will include discussion of cross-campus, campus specific and UC systemwide recommendations.
- Committee members encouraged the workgroups to seek multi-campus efficiencies.

**Report from the Committee on Research (COR) – James Sorensen**
As COR moves into an automated review process, the committee’s role may need to be revised – perhaps reduce the number of committee members and shift the focus toward research policy.

**Overview of the Committee on Research**
- COR has 24 faculty members from across UCSF.
- COR meets monthly, roughly nine times a year, with five meetings as a review group.
- Two meetings are held to review of Individual Investigator Grant (IIG) research proposals
  - Fall 2009 IIG Review: ten grants awarded (of 22 applications), $322,000 of the $732,000 requested
- Two meetings are held to review nominations for faculty Research Lectures (Faculty Research Lecture and the Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture)
- One meeting is held to review applications for Shared Equipment Grants

**Issues Discussed in the Committee on Research in 2009-10**
- Last year, COR voted to integrate its grant application process with the Resource Allocation Program (RAP), currently housed in the Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute (CTSI). The merged process is slowly proceeding as the two groups resolve integration issues. The goal is that all faculty at UCSF should go to one portal to apply for UCSF intramural funding.
- The outcome of joining RAP may include freeing up committee time to more carefully consider research policy issues, such as faculty participation in determining research policy at UCSF.

**Old Business**  
None.

**New Business**  
None.

Chair Fuentes-Afflick adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.