Academic Senate Coordinating Committee
Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH, Chair

MINUTES
Monday, January 10, 2011

PRESENT: Elena Fuentes-Afflick (Chair), Robert Newcomer (Vice Chair), Peter Loomer (Secretary), Anne Slavotinek (Parliamentarian), Donna Albertson, Lee Ann Baxter-Lowe, Michael Beattie, Farid Chehab, Jyu-Lin Chen (for Meg Wallhagen), Steven Cheung, Robin Corelli, Brian Dolan, Heather Fullerton, David Gardner, Deborah Greenspan, Bonnie Halpern-Felsher, Janice Lee, Grayson W. Marshall, Wendy Max, Norman Oppenheimer, Russ Pieper, Steven Pletcher, Peter Sargent (for John Featherstone), Peter Taylor (for Patricia Calarco), Catherine Waters

ABSENT: Paula Braveman, Erika Froelicher, Sam Hawgood, Roland Henry, Mary Anne Koda-Kimble, Errol Lobo, Sally Marshall, Sally Rankin, Ida Sim, Candy Tsourounis, Elizabeth Watkins, Leslie Zimmerman

GUESTS: Paul Green, Vice Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Robert Nissenson, Vice Chair, School of Medicine Faculty Council
Tejal Patel, Professor, Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences
Roberta Rehm, UCAF Representative

The Committee on Committees was called to order by Chair Fuentes-Afflick on January 10, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in room N 225. A quorum was present.

The minutes of November 1, 2010 were approved.

Chair’s Report – Elena Fuentes-Afflick

Update on Academic Senate Participation in UCSF Operational Excellence
Chair Fuentes-Afflick is working with Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Jeff Bluestone to improve Academic Senate representation in the UCSF Operational Excellence process.

Division Vice Chair Robert Newcomer is a member of the Faculty Oversight Committee. He noted that the Academic Senate Office is working with the Operational Excellence Communications Work Group to reach out to faculty. He encouraged faculty to continue to participate in the Research Administration Operational Excellence effort.

Faculty Research Lecture – Basic Science
“License to Kill – ‘Natural Killer’ Cells in Host Defense Against Viruses and Cancer”, Lewis Lanier, PhD will be held on February 8, 2011, 3:30-5:00 pm in Cole Hall. Reception to follow.

Review of the Proposed Revisions to APM 010 and 015 – Roberta Rehm, University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) Vice Chair
R. Rehm presented the proposed revisions to APM 010 and 015, which seeks to include discussion of University of California institutional matters in the definition of areas protected by academic freedom.
• Action: Committee members voted unanimously to support the proposed revisions with no opposition and no abstentions.

Reports from the Standing Committees, Faculty Councils and UC Systemwide Committees
Committee on Courses of Instruction – Brian Dolan, Chair
B. Dolan presented a brief overview of the issues currently under consideration by the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI).

Online Course Review System
Since 2007, COCOI has worked to bring the UCSF course review process into an online system. That the Course Review System launched in January 2010 and has been the mechanism for course review at UCSF, as well as the source for the UCSF online catalog since that time.

Review of Graduate and Professional Courses at UCSF
Until October 2010, the UCSF course review process was as follows:
• New course proposal, change to an existing course or course inactivation initiated by a UCSF faculty member.
• Proposed course action reviewed and approved by the appropriate department chair.
• Upon department chair approval, the appropriate school curriculum committee reviewed the proposed course action.
• Proposed course actions approved by the school curriculum committee would be reviewed and approved by the school dean.
• COCOI was the final review and approval before routing the final course action to the Registrar for publication in the UCSF Course Catalog.

On October 20, 2010, School of Medicine Vice Dean for Education David Irby requested that the School of Medicine no longer be responsible for the review of graduate (non-professional) courses offered. Instead, he argued, they should be reviewed by the Graduate Division. This request initiated a change in the course review process for non-professional courses at UCSF.

The process for reviewing professional degree courses remains unchanged, as described previously. In consultation with the Graduate Division as well as education colleagues within the Schools of Dentistry and Pharmacy, graduate education courses will now be reviewed as follows:
• New course proposal, change to an existing course or course inactivation initiated by a UCSF faculty member.
• Proposed course action reviewed and approved by the appropriate degree program director.
• Upon department/ORU chair/director approval, the Graduate Division curriculum committee will review the proposed course action on behalf of the Graduate Dean.
• COCOI will be the final review and approval before routing the final course action to the Registrar for publication in the UCSF Course Catalog.

The Role of COCOI at UCSF
With the implementation of the Online Course Review System, COCOI is reflecting on its role in curriculum and education at UCSF. Some of the issues under consideration include:
• The role of the Academic Senate in fostering Interprofessional education at UCSF, including the Interprofessional education at the skills centers. Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Affairs Joe Castro is the best point of contact for the ongoing Interprofessional education efforts at UCSF.
• Now that the course review process is electronic and less time-consuming, should COCOI merge with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)? B. Dolan met with CEP to discuss this possibility. COCOI needs to either become more robust or diffuse out into existing structures.
• What role will the Academic Senate play in the increasing use of educational technology, online education and distance learning at UCSF?
How can the Academic Senate add value to campus-wide accreditation processes (i.e. WASC)?

As Coordinating Committee members discussed these issues, many clearly state that faculty oversight of the curriculum at UCSF should remain intact.

B. Dolan will continue to work with COCOI, CEP and others to determine the next steps.

Review of the Proposed MS in Translational Medicine – Michael Beattie, Chair, Graduate Council and Tejal Desai, PhD, Professor, Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences

On behalf of Graduate Council, M. Beattie presented an overview of the proposal for the Master of Science in Translational Medicine which they extensively reviewed and recently approved.

Coordinating Committee members posed the following questions which T. Desai answered.

- W. Max: Please explain the program's surplus in the first few years.
  - T. Desai: The surplus is due to a donor. Once the donation is exhausted, the program is intended to go to a steady-state. We also have a fundraising board with the intent that we would be able to offer fellowships. The program’s fees

- D. Gardner: Will this be marketed within UCSF or beyond?
  - T. Desai: This is intended for both UCSF students and people from industry.

- R. Corelli: Are there similar programs across the country?
  - T. Desai: Harvard has a PhD program but without the business and economics components. The University of Pennsylvania is just about to start something like this.

- B. Halpern-Felsher: Is this targeted for fellows?
  - T. Desai: yes, we hope fellows will participate in a one-year program. People from outside who want a slower pace can do a two-year program.

- S. Cheung: Courses would be taught by existing faculty members. Will new faculty also be hired?
  - T. Desai: the faculty funds in the proposal are to support existing faculty for their work in the program.

- F. Chehab: One year versus two year options. Will there be different requirements? Will there be different application requirements?
  - T. Desai: the requirements are the same. The pace will be determined by the individual student. There will be a capstone requirement – work on a project with a research design, work with a faculty member.

- S. Cheung: Will courses be taught by senior venture capitalists or other investors?
  - T. Desai: Yes, and there will be instruction from people from the insurance side as well.

- D. Gardner: The net educational fee will be $30,000. Was this priced with the idea that big pharmaceutical companies will participate?
  - T. Desai: The program price is based on market research on other programs in the executive MBA class.

ACTION: Approve the MS in Translational Medicine Proposal for a Division Vote

- The Coordinating Committee unanimously approved the proposal for a Division Vote

The Academic Senate Office will prepare an electronic Division vote.
Discussion of Committee Responses to the **UC Systemwide Task Force Report on Senate Membership** – Robert Newcomer, Division Vice Chair

R. Newcomer served on the UC Systemwide Task Force that issued the report currently under review. He summarized his experience on that Task Force. The Systemwide Senate Task Force discussions focused on HS Clinical faculty, as they had already excluded the Adjunct category as too diverse across the UC System. UCSD took the position that there was so much diversity in the health sciences faculty that they wanted to support the status quo and consider faculty on a case-by-case basis. UCSF is unique in treating Adjunct faculty as equal colleagues.

He then opened the discussion of the Report and the responses from the eight committees and faculty councils requested to review the Report (**CAC**, **CAP**, **COC**, **CFW**, **SOD FC**, **SOM FC**, **SON FC**, **SOP FC**).

Here are the points raised by committee members during the discussion:

- Some faculty across the UC System are concerned about dilution of non-health sciences votes within the Academic Senate.
- At the UC Systemwide level, there is much discussion about who will teach in a downsized University. Some proposed that those faculty would hold Adjunct faculty positions.
- What are the barriers for moving Adjunct faculty into Senate series?
- A significant problem with the Adjunct series is that although Adjunct faculty contribute to the University but are not able to supervise students and to be full participants in the Graduate programs.
- Some at UCSF claim that moving faculty from HS Clinical to Clinical X would ‘erode’ the value of Clinical X. Some faculty see this as a slippery slope. Many faculty want a clean line of demarcation between faculty and lecturers.
- The administrative barriers for moving HS Clinical to Clinical X are challenging, including the requirement for a national search, the 1:6 ratio, etc need to be addressed.
- Would the UC Davis strategy of rolling all HS Clinical faculty into Clinical X work for UCSF?
- Could the difference between the UCSF position and those of other campuses merely be a language problem? How could we better communicate with colleagues at the other campuses?
- Could UCSF get a local waiver? The more local discretion for UCSF on this issue, the better.
- CAP discussed the idea that faculty activities should determine Senate membership rather than series. Series is a poor mechanism for determining Senate membership.
- The existing system is unfair. Whatever is decided at the UC Systemwide level, faculty at UCSF need to do whatever we can to mitigate a two-tiered system. Separating Senate from non-Senate faculty creates a two-tiered system excludes faculty from shared governance.
- How can we have representation without reclassification of faculty?
- UCSF’s arguments for this issue need to be framed in terms of rights rather than history or tradition.
- The UCSF Academic Senate should survey all faculty on these issues.

**Old Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.

**Adjournment**
There being no further business, E. Fuentes-Afflick adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.