The School of Medicine Faculty Council was called to order by Chair Nissenson on January 19, 2012 at 3:36 in Room CL 222. A quorum was present.

Approval of the December 15, 2011 Meeting Minutes
The minutes of the December 15, 2011 meeting were approved (Attachment 1).

Chair’s Report
Chair Nissenson updated the Council about a recent School of Medicine Department Chairs and Directors meeting where a discussion occurred about the Academic Senate Membership Task Force.

- The members present at the Chairs and Directors Meeting recognized the need to limit the expansion of Senate membership at this time to avoid jeopardizing the current exception to the eight year rule for UCSF Assistant Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty.
- Some mild concerns were raised about the expansion of Senate membership:
  - Expanding the pool of qualified applicants for loans that are currently only available to a finite number of Academic Senate faculty for housing assistance (i.e. the Mortgage Origination Program) could have an adverse effect on the availability for current Senate members.
    - Department Chairs will still have the authority to approve the disbursement of funds.
  - If adopted system wide the pool of eligible people would be greatly increased, but members noted that system wide adoption was not likely to occur in the near future.
  - Expanding Senate membership could blur the line between In Residence faculty and Adjunct faculty

Vice Chair’s Report
Vice Chair Sullivan updated the Council on matters that had been discussed at the Coordinating Committee meeting:

State of California Cuts to UC’s Budget
- Robert Newcomer, Chair of the UCSF Senate, acknowledged the significant impact that the Governor’s budget cuts to education funding will have, but explained that for this year those cuts can be absorbed by UCSF reserves.
UC Online Education

- Farid Chehab, the Vice Chair of the UCSF Senate, advised members to be prepared for an increase in programs and courses that will be offered online.
  - Online courses can be cost-effective and can reach a larger audience.
  - Training will be provided for those who want to learn how to teach online courses.
  - New online courses must be approved by the Graduate Council.

Faculty Diversity

- Eliseo Perez-Stable, the Chair of the Equal Opportunity Committee (EQOP), reported on the work of the Appointment and Promotion Review and Appraisal Committee and on the status of race and ethnic minority faculty at UCSF.
  - EQOP requested that the Academic Senate Coordinating Committee make a formal recommendation to the UCSF Provost Office regarding the Advance CV format to include a category that describes the faculty person’s “Contributions to Diversity and Reducing Disparities.”
  - Extensive discussion took place at the Coordinating Committee meeting about whether any new language about diversity needs to be added to the Advance CV and, if so, in what form. The Committee decided that some language will be added at this time to clarify that contributions to diversity are important criterion and further consideration of additional changes will take place in the future.
  - Discussion ensued at the Coordinating Committee meeting about whether UCSF meets its targets in terms of underrepresented minorities, whether those benchmarks are appropriate, and what criterion is used in setting those benchmarks?
    - Committee members noted that some other institutions and initiatives have a much higher standard than the state benchmarks followed by UCSF and actually seek diversity parallel to state or national population figures.
  - The SOM Faculty Council members noted that the School of Medicine could improve in the area of diversity and asked what efforts are currently being made?
    - Council members discussed that there is currently no required training on how deal with unconscious bias in the search process and that there are often no proactive efforts during a search process to look for more diverse candidates.
    - The Council discussed the need for additional funding for retention of diverse faculty and for fellowships for diverse faculty and students.
    - The Council requested that the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Renee Navarro, and the new Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, when that person is appointed, come and talk about these issues at a meeting in the near future.

- Committee on Research Update Judith Moskowitz, the Chair of the Research Committee, updated the Coordinating Committee on research related issues:
  - Chair Moskowitz reminded faculty that the new UCSF Patent agreement needs to be signed by all faculty and staff and that an email had gone out with a link to sign the agreement.
  - She advised the Committee that the University is contemplating what consequences will have to be used in order to gain compliance because so few had signed it thus far.
  - The Committee on Research funded 14 Academic Senate grants for a total of approximately $400,000, and RAP awarded over $2 million.

Clinical Affairs Committee Update – Phil Rosenthal, Vice Chair, Clinical Affairs Committee

Phil Rosenthal, the liaison from the Clinical Affairs Committee, provided a presentation on issues that have been discussed in the Clinical Affairs Committee. Discussion included:

APeX

- CAC members have found that the template is not always user-friendly and would like to be able to modify it to fit the clinicians individual practice.
Even if a patient is a six months old, clinicians currently need to ask about the patient’s sexual history and history of using alcohol, drugs, and cigarettes. This takes time and seems nonsensical.

- Faculty Council members asked whether CAC has a representative on the Physician Advisory Group for APeX, which can help resolve some of these issues?
  - P. Rosenthal was not aware of any CAC representation on that group. The Faculty Council suggested trying to arrange to work with them in the future.

- CAC members and the Council agreed that having informative “lunches” and trainings at times other than noon would be very helpful because many clinicians are unable to come at that time and miss out on all of those programs.

- CAC members and the Council have been frustrated by implementing a new system that has cut productivity, is cumbersome and appears to them has yet to show significant benefits. Those present agreed that there should be an easier way to implement a new system where there is more optimization, and in the future they would like UCSF to wait until they reach that point.

Strategic Support between UCSF Medical Center and the School of Medicine

- Members of the Faculty Council raised a concern about financial aid that is given to SOM Departments that is strategically targeted to serve the Medical Center’s goals and help the Medical Center make a profit, but cannot be used more broadly where it may better serve the SOM. Members asked whether the Medical Center owes an obligation to the SOM to support broader things rather than to strategically support things in its own interest.

- Council members gave examples of other models, such as Cedar Sinai, where a certain amount of the profit is given off of the top to their School of Medicine rather than the funds being given with restrictions and designations as to how they must be used.

- Council members also discussed the fact that even after the funds are earmarked for a certain Division, then the Chair of the Department and the Division Chief really have the power to decide how the funds are disbursed and what they are really used for. This is an issue that has been discussed in the CAC as well. Council members noted that even when the money has been planned for a program it does not always filter down to that program.

- The Council requested scheduling a discussion with the Dean in a future Faculty Council meeting, specifically to discuss the relationship between the SOM and the Medical Center.

Long Range Development Plan – Lori Yamauchi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning

Assistant Vice Chancellor Lori Yamauchi presented an overview of UCSF’s Long Range Development Plan (Attachment 2). Discussion included:

- UCSF’s space at Parnassus is over the UC space ceiling or limit (which was approved by The Regents in 1976) by almost 300,000 gross square feet so UCSF is out of compliance with the space ceiling policy.
  - For UC Hall the plan for the past thirty years was to demolish it, but in June, 2010, UCSF leadership decided they would rather retrofit the building. As a result, the current plan is to decant the building, retrofit it, and reuse the building.
  - The new building plan is for a mixed use scenario with three floors of housing and three floors of office space. All labs would be moved out of the building. Most labs are already vacant, but there are many offices in use. This change will help because housing does not count against the space ceiling. The Clinical Sciences Building is also seismically challenged and will need to be addressed soon, but there is no hard deadline prescribed by the state like there is with Moffitt (Moffitt must be seismically retrofitted or vacated by 2030, per State seismic law for hospitals). The goal is to fix them both by 2022 and to start with Clinical Sciences.

Q: How have you determined the space needs department by department? In many places it seems like we are just living with what we have, but that is not necessarily what we optimally need.
A: We have tried to divide up the space needs into three categories - instruction, research, and clinical. For research space, we have not looked at it department by department, but we have looked at funding and faculty projections and we have looked at wet and dry research space needs. We view it as funding drives space needs. For clinical settings, we looked at inpatient, outpatient, and office space and then used the Medical Center’s ten year financial plan to project clinical space needs. For academic office space, we asked schools and departments what their current office space needs were and then accounted for faculty growth, as projected by the schools.

Q: The quality of the data used to make decisions is really important. How do you ensure that the data used is high quality? It appears they may have overestimated when making projections for Mission Bay.

A: For the campus’s ten-year financial forecast/plan, analysis on research and development growth and funding and the marketshare that UCSF will have were produced by the consulting firm Huron, in consultation with the campus. The Medical Center produced their 10 year financial plan on the clinical side. Beyond those 10 years, it is difficult to know. We are trying to establish a maximum envelope beyond which we would not need to build, but it is difficult to know. There is a master plan for all of higher education in California (UC, CSU, Community Colleges) with space standards by discipline, except for Health Sciences so no real set guidelines or standards apply to UCSF. We are utilizing consultants to know whether we are measuring up to other schools and to ensure quality data.

Q: Is it really less expensive to retrofit a building than to demolish it?
A: The decision whether to retrofit or demolish a building depends on the plans for the space. Analysis of UC Hall showed that it was more expensive to demolish it and build a new building than to retrofit it. Furthermore, there are no State or general funds, including bonds, to help fund a new building. General ballot measures are not popular right now, nor, in the case of SFGH, does the City want to share in the funding. In response to a follow-up question, L. Yamauchi will look into whether any historic tax credit funding is available.

Old Business
No new business.

New Business
No new business.
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