Approval of the April 29, 2012 Meeting Minutes
The minutes of the April 29, 2012 meeting were approved (Attachment 1).

Chair’s Report
None

Analyst’s Report
None

Faculty Insurance Options - Elena Fuentes-Afflick, Vice Dean, Academic Affairs, SOM
Vice Dean Fuentes-Afflick presented on the proposed changes to the Voluntary HSC Supplemental Insurance. These proposed changes will only cover the Y portion of salary, not X+Y. Overall SOM Academic Affairs recommends Option 1 over Option 2. Option 1 provides more benefits for spousal and child dependent coverage.

The proposal will be distributed to all SOM faculty. There will be an open enrollment period. However if UCSF does not reach the minimum enrollment (30%) the rates as proposed will not take effect. Some think that low enrollment is due to lack of information made available to faculty in advance. Academic Affairs is trying to avoid that issue.

Faculty Council members will review further and send comments to Vice Dean Fuentes-Afflick by the end of May.
The understanding was that the appointments to the subcommittees would be made by the Deans and that the subcommittees would report to the Faculty Council. The bylaws state that the Faculty Council appoints the members of the subcommittees.

David Wofsy
Admissions
DW: The Admissions Committee includes about 80 members of faulty and students, intended to represent a cross-section of the school by department, area, gender, etc. Committee members do not have terms. It is composed only of people who are committed to the committee and on a volunteer basis.

The Committee interviews around 500 people each year for admission. The work of reviewing applicants is conducted by panels of the entire committee - for workload purposes only. Panels are not grouped by area (i.e. out-of-state applicants).

UCSF loses applicants to Harvard by about 3:1, but UCSF beats everybody else. However, this may change as costs rise at UCSF. Average debt of a graduate from UCSF is around $100,000 to $110,000, a greater amount than for students graduating from Harvard. Rising costs pose a threat to diversity in the admitted classes.

Member Discussion
AM: Scholarship has increased by 60% in the last few years while tuition has increased by 50% in the same period.
DW: This is correct. However, much of the aid comes from student professional fees.

DSu: This Council has been discussing diversity recently.
DW: The SOM has seen two drops in diversity - in the 1990s after Prop 209 and again in 2005. UCSF’s School of Medicine has a significantly diverse student population, although that will be hard to sustain.

DW: I recently saw information about how poorly UCSF does on faculty diversity and how well we do on diversity for students. Unfortunately, it’s the same information I saw ten and twenty years ago. We cannot take for granted that a diverse student population will become diverse faculty.

HN: What about in-state versus non-state? What about differences in fees?
DW: Applicants are about 50-50 in-state/out-of-state. Our classes are usually about 80% in-state and 20% out-of-state. The other four UC medical schools are 90-95% in-state. There isn’t much of a difference because out-of-state students establish residency within their first year because they are graduate students rather than undergraduates.

Maxine Papadakis
Student Welfare
The Student Welfare committee did not meet this year. It is intended to address academic freedom for students.

Screening and Promotions Committees for Years One, Two, Three and Four
MP oversees this committee. The group meets with the program directors. When a student is recommended by the Screening Committee for dismissal, their case goes to the Academic Standards Committee.

The Academic Standards Committee is advisory to the Vice Dean and can recommend whether a student continue, take time off, re-take courses or be dismissed. Fewer than one third of the students recommended to the Academic Standards committee are dismissed.
MP has invited SOM Faculty Council Chair Nissenson to participate in a meeting of a Screening Committee for each of the four years. Also, David Irby has become a member of the Committee on Educational Policy and is expected to review some of these policies. Many policies are administratively heavy and would benefit from being streamlined.

**Member Discussion**

AM: The bylaws seem to lack some information that could be of concern for student behavior. Also, in a recent experience with these committees, it would have helped to have information on the web to guide faculty members who participate in the processes and necessary information.

HN: When students come to any faculty member, there is a sense of not wanting to do anything wrong. The process itself was explained to me by the student. Resources are needed for faculty who are approached by students in the process of being dismissed.

CL: The bylaws differentiate between issues that are so egregious that they approach or break the laws of society. Professionalism falls under the purview of the faculty in the Academic criteria. We should consider drafting a set of guidelines for advice.

MP: We haven’t pursued professional disqualification in a very long time. We have addressed unprofessional behavior in the academic category.

PR: How does UCSF compare with other institutions?

MP: We need to report to AAMC any time we dismiss a student. We usually dismiss 1% of students or fewer.

DW: I attend all the screening committee meetings and review the applications of problematic students to look for patterns for the admission process. MP also attends the admissions committee meetings to offer her perspective.

CL: The Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Affairs requested last fall that a task force review struggling students. We can do our best in the admissions process, but it is important to remember that this is also a significant developmental time (age 20-30).

JSp: Do people leave because this is not the profession for them?

MP: No, we keep our discussions focused on professionalism.

**UCSF Mission Bay Operations Planning Update - Scott Soifer, Vice Chair, Pediatrics**

MB Hospital Planning Committee Member Scott Soifer presented the attached slides. The overall challenge for the process is how to build an infrastructure that ensures that patients at Parnassus and Mission Bay get comparable care?

What will Mission Bay hospital’s relationship be with SFGH?

CL: what is the plan for engaging faculty in the planning process?

SS: We plan to meet with department chairs to discuss the process. How will each department or division provide their services?

HF: *in early 2012-13, SOM FC should invite key department chairs to discuss this process.*

SS: Telehealth will be an important component of the planning process.

CL: We need to ensure that the impact on residents is included in the conversations about the planning - travel, location, supervision, etc. Engage the GME office about what is needed.
SS: We cannot use residents to solve clinical issues. Residents need to be brought to UCSF within the UCSF’s educational mission and needs.
HN: Are surgical faculty included in these discussions?
SS: all of the oncology surgeons will be based at Mission Bay. Yes, the discussions are happening. Transplant surgeons will experience the greatest inefficiency.

HN: Once the structures are established, UCSF will need to distribute information to clinicians every year.

**Old Business**
None

**New Business**
None

**Adjournment**
Vice Chair Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 5:00pm.
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