The Faculty Council was called to order by Chair Nissenson at 3:35 p.m. in room CL 222.

Approval of Minutes from September 22, 2011
The minutes were approved.

Chair’s Report

Chair Nissenson updated the committee on various topics:

1. Senate Membership Task Force
   a. SOM Dean’s Office supports efforts of the Senate Membership Task Force

2. SOM Faculty Council Annual Report distributed to all SOM Faculty
   a. An Executive Summary and link to the Annual Report were distributed via email

3. Coordinating Committee
   a. The November and December 2011 meetings will cover various topics including
      i. APM 670 changes
      ii. Long-range development planning and having faculty be involved in the process
      iii. SOM Compensation Plan project
          1. Goal is to evaluate how to proceed. The task force report and its recommendations will be made in December. Mike Hindery is developing a set of principles and will present these to the committee at a future meeting.

4. GME Funding
   a. CMS is proposing reducing funding by 50%.
   b. Even if we eliminate all funding for fellowship positions that will only account for 10% of all UCSF GME funding.
   c. This issue is only now being started to pay attention to.
Presentation on the VA Medical Center – Diana Nicoll, Chief of Staff, VAMC-SF and Associate Dean, UCSF School of Medicine, and Carl Grunfeld, Associate Chief of Staff for Research and Development, VAMC-SF

The Council heard a presentation on the VA Medical Center and how it interacts with the UCSF Medical Center. The VAMC has had electronic medical records since 1994, including a barcode program for medication. For more information, please review the attached PowerPoint. (Attachment 1)

Discussion of APM 670 Changes
Current Academic Planning & Budget (APB) Chair Mary Gray and former APB Chair, Steven Cheung, went over the proposed changes to APB 670 and the Memorandum of Understanding created by APB in conjunction with Deans Hawgood and Featherstone.

APB 670 Memorandum of Understanding (UCSF-specific)
UCSF proposed revisions over the summer 2011. These were partly incorporated into the proposed APM 670 changes that were released for review by UCOP.

UCSF APB recommended an increase from $20K to $30K for outside income. The actual revised amount was raised further to $40K. Vacation days and weekends are excluded from the number of days allowed for outside work.

If faculty are below the $40K threshold that is the amount for which they don’t need approval from department or institution.

There is no assessment made by the institution, however, it is considered taxable income. Interim Vice Dean, Academic Affairs, Neal Cohen advised that SOM wanted to be cognizant that some faculty want the funds to come to UCSF such that they can be used for educational purposes, or if the faculty member has a salary shortfall.

Downfalls, per Neal Cohen, are professional liability issues and separately, pulling work and patients away from UCSF. For faculty in non-medical fields, they have nine-month appointments and as such, they are free to do what they wish in the interim months. UCSF is different as faculty have year-round appointments.

Proposed changes APB 670
A major change is the decentralization in the implementation process. As read, each school could have its own implementation procedure.

Members raised the following issues as to the work ahead and how these changes should be governed by UCSF?:

1. What and who will determine when a faculty member is in good standing?
   a. What is the definition of “in good standing”?
2. Should there be an automatic trigger if the pricing index goes up?
3. If there is one set by UCOP, UCSF should re-address the imposed limit.
4. Academic programmatic unit
   a. Does it make sense for members in that as written it matches how things have been done in the past?

Former Chair Cheung highlighted the following main issues:

1. With the new $40K limit, UCSF is asking and recommending that this not be taxable income
2. There should be an automatic trigger set up such if the pricing index goes up.
   a. Every set amount of time, there should be an automatic update to the price limit
3. For-profit income should be addressed
4. UCSF wants a UCOP definition of a “workday”.

Old Business
None.

New Business
None

Chair Nissenson adjourned the committee at 5:05pm.
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