School of Nursing Faculty Council
Jyu-Lin Chen, RN, PhD, Chair

MINUTES
Friday, November 18, 2011

PRESENT: Jyu-Lin Chen (Chair), Shari Dworkin (Vice Chair), Christine Baggott for Brad Aouizerat, Gerri Collins-Bride, Karen Duderstadt, Jill Howie Esquivel, Susan Janson, Hai-Yen Sung, Miranda Kramer, David Vlahov (Dean), Kathleen, Dargan, Carolyn Wylie

ABSENT: None

GUESTS: Heather Alden, Executive Director, UCSF Academic Senate

Chair Chen called the meeting of the School of Nursing (SON) Faculty Council to order on Friday, November 18, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. in Room N 319D. A quorum was present.

The minutes from August 19, 2011 and October 14, 2011 were approved with minor changes.

Chair’s Report – Jyu-Lin Chen (Attachment 1)

Chair Chen disseminated the attached report by email prior to the meeting and had handouts available. She had provided an update on the Long Range Development Plan, Mission Bay library space issues, the UC Patent Agreement Policy, the Senate Membership Task Force, Operational Excellence, the Chancellor’s Award Nominations, and an upcoming Faculty Research Lecture.

Dean’s Report – David Vlahov

Dean Vlahov reported about the proposal in the School of Nursing to convert the DNSc degree to a PhD.
  • About 150 UCSF graduates would be eligible for this degree conversion.
  • The Dean prepared a letter to the Graduate Council for eventual review by the UC Provost (via the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs).

The Dean will continue his report at the Full Faculty meeting this afternoon.

Associate Dean’s Report – Zina Mirsky

The Associate Dean’s report will be given at the Full Faculty meeting this afternoon.

Department Reports - Departmental Reports will be given at the Full Faculty meeting this afternoon.

Family Health Care Nursing – No Report
Community Health Systems – No report
Physiological Nursing – No report
Social and Behavioral Sciences – No report
**Student Report, Miranda Kramer**

M. Kramer provided an update on Nursing student concerns to the Faculty Council. The School of Nursing Student Council invited Judy Martin-Holland, Associate Dean, Academic Programs, and Jeffery Kilmer, Assistant Dean, Student Affairs, to their most recent meeting to discuss student concerns. They discussed the following topics:

- The programs and degrees currently offered in the School of Nursing
- The School of Nursing’s current and future direction.
  - Students who attended were relieved to learn that the faculty do have input on the curriculum and on direction of the school.
- Improving communication between students, faculty, and the administration.
- Funding & Tuition – students expressed worry about their continued ability to pay the rising costs of education.
  - Students also expressed that rather than simply bringing their funding and tuition concerns to Schools or campuses, they need to mobilize and organize an advocacy campaign directed towards elected officials.

**Senate Analyst Report – Kathleen Dargan**

Louis Ptacek, MD and Ying-Hui Fu, PhD will give the Academic Senate Faculty Research Lecture in Translational Science on February 14, 2011 in Rock Hall, 3:30 – 5:00. A reception will follow.

NOTE: THE DATE FOR THIS LECTURE HAS CHANGED to February 15, 2012, 3:30–5:00 pm in Rock Hall at the Mission Bay campus.

**Equity and Fairness in Merit Review Process Task Force Update – Jyu-Lin Chen**

Last year a task force looked at School promotion issues and conducted a survey. One recommendation was to follow up and the Council discussed ways to do so.

- Members discussed the importance of increasing transparency, as the current merit review process is not entirely transparent (both in terms of the requirements and in terms of when a chair is voting against the rest of the faculty).
- Vice Chair Dworkin reported that the survey indicated a general sense of confusion about what the criteria for advancement are.
  - In the survey, the majority of the faculty felt the merit process process was fair (73%) while 27% felt that there were discrepancies between their perception of readiness for a merit review and departmental assessment.
  - In the survey, faculty perceived that the merit process was “very fair” across departments
  - In the survey, faculty perceived that the merit was “fair” within departments
  - In the survey, ½ of faculty did not know about their right to have their merit case re-reviewed if there was a disagreement about the outcome of their review
  - Of those who felt there was a discrepancy between their perception of readiness at the individual and departmental level, many faculty expressed confusion about what the criteria for advancement actually are. Some faculty expressed concerns that their chair can overturn the vote of the department and hence more transparency is needed in the process. The smallest number of faculty reported that there may be discrepancies across departments, although there is no real knowledge base concerning what different departments do. As pointed out by Dean Mirsky, departments must have a review process in place, but these processes can be department specific.
The Council felt that the new ADVANCE system will help faculty to know when it is time to go up for a merit review and to clearly see what the criteria for advancement are. The ADVANCE system will also allow for the ability to see when a chair has voted against the recommendation of faculty. The Council decided to discuss the possible formation of a task force to review the promotion process and specifically to follow up on the recommendations made by the prior task force. The Faculty Council’s Vice Chair, Shari Dworkin, will chair the new task force if the Council determines that the task force is needed. There was discussion among Council members and concern voiced about the fact that there are multiple priorities and that they need to decide what is most valuable for them to pursue. Some members stated that because the majority of faculty felt that the merit review process was fair and most of the recommendations from the prior task force have already been implemented, focusing on other issues of strategic planning might be a better use of the Council’s resources and time.

For now, The Council finds that one important step should be taken and then the need for a task force will be revisited. Vice Chair Dworkin will work with Chris Miaskowski, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, as well as a former member of the Committee on Academic Personnel to ensure that there is a brown bag discussion regarding the merit review process.

- Given the report findings that the most common need requested by faculty was a need for more information, the Council would specifically like the brownbag to focus on the criteria for faculty advancement and promotion
- The brown bag should also inform faculty about their right to be re-reviewed if they disagree about the outcome of their review. The steps in this process should be highlighted.
- This discussion should include improving mentorship so that faculty know what is required of them
- Some of the emphasis should be on reducing the variability between clinical and non-clinical faculty.

**Issues to be addressed by the Faculty Council in 2011-2012**

1. Operational Excellence – including the impact of the implementation of new systems in the School of Nursing
2. Faculty Stress and Stability
3. Structural Degree Issues – What students are seeking and what we offer
4. Long-term funding and specialty structures
5. Strategic Planning
6. Improving Communication Lines to Students

**Concerns Related to Student Protests**

The Faculty Council will ask the departments to request that the Chancellor hold a Town Hall Meeting on this issue.

**Recent HRSA Funding Changes – Mary Lynch, Chair.**

Mary Lynch, Chair, Master’s Program Council, reported on developments relating to the recent HRSA funding changes.

The Master’s Program Council (MPC) called a meeting of specialty coordinators on November 2, 2011 to discuss the impact of the reduction in HRSA funding on specialties and the Master’s Program. This can be found at: [C:\Users\kdargan\Desktop\Changes in HRSA Funding Specialty Coordinators Meeting.docx](C:\Users\kdargan\Desktop\Changes in HRSA Funding Specialty Coordinators Meeting.docx)

HRSA funding used to amount to $500,000 – $1,000,000 in grants per year, but is now at $700,000 every other year. This change will affect numerous specialties.
• Approximately 50% of the current specialties will be without HRSA funding by 2013
• MPC felt it was important to link with SON Faculty Council and work together

Decreased funding and increased pressure can result in faculty stress and concerns about longevity. With that type of stress on faculty, they may be less creative, and when they are concerned about job security, they may search for other employment.

At this time, the Council felt that it is important to look at where SON plans to go as a School, which programs need funding and what grants to focus on so they do not waste time competing against each other. They felt they should devise criteria and support the best programs for grants to submit. M. Lynch reiterated that criteria had been developed and released this week. The Council felt that SON needs a school-wide system rather than having departments take the lead. Members also stated that:
• There is a lack of information about resources available within departments that could be shared
• SON needs to create a structure that enables new approaches
• SON needs to utilize the changing funding structure as a time to prioritize their needs, and change their overall philosophy and approach
• SON should have a fruitful, fair, discussion, and process where the MPC and SON Faculty Council work together

Old Business
None.

New Business
None.

Chair Chen adjourned the meeting at 11:10 a.m.

Senate Staff:
Kathleen Dargan, Senate Analyst
Kate.dargan@ucsf.edu; 415-476-1308