School of Medicine Faculty Council
Joseph Sullivan, MD, Chair

MINUTES
Thursday, September 13, 2012

PRESENT: Joe Sullivan (Chair) Ellen Weber (Vice Chair), Marcelle Cedars, Cynthia Curry, Teresa De Marco, Judith Ford, Ruth Goldstein, Celia Kaplan, Phil Rosenthal, Lydia Zablotska

ABSENT: Robert Baron, Elena Fuentes-Afflick, Sam Hawgood, Harry Hollander, Catherine Lucey, Alma Martinez, Heather Nye

GUEST: Heather Alden, Executive Director, UCSF Academic Senate, and Alison Cleaver, Senior Senate Analyst, UCSF Academic Senate

Chair Joe Sullivan called the Faculty Council meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. in room S-118.

Approval of Minutes from June 21, 2012 (Attachment 1)
The minutes were approved with revisions.

Chair’s Report
Chair Sullivan welcomed the Council members and asked each member to introduce themselves to the group.

Chair Sullivan asked Vice Chair Ellen Weber to give a presentation on the recent call for nominations to the Health Science Compensation Plan Advisory Council. Vice Chair Weber gave an overview of the Advisory Committee’s charge and membership. The committee was created to assist in the oversight of the Health Science Compensation Plan at UCSF. The membership of the committee consists of six members: Three members appointed by the Dean and three members elected by the faculty. Of the elected members, one will be from the adjunct series, one from the clinical series and one selected at-large. All School of Medicine faculty are welcome to nominate faculty colleagues that are willing to serve on the committee. Faculty members are also free to self-nominate. The nomination process will end on September 20 and the election will occur immediately afterwards.

Discussion of Faculty Council Issues for 2012-2013
Chair Sullivan presented a list of proposed issues for the Faculty Council to address in the coming year. He welcomed the Council members to suggest additional issues and to rank the list of topics in order of importance.

The Faculty Council then reviewed and ranked the following list of topics:
1. **Funding Flows:** Council members had questions and concerns about the new funding flows model that the Medical Center is piloting with the Department of Neurology’s outpatient services. Chair Sullivan described that in the proposed new model the Medical Center collects all department revenues and, in return, the Center assumes all department overhead costs. In addition, the Medical Center proposes to give a “kickback” to the department, on an “RVU basis,” if the department hits a set target. If their target is exceeded, then even more money is given to the department. Chair Sullivan noted that departments are looking at this as a good thing since administrative costs will be assumed by the Medical Center. When asked where the Medical Center would get the money to take over more costs, Chair Sullivan answered that the assumption is that the Medical Center will be able to cover the additional administrative costs from revenues generated “downstream” of clinic referrals.

The Faculty Council raised several major academic questions about the proposed funding model: First, in the new model will the faculty report to the Chair of the Department, or David Morgan in the Medical Center? Second, how does the Medical Center plan to compensate for the academic mission of the departments? For example, how much money will be going back to the Medical School? According to Chair Sullivan, this question has not been answered by the Medical Center. The Council would like to address these questions in coming meetings. To speak to this issue, Council members would like to invite Michael Hindery, the SOM Vice Dean for Administration, Finance and Clinical Programs.

2. **Quantifying Education Efforts:** With the Medical Center now taking control over clinical practices, faculty are concerned that tracking of resources might have an effect on teaching and education. This relates to the recent determination of educational relative value units (RVUs) at UCSF. RVUs are used to measure the amounts of resources that are required to perform various services within a department or multiple departments. Council members would like to have a more detailed explanation of how the RVUs have been determined.

3. **Operational Excellence:** How are changes going to be measured and evaluated? Members expressed concerns about the cost of the program, as well as the lack of communication and transparency. Council members agreed that there must be a follow-up study of the program. The Council discussed plans for a survey. Members mentioned that Clare Brindis has been working on a survey in the School of Medicine. The Faculty Council members would like to check-in with Clare on the status of her survey.

4. **Communication with the Mission Bay Clinical Operations Committee:** There needs to be better communication between the faculty and the hospital. It is hard to tell who is in charge in the implementation of policy.

5. **Long Range Development Plan**

6. **Space Planning**

**Discussion on Faculty Council Bylaws and Implementation Guidelines**

Council members discussed recent concerns with bylaws. These concerns included a lack of standing committee oversight, Council Chair term limits and Senate Membership changes.

**Standing Committee Oversight:** Council members agreed that they need to address the lack of standing committees oversight, but not in a way that will encroach upon the work of the committees. Council members agreed the best way to establish oversight is to ask the standing committees to report to the Council at least once a year. The Council members also agreed that the reporting should be spaced out
so that only one standing committee presents at each meeting. A once-a-year reporting method would be best because it will allow the Council to learn about the work of the committee and ask questions.

Council member Zablotska asked the Faculty Council to review membership policies of the standing committees. The Council agreed.

Council Chair Term Limits: Council members discussed a proposal to extend term limits of the Council Chair from a one-year term to a two-year term. Members agreed that the Chair should serve a longer term to help the Chair build sufficient knowledge and be more effective. The only concern with the extension of the Chair’s term is that the Vice Chair would have to serve a two-year term before serving as Chair. To resolve the issue, the Council members agreed to make the Post Chair a full member of the Council. Currently the Post Chair is only a Permanent Guest. To make this change, the Faculty Council will include this bylaw change along with additional changes from the standing committees.

Senate Membership: Members discussed whether or not the Council should allow a non-senate chair to become Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Council. The Council agreed that an expansion of Chair rights should be extended to non-senate faculty and that this will be a bylaw change.

Presentation on the Academic Senate and the Role of the Faculty Council

Heather Alden, Executive Director of the Academic Senate Office, gave a presentation to the Council members on describing the Academic Senate and the role and responsibilities of the Faculty Council.

Heather and the Council then reviewed the SOM Faculty Council bylaws relating to the Council’s oversight of the standing committees, as well as the charge of the Faculty Council.

Heather concluded her presentation by informing faculty of the Division's Bylaw Revision Taskforce. This taskforce will be looking into ways the Division can expand privileges to faculty members that are not part of the Senate.

Old Business
None

New Business
Council members approved the 2011-2012 Annual Report

Chair Sullivan adjourned the committee at 4:58pm.