Primary Focus Points for the Year:
- APM 670
- Campus Space Planning
- Operational Excellence
- SOM Standing Committees Bylaws and Policies
- SOM Faculty Council Bylaws
- Mission Bay Academic Building
- Monitoring the Redesign of the Undergraduate Medical Education Curriculum
- Changes to Health Science Compensation Plan
- Monitoring Changes to 19900 Funds
- Monitoring the Rollout of APeX
- Support of Sustainability Committee

Task Forces, Special Committees and Subcommittees
- None

Issues for Next Year (2013-2014)
- Funds Flow
- Indirect Costs
- Mission Bay Academic Building
- Monitoring the Redesign of the Undergraduate Medical Education Curriculum
- Ongoing Communication with the Mission Bay Hospital Clinical Operations Oversight Committee
- Operational Excellence

2012-2013 Members

Joseph Sullivan, Chair
Ellen Weber, Vice Chair
Marcelle Cedars
Cynthia Curry
Teresa De Marco
Judith Ford
Ruth Goldstein
Celia Kaplan
Alma Martinez
Heather Nye
Robert Nissenson (Post-Chair)
Phil Rosenthal (CAC Liaison)
Lydia Zablotska

Ex-Officio Members
Bobby Baron, Associate Dean, Graduate Medical Education
Renee Binder, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs
Elena Fuentes-Afflick, Vice Dean, Academic Affairs
Samuel Hawgood, Dean
Harry Hollander, Chair, Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy
Catherine Lucey, Vice Dean, Education

Number of Meetings: 10
Senate Analyst: Artemio Cardenas
Systemwide Business

In 2012-2013, the Council took up the following UC Systemwide issues:

**APM 670**

During the 2012-2013 academic term, the School of Medicine worked to implement revisions to APM 670, the policy governing compensation of health science faculty. In October 2012, Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, Elena Fuentes worked with the Faculty Council and Academic Senate to run an election for members to serve on a new Advisory Committee. Later, in February 2013, Vice Dean Fuentes-Afflick attended a Council meeting to review several topics including, the changes to APM 670, the membership and responsibility of the Advisory Committee and the next steps for the polices to be implemented (Appendix 1). Council members were informed that the new policies should be approved by UCOP and fully implemented in July 2013.

Divisional Business

This year, the School of Medicine Faculty Council took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

**Campus Space Planning**

In November, Bruce Wintroub attended the Faculty Council meeting to talk about UCSF’s plans use a new space plan. Under this new system schools and departments would be assessed by a campus space committee to determine whether the department brings in enough money to match the cost of the space. The hope was that if departments had extra space, they would realize it would be more cost efficient to release the space back to the Chancellor. During his presentation, Bruce shared the UCSF-wide Core Space Principles and described how the new plan would be implemented. Principles include:

1. Accountability and Governance
   a. Deans will be responsible to report to the Space Committee. Metrics will be developed to allow the committee to know if space is being used efficiently.
2. Fairness, Consistency, Transparency, Sustainability, Strategic Prioritization
3. Non Permanence
   a. Space does not belong to one entity in perpetuity
4. Operational Cost Responsibility
   a. All research (wet and dry) space will be expected to cover costs of $90 per square foot.

**Changes to 19900 Funds**

In November, the Faculty Welfare Committee submitted a letter to the Dean Hawgood requesting his response to faculty concerns about recent changes to the distribution of 19900 funds. In particular, on the potential scenario where faculty would be asked to take salary reductions to compensate for increases in benefit costs. After not hearing a response, the Faculty Welfare Committee contacted the Faculty Council to ask for assistance. In March, Faculty Council Chair Sullivan emailed Dean Hawgood requesting a response the Faculty Welfare letter. The Dean responded by commenting that there have been budget cuts to funds (19900) used for faculty benefits. As benefit costs increase, the departments are coming under increased pressure to find alternative resources to make up for the gap between the 19900 funds and the cost of benefits. He added that there doesn’t seem to be an immediate solution and that this is a problem for the campus and for the school as some departments might fall into deficit trying to make up for the gap.

To provide the Council with more details, Chair Sullivan invited Vice Chancellor of Finance Eric Vermillion to attend the May meeting and talk about faculty concerns with the recent shift in the distribution of 19900 funds. According to Vice Chancellor Vermillion the University has provided for all salary and benefit increases paid out through 19900 funds. To make sure that each school was not disadvantaged by the funding realignment, the Finance office reviewed the benefits costs of each school and distributed funds based on historical averages. While benefits costs have increased, the Schools have always been made whole by the central campus.

**Mission Bay Academic Building**

The School of Medicine Faculty Council worked diligently throughout the academic year to provide campus leadership with alternatives to the plans to incorporate an activity-based workspace in the under construction
Mission Bay Academic Building. Primary concerns of the Council included issues with privacy, limited storage, productivity and worries that the space would eventually hurt faculty recruitment and retention.

In November, the Council asked Vice Dean Bruce Wintroub to comment on the Mission Bay Hospital after his presentation on space planning. Vice Dean Wintroub informed the group that the decision to use the activity-based workspace was based on the fact that there wasn’t enough space in the new building ensure that all faculty members would have an office. The campus leadership also didn’t want to create a space where some faculty had offices and some didn’t. In an effort to make the space equitable, the space committee recommended the implementation of an activity-based workspace.

In April, Chair Sullivan joined Vice Chair Weber and member Phil Rosenthal on a tour of a mock-up of an activity-based workspace. The tour was preceded by a slide presentation from Vice Dean Wintroub. During the discussion he informed the faculty that it was too late for the University to change its decision, but there still was room to adjust accommodations to ensure that faculty concerns regarding privacy and comfort would be addressed. Chair Sullivan and Vice Chair Weber then worked to gather faculty input on accommodations. Working with the Senate, further work on the topic is planned for the 2013-2014 term.

**Operational Excellence (OE)**

**Evaluation Efforts**
In October, Faculty Council members requested more information on the evaluation of the Operational Excellence services. Before the program was implemented, faculty where told that the new changes would reduce administrative costs and improve service. Since Operational Excellence has taken effect, Council members have experienced or received feedback that services were below the previous standard and that some departments were spending more money than before to compensate. To provide more details on the University's effort to evaluate OE, Claire Brindis, SOM faculty member and member of the Operational Excellence Oversight Committee, joined the Council in November to give an overview of the efforts to evaluate OE. She informed the Council that when the OE program was first implemented at SOM, it was realized that evaluation metrics needed to be established to ensure that OE actually delivered upon its goals of reducing costs and maintaining or increasing efficiencies. To do this, faculty and administrators looked to create a common tool that could evaluate the program on an ongoing basis. The result was a survey created by Dr. Brindis and several other faculty members. This survey tool includes two parts: 1) A baseline survey that went out to faculty before OE changes were implemented and 2) a longitudinal survey titled, “How’s my Driving.” The survey is submitted to faculty after each grant submission. The information that is provided through these surveys is collected by the OE administration and used to improve the program.

With the support of the Faculty Council, Dr. Brindis was later tasked with leading the University’s effort to evaluate OE. Additional surveys were released in March and June. The Council looks forward to reviewing results in the 2013-2014 term.

**Reports from OE Leadership**
In March 2013, the Faculty Council invited David Odato, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human resources and Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, reported on the status of recent reforms to human resources and research services. In particular, faculty members were concerned with increased costs and the troubles with the quality of services.

**OE Human Resources**
In his presentation, Associate Vice Chancellor David Odato provided an overview of the OE HR organization and the challenges the program has faced over the past several months (Appendix 2). Council members questioned Odato on reports of low faculty satisfaction, increased costs, and duplication of services. AVC Odato responded by detailing costs attributed to unforeseen and underestimated costs of centralization. With the start-up process now over, the group is now focused on reducing costs and increasing the level of service. He pointed out to the Council that over the past several months the time it takes the HR department to complete an issue has declined and that survey responses show an increase in satisfaction. He also informed the Council that duplication of services should not be happening and he hopes that departments will eventually decide to move services requests to the central group.
OE Pre-award Changes
Associate Vice Chancellor Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki reported on the status of Pre-Award administration and the priorities of the program in FY 12-13 (Appendix 3). She informed the Council that despite a number of challenges, the overall quality of service is still good. The main task now is meeting the demand of proposals with the number of Research Service Coordinators (RSC) available. AVC Hildebrand-Zanki also gave an overview of the faculty evaluation efforts that will be taking place.

Support of the Sustainability Task Force
The Faculty Council listened to presentations from the Sustainability Task Force and supported the initiatives to end the consumption of clean meat on campus and bring awareness to the call to encourage UC to divest from coal burning companies.

School of Medicine Business

This year, the Faculty Council took up the following issues related to the School of Medicine:

Discretionary Funds Absorption by Departments/Division
The Faculty Council continued to monitor possible changes to the allocation of discretionary funds. In April, Jeanette Brown, Professor in the OB/Gyn & Reproductive Sciences Department, joined the Council meeting to discuss possible department plans to start the practice of taxing faculty discretionary funds. She explained that discretionary funds are the residual funds that remain after a grant has been processed. These types of funds often come from private foundation grants and other non-federal grants.

After discussion, Faculty Council announced that they were unanimously opposed to any taxation of discretionary funds. However, the Council members informed Professor Brown that none of the departments is currently engaging in the activity. Professor Brown thanked the Council for their input and requested that they further bring awareness to the issue.

Monitoring the Redesign of the Undergraduate Medical Education Curriculum
In December, Susan Masters, Associate Dean of Curriculum at the School of Medicine, gave a presentation on the efforts of the School to redesign the undergraduate medical education curriculum (Appendix 4). Joining Susan Masters was Council member and Vice Dean Catherine Lucey. The purpose of the presentation is to inform the Council of the reasons why SOM is taking on the initiative, what goals the SOM wants to accomplish, and to inquire how the Council would like to arrange oversight over the next year. At the end of the presentation, the Council requested that a member of the redesign group should join the Council next year to report on the progress of the effort.

SOM Faculty Council Bylaw Revisions
Over the course of the year, the Faculty Council reviewed its bylaws in an attempt to update the rules to current Council practices and to expand senate membership to non-senate faculty. Along with three other Faculty Councils, the Medicine Faculty Council started the process of reviewing and revising their bylaws. In March, the Council submitted the revised bylaws to the Academic Senate Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction for approval. Upon review, the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee approved most changes with the exception of revisions to Bylaw 100, a Division bylaw defining the membership of the Academic Senate and the members’ voting rights and privileges. The Committee ruled that the Faculty Council did not have jurisdiction to revise the Division bylaws and that there needed to be edits accordingly. In response, all of the necessary changes were made and a draft was resubmitted. After a second review, the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee approved. In July the Full Faculty of the School of Medicine voted to approve the revisions (Appendix 5).

SOM Standing Committees Bylaws and Policies
Following up on the efforts of the members in the previous year, the Council worked to obtain the policies and procedures of the standing committees and determine how to best arrange oversight of each committee. In October and November, the Council received the policies and procedures for all of the committees (Appendix 6). Council members requested that the leaders responsible for each committee be called in to discuss an oversight arrangement, and whether any standing committee bylaws needed to be revised. Vice Dean Catherine Lucey attended in March to present on the Curriculum and Educational Policy. Included in her presentation, she
reported on the work of the committee over the past year and the plans for the next year. She also presented a draft of bylaw revisions for the Council to review (Appendix 7). She noted that the purpose of the revisions is to be more inclusive by establishing a broader relationship between Undergraduate Medical Education, Graduate Medical Education and Continuing Medical Education.

In May, Associate Dean of Admissions, David Wofsy, reported on the work of the Admissions Committee and detailed the justifications for the committee’s policies and procedures. After review and discussion, the Council ruled that no bylaw revisions were necessary.

Also in May, Maxine Papadakis, Associate Dean of Student Affairs reported on the policies and procedures for the following standing committees:

- **Student Welfare Committee:**
  Associate Dean Papadakis informed the Council that this committee does not currently have any members and there is no anticipated meeting time in the immediate future. Council members asked if the Committee should continue, or if it should be removed from the bylaws. Associate Dean Papadakis informed the Council that Catherine Lucey had hired Liz Yap, an attorney from UC Office of General Council, to review all of the medical school’s policies and documents and issue a recommendation report. The Council should wait until the report is released to make decision on what to do with the Student Welfare Committee.

- **Screening and Promotions Committee:**
  Associate Dean Papadakis reviewed the work and the processes and policies of each of the Screening and Promotions committees. She asked the Council to clarify the annual appointment of members. Council informed her that the current methods are satisfactory. After the review, Associate Dean Papadakis and the Council members discussed the recent trends in student performance and wellbeing.

## Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions, which the Faculty Council will continue into 2013-2014:

- Funds Flow
- Indirect Costs
- Mission Bay Academic Building
- Monitoring the Redesign of the Undergraduate Medical Education Curriculum
- Ongoing Communication with the Mission Bay Hospital Clinical Operations Oversight Committee
- Operational Excellence
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Senate Staff:
Artemio Cardenas, Senate Analyst
Artemio.Cardenas@ucsf.edu, 415/476-4245
APM 670 – the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP)
Summary of Revisions

Approval Authority and Reporting

- The Regents retain their present authority to amend or repeal the Plan.
- School Implementation Procedures require approval of the President, as do the inclusion or exclusion of schools in the Plan. However, the President may delegate this authority to the Provost.
- School Implementation Procedures (i.e. the school compensation plans) are due to the Office of the President by January 31, 2013. Our Procedures have been submitted to the Chancellor. After the Chancellor reviews all four schools’ Implementation Procedures, she will send the documents to UCOP. We do not know exactly when UCOP will return the Implementation Procedures to our campus but we hope the turnaround will be fairly rapid.

Advisory Committee

- A school-specific Advisory Committee, comprised of Senate and non-Senate faculty that represent a range of disciplines and all five series, has been established. All members must have faculty appointments. APM 670 spells out the process for forming this committee, as well as its charge (see below). Last September, the Dean named three members to this Committee; we solicited nominations and held an election (open to compensation plan members in good standing) to identify the remaining Advisory Committee members. Amy Friedli is the staff member for the committee. The Advisory Committee met in October 2012 to review and provide input on the draft Implementation Procedures that were submitted to UCOP.
- The Advisory Committee members are: Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH, Renee Binder, MD, Neal Cohen, MD, MPH, MS, Bobby Baron, MD, Steve Tomlanovich, MD and Irene Yen, PhD, MPH.
- The Advisory Committee’s role is to assist the Dean in resolving any issues that may arise related to the implementation of the new HSCP. The Committee also assists in assuring compliance with and resolution of issues pertaining to outside professional activities, conflict of interest and conflict of commitment.
- The Advisory Committee’s scope of review includes the School’s Implementing Procedures, department and ORU Implementing Procedures, Good Standing criteria, faculty complaints pertaining to the Plan and any issues regarding APU assignments and/or outside professional activities.
The Advisory Committee is charged with advising the Dean on:

1. Development of the School’s Implementing Procedures, including Good Standing criteria, APU assignments and APU scales.
2. Departmental Implementing Procedures
3. Review of potential (or actual) conflicts between a plan participant’s commitment to the School (to generate revenue within the HSCP) and her/his outside professional activities
4. Review of faculty appeals regarding implementing and administering the HSCP that are not resolved at the departmental or School level or that are submitted to the Committee as a result of a determination that a faculty member is no longer in Good Standing.

The Committee must prepare an annual report that summarizes its activities and distribute the report to Plan participants, the Dean and the Chancellor.

Good Standing Criteria

Under the current SOM compensation plan, there are references to good standing but no consistent good standing criteria, nor are there criteria in either the APM or at a campus level.

APM 670 mandates that Written Good Standing Criteria be established at the School or Department level and included in the School/Department Implementing Procedures.

The four UCSF schools worked with Vice Provost Marshall to develop standard Good Standing Criteria and standard language across the Implementation Procedures (school compensation plans). We are hopeful that this will be approved as submitted by the President. If it is, Departments can simply drop the new language regarding the Advisory Committee and Good Standing Criteria into their compensation plans. The intent is that this language is standard across the schools and across the departments and ORUs, i.e. variations cannot occur.

Plan Participants shall be deemed in Good Standing until they are otherwise found to be not in Good Standing.

Loss of Good Standing may occur in the following instances:

• Finding of faculty misconduct
• Finding of research misconduct
• Finding of unsatisfactory performance in a Five-Year review
• Refusal or failure to participate in assigned duties
• Loss of clinical privileges (as required)
• Loss of licensure and/or credentials (as required)
• Refusal or failure to complete required trainings
• Lack of compliance with University policy and/or reporting requirements
• Failure to meet expectations related to the generation of salary support and/or shared expenses

Plan participants must satisfy the Good Standing Criteria in order to be permitted to earn and/or retain income from outside professional (non-clinical) activities.
• The faculty member must be notified in writing of the determination that she/he is not in Good Standing, the basis for this determination and the steps that need to be taken to return to Good Standing.
• Faculty who are not in Good Standing must obtain written approval in advance from their Chair to engage in any unassigned professional activities (outside professional activities).
• A faculty member who is not in Good Standing may have this determination impact his/her negotiated compensation and/or incentive/bonus compensation.

**Outside Professional Activity**

• Currently there is review and revision of APM 025 (Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members) underway. This includes development and the forthcoming issuance of a new section of the APM, 671, which will govern conflict of commitment and outside activities of health sciences compensation plan faculty.
• It does not appear that the types of activity that are and are not permitted would change much, if at all. What is likely to change is the amount of time that can be devoted to such activities and the resulting amount of income that can be retained by the faculty member.
• APM 670 does make one change in this area: the maximum annual outside professional earnings approval threshold is increased to $40,000 or 20 percent of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan Salary Scale for an individual faculty member’s rank, step, and APU, whichever is greater.

**Compensation and Benefits**

• Faculty salary rates, amounts or method of calculation are unchanged.
• The Guidelines on Outside Professional Activity were not changed but have been moved to Appendix B. Appendix B is likely to become APM 671.
• A section has been added to provide better guidance related to the assignment of APUs which determines a faculty member’s position on the Health Sciences Salary Scale.
• Approval by the Chancellor or his/her designee is required for any APU that is comprised of fewer than four members.
• Consistent with current practice, an APU can only move up one scale each year and, barring extenuating circumstances, cannot move down more than one scale per year.
• Changes regarding leave benefits are made to ensure consistency with the APM 700 series (sabbatical, leave with salary, extended illness, and childbearing and childrearing leaves).
• We will be providing suggested language and clarification recommendations in this area to departments and ORUs.
Miscellaneous Revisions

Faculty Complaints and Appeals

- Faculty complaints related to outside professional activities should first attempt to be resolved at the department/unit level.
- The faculty member may file a formal complaint with the Dean.
- The Dean charges the Advisory Committee with fact-finding.
- The chair/director or designee and faculty member have the right to be heard by the Advisory Committee.
Summary of Revisions to the Bylaws of the Faculty of the School of Medicine
Joseph Sullivan, MD, Chair

July 9, 2013

TO: Members of the Faculty of the School of Medicine
RE: Vote on School of Medicine Bylaw Revisions

The Faculty Council has revised bylaw language regarding:

Bylaw Updates
1. Detailing the role and responsibility of the Executive Office
2. Adding a UCSF Fresno Representative
3. Broadening the Council’s membership requirements
4. Ensuring continuity of institutional knowledge by controlling the number of members that rotate off each period
5. Making the Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy more inclusive by establishing a broader relationship between Undergraduate Medical Education, Graduate Medical Education and Continuing Medical Education.

Shared Faculty Governance
1. Defining a new “Committee of the Faculty” which includes all full-time SOM faculty
2. Broadening the language by removing explicit references to the rights of Senate faculty
3. Increasing the number of Health Science Clinical and Adjunct faculty members on the Council

Justifications
Bylaws of the Faculty of the School of Medicine
Section I.2.2 Membership and Voting Privileges
The Council has updated this section by changing “Chief Campus Officer” to “Chancellor.” This change was made to be consistent with the bylaws of the Division and other Faculty Councils.

Section I.2.B Membership and Voting Privileges
The Council created language for a new “committee of the faculty” that includes all full-time members of the School of Medicine. The Council has defined this new group to allow faculty in HS Clinical and Adjunct series to vote on all school related issues that are not exclusively governed by the Academic Senate(as described in S.F Bylaw 100). This change was made to reflect the general practices of the committee and allow for greater faculty participation on the Council.

Section I.3.A. Officers and Section I.4.Duties of the Executive Committee
Council members updated the bylaws by shifting the staffing responsibilities from the Vice Chair of the Faculty to the Academic Senate’s Executive Office. This change was made to accurately reflect the current role of the Executive Office in staffing the Senate Councils and Committees. The responsibilities of the Executive Office are now detailed in Section I.4.
Section II.1.A. Council of the Faculty and Section II.1.A.1 Elected
Council members have made several revisions to the membership of the Faculty Council. These changes were made to increase the number of non-senate faculty members on the Council and to update the language to broaden the membership requirements. To increase representation of non-senate faculty, the Council has revised the number of elected non-senate members to go from three to four. This change was made because the Council feels that faculty members from Health Science Clinical and Adjunct series make up the majority of the academic population at the School of Medicine and that representation should be granted accordingly. The bylaw changes are also consistent with a Divisional effort to expand Senate membership.

Council members have also updated the language to reflect the multiple roles of faculty in the School of Medicine. For example, instead of stipulating requirements for a particular group, such as Basic Scientist, the SOM faculty will now have the flexibility to elect members that may have overlapping responsibilities and represent multiple interests.

Finally, to reflect the Council’s tradition of including a UCSF Fresno representative, the members have added a new representative position. This position will be nominated and elected by the faculty at the Fresno campus.

Section II.1.A.2. Ex Officio
Council members added two Ex Officio members to the Council. These now include the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Graduate Medical Education. The members were added to now include representation of important parts of the School.

Section II.1.A.3. Representatives
Council members removed this section and moved all references to Health Science Clinical and Adjunct to Section II.1.A.1 Elected. The Council made this change to expand representation and remove all bylaws that limit voting rights to just faculty from the Ladder Rank, In Residence and Clinical X series.

Section II.1.B.1. Terms of Office
Council members removed “Academic Senate” to be consistent with the changes to Section II.1.A. Council of the Faculty and Section II.1.A.1 Elected. Council members also wanted to ensure continuity in the Council's membership, so they revised the bylaws to confirm that no more than three or four of the Council would rotate off the Council in a given year.

Section II.1.B.2. Terms of Office
Council members removed “The Representatives shall serve three year terms” to be consistent with the changes to Section II.1.A. Council of the Faculty and Section II.1.A.1 Elected.

Section II.1.B.3. Terms of Office
Council members removed the references to “Senate” and “Representatives” to be consistent with the changes to Section II.1.A. Council of the Faculty and Section II.1.A.1 Elected.

Section II.1.C.1 Nominations and Elections
Council members updated this section by removing the nomination and election responsibilities from the Vice Chair. The responsibility to conduct elections is now referenced in Section I.4. Duties of the Executive Committee.

Section II.1.E. Replacements
Council members removed “Senate” to be consistent with the changes to Section II.1.A. Council of the Faculty and Section II.1.A.1 Elected.

Section II.1.H.3. Duties and Powers
Council members want to revise the bylaws to read that the standing committee members are approved, rather than appointed, by the Council. This change was made to reflect current practice.

Section II.2.C Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy
Justification provided by the Undergraduate Medical Education Office:
The proposed changes to the current by-laws for the Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy are meant to be more inclusive of the whole of Medical Education curricula at UCSF. The current bylaws restrict input and dominion of CCEP to the Undergraduate MD curriculum only. Now that Graduate Medical Education (GME) has its own curriculum development and oversight process with an Associate Dean for GME, a Director of Curricular Affairs in GME, and a Curriculum Committee, the Residency and Fellowship Programs deserve representation and input into how curricula and policies are shaped in the School of Medicine. The other major change has to do with lengthening the terms of the members so that more voices can be included.

Pros/Cons
The inclusion of Graduate Medical Education perspectives will make it possible to develop and guide the initiatives that will cross the UME/GME continuum and to consider how developments in one area impact and affect those in the other. Including the GME focus of the committee will also allow for enhanced faculty input of resident and fellow education.

Any ill effects that the Senate might consider would be the administrative effort in changing the legislation and a more diffuse focus on the specifics of the curriculum and policies of the MD program. We hope to mitigate the former problem with the tracked changes draft below. Regarding the latter issue of diffuse focus on the MD program, CCEP has anticipated that problem by creating a subcommittee called the Integrated Curriculum Steering Committee (ICSC). This committee oversees the work of the Essential Core Course Committee (ECCC) and the Clinical Core Operations Committee (CCOC). It receives reviews of every course throughout the MD curriculum and also gives these committees guidance in how best to translate and maintain the policies and guidelines established at CCEP. With ICSC in place, CCEP can expand its focus to attend to Graduate Medical Education’s curricular needs as well as Undergraduate Medical Education’s. It can also serve a higher-level role across the Medical Education continuum.

The increased length of term of members to 3 years for faculty and 2 years for students and residents will reinvigorate the membership of the committee. 1-year terms can result in repeated re-appointments of members that ultimately result in extremely long terms. That can lead to waning levels of commitment. By increasing the initial length of term and limiting the number of times each appointment can be renewed, more perspectives will be heard while preserving the important element of institutional memory. In addition, we recommend that we eliminate the seats reserved automatically for volunteer clinical faculty and adjunct faculty. Instead, we have increased the number of at large seats and request that the Faculty council decide on how to distribute the seats.

If you have any questions about the bylaws, please contact artemio.cardenas@ucsf.edu or 415.476.4245.

Sincerely,

Joseph Sullivan, MD
Chair, School of Medicine Faculty Council
DRAFT: Bylaws of the Faculty of the School of Medicine

Section I. General Provisions.

1. Functions
   A. The Faculty (1) of the School of Medicine shall govern and supervise the School in accordance with San Francisco Division Bylaw 95.
   B. The officers and committees of the Faculty shall take appropriate steps to inform the entire teaching staff (2) about the affairs of the School. They shall encourage expression by the entire teaching staff of their views on matters of policy affecting the School.

Membership and Voting Privileges

   A. When the Faculty is functioning as a Committee of the Division of the Academic Senate, the membership of the Faculty is as specified in Division Bylaw 100, namely:
       1. The President of the University,
       2. The Chancellor,
       3. The Dean of the School,
       4. All members of the Faculty who are members of the School of Medicine.

   B. Only members of the Faculty who are voting members of the Academic (Am. 6/93) Senate are eligible to vote.

   A. All members of the teaching staff of the School, including those holding titles in the Adjunct (Am. 6/93), Clinical, Lecturer, and Research series, may attend meetings of the Faculty, may make and second motions, and may have the privilege of the floor for discussion.

   B. When acting as a Committee of the Faculty, the Committee’s membership shall include all full-time faculty members of the School of Medicine. All members may have privilege of the floor and may participate on any voting actions pertaining to the school.

Officers

   A. The Chair and Vice Chair of the Council of the Faculty are Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty.

   B. Duties of Officers

       1. The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Faculty and of the Council of the Faculty. The Chair shall serve as liaison officer of the Faculty to the Dean.
       2. The Vice Chair shall preside in the absence of the Chair at meetings of the Faculty and of the Council of the Faculty.

Duties of the Executive Office

   The Executive Office of the San Francisco Division provides professional, analytical, and administrative support; guidance; coordination; communication; and assistance (Division Bylaw 25). Its duties shall include:

       1. Maintaining proper records
       2. Sending advance notice (call) for meetings and presentation to the faculty, in advance of any meetings, of adequate information regarding matters to be considered.
       3. Minutes of each Faculty Meeting
4. Conducting all elections
5. Keeping a valid roster of voting members of the Faculty

Meetings
- Frequency - The Faculty shall meet at least once during each Fall, Winter, and Spring academic term and at the call of either of its officers, the Dean, the Faculty Council, or upon written request of ten members of the Faculty.
- A. Quorum - Twenty members of the Faculty constitute a quorum.
- B. Order of Business - The order and conduct of business of Faculty meetings shall be guided by the provisions of the Bylaws of the San Francisco division, Chapter IV, Sections I, II, and III.
- C. General Conferences - The Dean or the Chair of the Faculty may call conferences of the entire teaching staff to discuss matters of general concern. Legislation shall not be adopted at such conferences.

Section II. Committees

1. Council of the Faculty
   A. Members. The Council of the Faculty shall have ten elected members, five ex officio members, and one representative, (Am. 9/91, 4/92, 9/93 & 1/13)
   1. Elected: Representing the broad interests and activities of the School of Medicine, the Faculty shall elect six members from the Ladder Rank, in Residence and Clinical X series, and four members from the Health Science Clinical and Adjunct series. No more than two members from one department and its divisions may serve simultaneously. (Am. 9/91, 4/92, & 1/13)
   2. Ex Officio - The ex officio members shall be: The Dean, the Vice Dean for Education, Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, Associate Dean for Graduate Medical Education, and the Chair of the Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy.
   3. Representative – The Council shall include one representative from the UCSF Fresno Campus
   B. Terms of Office
   1. The elected members are each to have a three-year term, staggered such that three or four members of the Council shall be elected each year.
   2. The representative shall serve three-year terms (Am. 6/93).
   3. No elected member may serve more than two consecutive elected terms. (Am. 9/91 & 4/92)
   C. Nominations and Elections
   1. Procedures for nominating and electing the Council of the Faculty shall be guided by those described in the Division Manual, Ch. V, Bylaw 65.
   2. UCSF Fresno Representative - The faculty at the Fresno campus shall have the right to nominate and elect a representative.
   D. Officers - The Council of the Faculty shall select from its elected members a Chair and a Vice Chair, subject to confirmation by the Faculty.
   E. Replacements - If an elected member is unable to serve for four months or longer, the Council of the Faculty shall appoint a replacement member from the appropriate constituency to serve during that period subject to confirmation by the Faculty. (Am. 9/91 & 4/92)
   F. Meetings - The Council of the Faculty shall meet at least once in each academic term. Meetings may be called by the Chair, the Dean, or any three members of the Council of the Faculty.
   G. Quorum - A quorum shall consist of any five elected members provided that one of the officers or the Dean is present.
   H. Duties and Powers
1. In accordance with Division Bylaw 95, the Council of the Faculty shall have authority to act for the Faculty, or to delegate to the Dean authority to act, in the following matters:
   a. in approving petitions of students to graduate under suspension of the Regulations;
   b. in approving the awarding of degrees, certificates and honors at graduation;
   c. in exercising its jurisdiction over scholastically disqualified students;
   d. in dismissing students for causes other than scholastic disqualification.
   All actions carried out under these provisions shall be reported to the Faculty at least once annually.

   The Council of the Faculty may act for the Faculty with respect to any subject delegated to it by the Faculty and may advise the Dean upon his/her request.

   The Council of the Faculty may establish and maintain liaison with the Faculties of the other Schools of the Division and of other Divisions of the Senate.

   The Council of the Faculty shall report to the Faculty at least once each Fall, Winter, and Spring academic term.

   Standing Committees
     . General Provisions
     The Chair and the members of the Standing Committees established herein shall be appointed by the Council of the Faculty, with input from the School of Medicine deans, subject to confirmation by the Faculty at the Fall meeting of the Faculty.
     . Elected Academic Senate members of the Council of the Faculty are eligible to Chair Standing Committees. (Am. 9/91)

   Standing Committees serve terms of one year beginning with the first day of instruction of the Fall academic term.

   Each Standing Committee may appoint such subcommittees as it deems necessary to conduct its business.

   All members of the teaching staff of the School who hold titles in the Adjunct (Am. 6/93), Clinical, Lecturer, or Research series may be Advisors or Consultants to any Standing or Special Committees. Such appointees shall be eligible to vote on matters being considered by the Committee except when the Committee chair rules that the subject at issue requires restriction of voting privileges in order to comply with the Standing Orders of The Regents or the Regulations of the Senate.

   Each Standing Committee shall formulate standards and policies designed to secure prompt, continuous, uniform fulfillment of its duties. Standards and policies so formulated shall be subject to review by the Council of the Faculty.

   Each Committee is responsible to and is obligated to report its actions to the Council of the Faculty of the School at least yearly except when a Committee makes recommendations and gives advice to the Dean or to other Administrative officers. In this instance, the Committee shall report its recommendations to the Council of the Faculty if this action is consistent with the original charge to the Committee and serves the best interests of the University and the School. Committees may also communicate with other Committees of the School or the Division. If a Committee desires advice or approval of an action, it may consult the agency which established it.

   A. Committee on Academic Standards
     Functions
     . The Academic Standards Committee shall evaluate the performance and progress of students who have experienced significant difficulty in their academic performance.
a. The committee shall review recommendations to dismiss students from the School of Medicine, which are made by the Screening and Promotions Committees.

b. The committee makes recommendations to the Vice Dean for Education concerning the academic progress or dismissal of medical students.

## Membership and Voting Privileges

The Council of the Faculty with input from the vice dean for education appoints seven members of the faculty and the chair. None of the members may sit on Screening and Promotions Committees. All members have full voting privileges.

a. The Associate Dean for Curriculum and the Associate Dean for Students serve as *ex officio*, non-voting members who assist the voting members as needed.

### B. Committee on Admissions

#### Functions

- The Admissions Committee shall review and evaluate all applicants to the School of Medicine MD program.
  
a. The Admissions Committee is responsible for, and has sole authority to select the applicants who will matriculate to the School of Medicine.

#### Membership and Voting Privileges

- The Council of the Faculty with input from the associate dean for admissions shall appoint the Admissions committee which shall be composed of a representative cross section of faculty members and students from the School of Medicine, with faculty predominating in a ratio of at least 2:1. The committee members should reflect the diversity of the UCSF community.
  
a. The Associate Dean for Admissions shall serve as Chair of the committee and take responsibility for developing and overseeing the procedures that the committee will follow in fulfilling its responsibilities, and for insuring that the procedures employed in selecting students are consistent with all of the policies and procedures of the University of California, San Francisco.
  
b. The Associate Dean for Students shall serve on the Admissions Committee as an *ex officio* non-voting member.
  
c. All members of the Admissions Committee shall have equal vote in selecting members of the entering class.

### C. Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy

#### 1. Functions

- The committee shall provide oversight for the *continuum of medical education at the UCSF school of medicine*. This includes direct oversight and accountability for undergraduate medical education. Graduate medical education (GME) and continuing medical education (CME) shall participate in the CCEP as described below and report to CCEP for informational purposes. GME and CME will continue to report to the Vice Dean for Education for oversight.

- The committee shall establish educational policy, plan future directions for educational programs and environments, evaluate educational programs, and promote educational innovations and scholarship.

- The chair of the committee shall work closely with the Vice Dean for Medical Education to direct the *continuum of medical education*.

#### 2. Membership and Voting Privileges

- The Council of the Faculty with input from the Vice Dean for Education shall appoint eight at large members who will be chosen to provide, so far as possible, liaison with the basic science departments, the clinical departments, and the affiliated teachings hospitals.(Am. 9/91)
b) Two student representatives from the MD curriculum shall be recommended by the Associate Dean for students and will be appointed by the Faculty Council.

c) Two graduate medical education trainees will be recommended by the Associate Dean for GME and will be appointed by the Faculty Council. One shall be participating in a first board program (i.e., a Resident) and the second shall be from an advanced GME training program (i.e., a Fellow).

d) The following shall serve as voting *ex officio* members: the Vice Dean for Education; the Associate Dean for Curriculum; the Associate Dean for Students; the Directors of the MSTP, PRIME, the UCSF/UCB Joint Medical Program, *Pathways to Discovery*; the Associate Dean for Admissions, Associate Dean for CME and GME, and the Chairs of the UME curriculum subcommittees and the GME Directors of Curricular Affairs and Resident and Fellow Affairs.

e) The Dean of the School of Medicine is a permanent guest.

f) CCEP members eligible for the position of Chair of CCEP include any non Dean’s staff members of CCEP who have completed one term on CCEP. They will be recommended jointly by the Vice Dean for Education and the Chair of the Faculty Council and will be appointed by the Faculty council. They will serve two years as Chair and one as immediate past chair.

3. Terms

   a) At large (non ex officio) faculty members shall be appointed for a term of three years, renewable once and staggered such that no more than half of the at large members rotate off at once. Members may be removed if they have repeated absences from meetings or fail to carry out appointed responsibilities.

   b) Student and Resident members shall be appointed for a two-year, non-renewable term.

4. Reporting Relationship

   a) The CCEP reports jointly to the Vice Dean of Education for the School of Medicine for strategic visioning and to the Faculty Council for curricular oversight and educational policy changes.

   b) The *CCEP* Chair is an ex-officio member of the Council of the Faculty and is expected to attend all meetings of the Council of the Faculty.

---

D. Screening and Promotions Committees for Years One, Two, Three and Four Functions

   The Committees shall assess the academic progress of all medical students at the end of each block, quarter or academic year. The Committee may recommend:

   1. Promotion to the next course, quarter, year and/or graduation.
   2. Promotion to the next course or quarter subject to certain conditions, or on a probationary status.
   3. Repetition of one or more courses or quarters of work on a probationary status.
   4. Referral to the Academic Standards Committee when a student’s academic performance requires a comprehensive performance review for failure to make satisfactory academic progress and/or meets criteria for dismissal. (see Regulations of the Faculty of the School of Medicine, VI. DISQUALIFICATION, C. STUDENT DISMISSAL)
a. The Committees shall recommend to the Council of the Faculty for approval and to the Dean of the School of Medicine for final action the students who have achieved the competencies and fulfilled the requirements for the MD degree and who should graduate.

Membership

. The Committee shall include the following voting members: The relevant course or clerkship directors or their designees.
   a. This Committee shall also consist of the following ex officio non-voting members: the Associate Dean for Curriculum and the Associate Dean for Students; and the Advisory College mentors.
   b. The Chair of the Committee shall be the Associate Dean for Students.

E. Committee on Student Welfare

Functions

. The Committee shall study and investigate any specific matter concerning the academic freedoms of a student or a group of students registered in any of the curricula of the School of Medicine, upon the request of the Dean, the Council of the Faculty, or upon petition by the student(s) concerned.
   a. The Committee shall advise the Dean, the Faculty Council, and the student petitioner(s) regarding its findings and may make recommendations as requested.

Membership

. The committee shall be appointed by the Council of the Faculty with input from the Associate Dean for Students and shall consist of four faculty members who are familiar with the MD program and two students in good standing.

Section III. Modification of Bylaws

6. Except for Bylaw Section 1.2.A., these Bylaws may be modified at any meeting of the Faculty in accordance with the procedures prescribed in Division Bylaw 35.
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* (n) = appropriate number to be determined by the Council of the Faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Committee</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Current Roster and Term Listings</th>
<th>Documentation of Policies and Procedures</th>
<th>Appointments</th>
<th>Meeting Schedule</th>
<th>Follows Robert's Rules of Order</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>Catherine Lucey</td>
<td>Yes, a roster with term information was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: The Faculty Council has approved the membership 2012-2013 committee.</td>
<td>Yes, a document was provided to the Council for review. &lt;br&gt;Info: The Vice Dean for Education suggests seven faculty members to serve. The Faculty Council approves.</td>
<td>Yes, a guideline of the appointment process was provided.  &lt;br&gt;Info: The Vice Dean for Education suggests seven faculty members to serve. The Faculty Council approves.</td>
<td>Yes, a meeting schedule was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: The committee meets on an ad hoc basis. Generally the committee meets one to four times a year.</td>
<td>Yes, information was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: This committee does not follow either Roberts or Sturgis Rules of Order.</td>
<td>Yes, minutes are recorded. &lt;br&gt;Info: Minutes are not forwarded to Council because of privacy concerns. However, a listing of actions can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>David Wofsey</td>
<td>Yes, a roster was provided. Committee does not have terms. &lt;br&gt;Info: The Faculty Council has not approved the membership of this committee.</td>
<td>Yes, documentation was provided. A summary of procedures was listed in a copy of the LCME accreditation application.</td>
<td>Yes, a guideline for the appointment process was provided.  &lt;br&gt;Info: Candidates for membership are selected by dept. chairs or by recommendation from current committee members.</td>
<td>Yes, a meeting schedule was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: The committee is divided into four or five smaller panels each panel meets monthly from December to March</td>
<td>Yes, information was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: This committee does not follow either Roberts or Sturgis Rules of Order.</td>
<td>Yes, information on minutes was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: The committee does not take minutes. The nature of the discussion in panel meetings is confidential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Education Policy</td>
<td>Catherine Lucey</td>
<td>Yes, a roster with term information was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: Council approved the 2012-2013 committee membership.</td>
<td>Incomplete – information on policies and procedures were provided by email, but a formal document has not been submitted.</td>
<td>Yes, a guideline of the appointment process was provided.  &lt;br&gt;Info: Members of the committee are appointed according to Section II of the Division Bylaws</td>
<td>Yes, a meeting schedule was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: With the exception of August, the committee meets on a monthly basis.</td>
<td>Yes, information was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: This committee does not follow either Roberts or Sturgis Rules of Order.</td>
<td>Yes, minutes are recorded. &lt;br&gt;Info: Minutes are made available for Council review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening and Promotions – Years One, Two, Three and Four</td>
<td>Maxine Papadakis</td>
<td>Yes, rosters and term information were provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: The Council has not approved the membership of these committees</td>
<td>Yes, documents were provided that list the committees’ policies and procedures.</td>
<td>Yes, a guideline of the appointment process was provided.  &lt;br&gt;Info: Membership of the committee includes course directors by year.</td>
<td>Yes, meeting schedules were provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: Each committee has different meeting schedules</td>
<td>Yes, information was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: None of the committees follow Roberts or Sturgis Rules of Order.</td>
<td>Yes, minutes are recorded for all committees. &lt;br&gt;Info: Minutes are not forwarded to Council because of privacy concerns. However, a listing of actions can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Welfare</td>
<td>Maxine Papadakis</td>
<td>Incomplete – a roster was not provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: A roster was not provided because the committee hasn’t met in several years</td>
<td>Yes, a document was provided to the Council for review.</td>
<td>Yes, a guideline of the appointment process was provided.  &lt;br&gt;Info: Members of this committee are appointed by the Associate Dean for Students.</td>
<td>Yes, a meeting schedule was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: The committee meets on an ad hoc basis.</td>
<td>Yes, information was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: This committee does not follow either Roberts or Sturgis Rules of Order.</td>
<td>Yes, information was provided. &lt;br&gt;Info: The committee does not take minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green – Complete, all requested information was provided  
Yellow – Incomplete, more details or documentation may be needed  
Red – Not provided, requested information has not been provided
Proposed Changes to Current Bylaws for Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy (CCEP)

Statement of Purpose
The propose changes below to the current by-laws for the Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy (Section II.D. of Appendix IV, Bylaws, Regulations, and Procedures of the School of Medicine; Bylaws of the Faculty of the School of Medicine) are meant to be more inclusive of the whole of Medical Education curricula at UCSF. The current bylaws restrict input and dominion of CCEP to the Undergraduate MD curriculum only. Now that Graduate Medical Education (GME) has its own curriculum development and oversight process with an Associate Dean for GME, a Director of Curricular Affairs in GME, and a Curriculum Committee, the Residency and Fellowship Programs deserve representation and input into how curricula and policies are shaped in the School of Medicine. The other major change has to do with lengthening the terms of the members so that more voices can be included.

Pros/Cons
The inclusion of Graduate Medical Education perspectives will make it possible to develop and guide the initiatives that will cross the UME/GME continuum and to consider how developments in one area impact and affect those in the other. Including the GME focus of the committee will also allow for enhanced faculty input of resident and fellow education.

Any ill effects that the Senate might consider would be the administrative effort in changing the legislation and a more diffuse focus on the specifics of the curriculum and policies of the MD program. We hope to mitigate the former problem with the tracked changes draft below. Regarding the latter issue of diffuse focus on the MD program, CCEP has anticipated that problem by creating a subcommittee called the Integrated Curriculum Steering Committee (ICSC). This committee oversees the work of the Essential Core Course Committee (ECCC) and the Clinical Core Operations Committee (CCOC). It receives reviews of every course throughout the MD curriculum and also gives these committees guidance in how best to translate and maintain the policies and guidelines established at CCEP. With ICSC in place, CCEP can expand its focus to attend to Graduate Medical Education’s curricular needs as well as Undergraduate Medical Education’s. It can also serve a higher-level role across the Medical Education continuum.

The increased length of term of members to 4 years for faculty and 2 years for students and residents will reinvigorate the membership of the committee. 1-year terms can result in repeated re-appointments of members that ultimately result in extremely long terms. That can lead to waning levels of commitment. By increasing the initial length of term and limiting the number of times each appointment can be renewed, more perspectives will be heard while preserving the important element of institutional memory. In addition, we recommend that we eliminate the seats reserved automatically for volunteer clinical faculty and adjunct
faculty. Instead, we have increased the number of at large seats and request that the Faculty council decide on how to distribute the seats.

Effect of Proposed Changes on Current Legislation

Other than the changes reflected below to that section of the Academic Senate Bylaws, we do not anticipate other effects to current legislation.
Changes to Section II. D. (in tracked changes)

Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy

1. Functions

a) The committee shall provide oversight for the continuum of medical education at the UCSF school of medicine. This includes direct oversight and accountability for undergraduate medical education. Graduate medical education (GME) and continuing medical education (CME) shall participate in the CCEP as described below and report to CCEP for informational purposes. GME and CME will continue to report to the Vice Dean for Education for oversight.

b) The committee shall establish educational policy, plan future directions for educational programs and environments, evaluate educational programs, and promote educational innovations and scholarship.

c) The chair of the committee shall work closely with the Vice Dean for Medical Education to direct the continuum of medical education.

2. Membership and Voting Privileges

a) The Council of the Faculty with input from the Vice Dean for Education shall appoint eight at large members who will be chosen to provide, so far as possible, liaison with the basic science departments, the clinical departments, and the affiliated teaching hospitals. (Am. 9/91)

b) Two student representatives from the MD curriculum shall be recommended by the Associate Dean for students and will be appointed by the Faculty Council.

c) Two graduate medical education trainees will be recommended by the Associate Dean for GME and will be appointed by the Faculty Council. One shall participate in a first board program (i.e., a Resident) and the second from an advanced GME training program (i.e., a Fellow).

d) The following shall serve as voting ex officio members: the Vice Dean for Education; the Associate Dean for Curriculum; the Associate Dean for Students; the Directors of the MSTP, PRIME, the UCSF/JCB Joint Medical Program, Pathways to Discovery; the Associate Dean for Admissions, Associate Dean for CME and GME, and the Chairs of the UME curriculum subcommittees and the GME Directors of Curricular Affairs and Resident and Fellow Affairs.

e) The Dean of the School of Medicine is a permanent guest.

f) CCEP members eligible for the position of Chair of CCEP include any non Dean’s staff members of CCEP who have completed one term on CCEP. They will be recommended jointly the Vice Dean for Education and the Chair of the Faculty Council and will be appointed by the Faculty council. They will serve two years as Chair and one as immediate past chair.

2. Terms

a) At large (non ex officio) faculty members shall be appointed for a term of four years, renewable once. Members may be removed if they have repeated absences from meetings or fail to carry out appointed responsibilities.

b) Student and Resident members shall be appointed for a two-year, non-renewable term.

3. Reporting Relationship

a) The CCEP reports jointly to the Vice Dean of Education for the School of Medicine for strategic visioning and to the Faculty Council for curricular oversight and educational policy changes.

b) The CCEP Chair is an ex-officio member of the Council of the Faculty and expected to attend all meetings of the Council of the Faculty.