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• Accreditation
• Bylaw Revisions
• Campus Space Planning
• Changes to 19900 Funds
• IT Desktop Support Services
• Mission Bay Academic Building and Faculty Workspace Planning
• Online Instruction and Educational Technologies
• Operational Excellence
• Search for New Dean
• Senate Membership
• Student Conduct Policy Reform
• Support of Sustainability Task Force
• Tobacco Policy
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• Task Force on Student Conduct Policy (Shuvo Roy, Chair, Donald Kishi, Ellie Vogt)
• Task Force on Indirect Costs (Ruth Greenblatt)
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• Faculty Workspace and Campus Space Planning
• Indirect Costs
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• Strategic Plan
• Student Conduct Policy Reform
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Tina Brock, EdD, MS. BSPharm, Assoc. Dean Teaching
Don Kishi, PharmD, Assoc. Dean Student and Curricular Affairs
Ellie Vogt, PhD, RPh, Chair, Admissions
Michael Nordberg, CFO

Number of Meetings: 10 (Includes Fall and Spring Full Faculty Meetings)
Senate Analyst: Artemio Cardenas
This year, the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

**Campus Space Planning**
In October, Chair Greenblatt updated the Council members on a new report released by the UCSF Campus Space Committee (Appendix 1). The report provided recommendations to reform the allocation and use of space on campus.

In November, the Council invited the space committee’s School of Pharmacy representatives to answer faculty questions. At the meeting, Sarah Nelson, SOP representative on the committee, gave an overview of the recently issued Space Policy and Governance Principles report. This report outlines the policies that will be implemented starting at the beginning of 2013. Details of her presentation included the following points:

- The Chancellor formed the Space Committee to find ways to efficiently and effectively redistribute space across campus.
- The goal is have people feel comfortable with the idea of giving up space that is not essential.
- Faculty will not interact with the Space Committee directly, rather the Dean (contact point) of each school will be held accountable to the committee. It is the responsibly of the Dean and Chairs to ensure space is being used effectively.
- The $90 dollar per square foot benchmark was established as mechanism to help evaluate the cost of space. The actual cost for space will not be recovered directly. The $90 cost is an estimate that may be changed.
- No money will change hands.
- The first year, 2013, will be the pilot year for the program.

**Changes to 19900 State Funds**
In November, the Council was notified of a letter that was sent from the Faculty Welfare Committee to Dean Guglielmo regarding changes to the distribution of 19900 funds. In March, Associate Dean Michael Nordberg provided the Council with an explanation of the changes and how it would have an effect on faculty (Appendix 2). He explained that previously departments would charge benefit costs against 19900 funds for unlimited amounts. This central funding caused for a significant liability to the campus, so recently the policy was revised the policy to allow for a lump sum payment to be given from the campus to the departments. With the new policy change, departments now have a gap to fill between a lump sum payment from the campus and the rising costs of benefits. Some departments around the campus have started to fill benefit costs with funds designated originally as salary support. While this is an unfortunate trend, the departments have limited options. Council members recognized that this will be a problem going forward as benefit costs continue to increase.

**Future of Graduate Division**
In response to changes in leadership, the Council members asked for an introduction to the new Dean of the Graduate Division. In March, Elizabeth Watkins, Dean of the Graduate Division, attend the Council meeting and provided her vision and ideas. She informed the Council that one of her top priorities is to build a community for PhD students. She also talked about her desire to form a committee to address post-doc issues. Dean Watkins noted that when this committee is formed, she would like the Senate to be involved in the process. Council members agreed and offered support. One goal for SOP, is increasing creative interactions between graduate and professional students.

**Mission Bay Academic Building and Faculty Workspace Planning**
In October, the Council learned of the University’s plans to incorporate an activity-based workspace floor plan into the new Mission Bay Academic Building. While Pharmacy faculty were not included in the plans (though SOP faculty will utilize it), members of the school have become concerned that campus leadership will consider similar workspace plans when planning for the Clinical Science building and other space on the Mission Bay and Parnassus campuses. Over the course of the year, faculty provided feedback to the Academic Senate regarding the issue.
In March, the Council requested that the Academic Senate conduct a study of the new workspace to determine its value in an academic environment. In April, some Council members attended an activity-based workspace mock-up tour, hosted by SOM Vice Dean Bruce Wintroub. Council members reported that the space was problematic and would be sure to reduce faculty productivity. In May, Dean Guglielmo strongly encouraged the faculty to participate on space planning working groups to ensure that faculty feedback is well presented to the campus leaders before a decision is made on additional campus development projects. In June and July, Clinical Pharmacy faculty, who may be impacted by several of the space planning initiatives, were surveyed to determine their space needs in terms of workspace function (Appendix 3). The findings of the survey are being used by SOP representatives to present SOP functional requirements. The Council will continue to be involved in the process in the 2013-2014 academic term.

**Operational Excellence**

To follow up on faculty concerns with Operational Excellence services, the Dean and the Council worked to find ways to gathering information and evaluate additional expenditures of faculty time and financial costs.

In January, at the Full Faculty meeting, numerous faculty members voiced their concerns with various Operational Excellence services. Problems included increased faculty workload, inaccuracies with grant submissions, reductions in the level of IT services and increased costs to departments. To address these concerns, the Dean’s Office embarked on an analysis to determine the full cost of Operational Excellence on the school.

In February, Dean Guglielmo and Associate Dean of Finance Michael Nordberg reported on the school’s analysis of the fiscal impact of the Operational Excellence initiatives. The fiscal impact report showed that the school has lost an estimated $500,000 since the implementation of OE. In March, the Dean submitted the report to the Chancellor and the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost. In response, numerous meetings were arranged between the Dean and OE administrators to work on ways to improve the services and reduce costs.

To supplement this report, the Dean suggested that the Council should find ways to gather additional information on faculty problems with the OE services. The Council agreed and discussed ways to quantify additional faculty time that has spent due to errors and/or burdensome processes. In March, a survey was developed, but not released due to concerns about the type of data needed, faculty survey burden and utility of the data. The Council will reconsider the submission of a survey in the next academic term.

**Support of Sustainability Task Force**

Throughout the year, the Faculty Council received reports from the Academic Senates Sustainability Task Force and provided feedback on resolutions. To learn more about the Task Force’s Plans to become a standing committee of the Senate and to show support for additional initiatives, Vice Chair of the Task Force, Arianne Teherani, was invited to provide the Council with more information. The actions that the Task Force worked on during the 2012-2013 academic included:

- Developing a resolution to end the serving of meat treated with non-therapeutic antibiotics on campus
- Developing a resolution to divest from fossil fuel company
- Supporting ways to integrate sustainability into the UCSF curriculum
- Requesting that the Committee on Academic Personnel consider a faculty member’s contribution to creating a more sustainable environment, on campus and in the community, as a plus during packet reviews.

After the presentation, the Council requested that a member of the Pharmacy faculty be assigned to the Sustainability Task Force in 2013-2014. The Council also provided Vice Chair Teherani with additional sustainability issues the Task Force could address in future years.
Accreditation
At the beginning of the year, Dean Guglielmo informed the Council that over the course of the next year, the school would be undergoing an accreditation review. In February, the Dean invited a representative from the accreditation body to visit and provide feedback regarding the School’s accreditation plans. After a review of the school, administration and faculty embarked on immediate and long-term curriculum changes to strengthen the curriculum and meet accreditation standards. Over the next few months, the Dean reached out to students, faculty and administration to gather feedback and educate individuals about the reforms. In June, the school completed its first draft of the school’s accreditation report. Faculty were informed that they could comment on the report in July and that a final vote would be held in August. In October of 2013, the accreditation body will hold its official site visit. The 2013-2014 Faculty Council will be provided with more information at the September meeting.

Bylaw Revisions
Over the course of the year, the Faculty Council reviewed its bylaws in an attempt to update the rules to current practices and attempt to expand senate membership to non-senate faculty. In October, along with three other Faculty Councils, the Pharmacy Faculty Council started the process of reviewing and revising its bylaws. In May, the Council submitted the revised bylaws to the Academic Senate Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction for review. The following changes were made to the bylaws:

1. Addition of new sections that further describe the functions of the Council
2. Addition of details on the rights and privileges of both Academic Senate members and non-members
3. Allowance of more non-senate members to serve on the Council
4. Addition of new descriptions for the standing committee membership
5. Addition of section outlining the Council’s oversight over the Chairs of the standing committees
6. Removal of numerous outdated or unnecessary bylaw citations and references
7. Removal of an Order of Business section

The bylaw revisions (Appendix 4) were approved by the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee and the Full Faculty in June.

IT Desktop Support
In November, the Chair Ruth Greenblatt received requests from the Faculty Council and faculty members to review the planned changes IT Desktop Support. In December, Sian Shumway, Director of Customer and IT Field Services; Kurt Glowienke, IT and Desktop/LAN Support; and Michael Williams, Executive Director of Academic, Administrative and Research Technologies at SOP, gave an overview of the Basic and Premium service levels, services eligibility, and IT services organization. A report was shared with the faculty for reference and distribution (Appendix 5).

Online Instruction and Educational Technology at SOP
With the increasing use of online instruction on the UCSF campus and the announcement of a campus partnership with Coursera, the Council requested an update on the School of Pharmacy’s effort to use online instruction and educational technology in the curriculum. In November, Leslie Floren, Academic Coordinator and Associate Adjunct Professor, provided the Council members with an update (Appendix 6). Dr. Floren’s presentation covered the following topics:

- Overview of the changing environment within higher education
- Educational Initiatives and Advances at UC
  - UC System
  - UCSF Campus-wide
  - Efforts within SOP
- Educational Technology at UCSF

Student Conduct Policy Reform
During the 2011-2012 academic term, Associate Dean Robert Day and the Faculty Council initiated an effort to bolster the school’s Student Conduct policy. To finish the remaining tasks, the Council created a subcommittee to draft a recommendation. In November, Shuvo Roy volunteered to serve as the Chair and to assemble the membership of the committee. In December, the Student Discipline Task Force met for the first time to review all of the documents and determine what information was needed to form the policy. Greta Schnetzler, UCSF Deputy Campus Council, was asked review the student conduct policy and come back to the group with her thoughts and recommendations. In March, the subcommittee reached out and surveyed the schools of Medicine and Dentistry on student conduct information. In May, the work of the Council was postponed because Deputy Campus Council, Greta Schnetzler was promoted to Campus Council, thus leaving a vacancy on the subcommittee. The report is scheduled to be presented to the Faculty Council in the 2013-2014 academic term.

**Tobacco Policy**
In March, Dean Guglielmo informed the Council that he was asked if it would be possible for the school to support a policy expressing disapproval of the sale of tobacco products in pharmacies (which has been supported by Purdue University). In April, Robin Corelli and Lisa Kroon, two faculty members in the School of Pharmacy, joined the Council to present on the issue. A draft policy for approval was shared with the Council to obtain members thoughts and feedback. The Council joined the Pharmacy Leadership group and the Full Faculty in endorsing the proposal. The School will consider producing a webpage that provides UCSF SOP positions on issues of Pharmacy Practices, such as this tobacco policy.

**Search for New Dean**
In September, Chair Greenblatt informed the Council that the search process for a new Dean would begin later in the month. The Council submitted a letter to the search committee chair, School of Medicine Dean Sam Hawgood, requesting the faculty representatives be nominated by the Faculty Council. Chair Hawgood accepted. In April, Interim Dean Joe Guglielmo was named the new Dean of the School of Pharmacy. At the June Full Faculty meeting, the Faculty Council congratulated Joe Guglielmo on becoming the official Dean.

**Senate Membership**
Chair Greenblatt gave an update on the movement to expand senate membership. She reported that the UCSF Division has been making an effort to implement incremental changes that expand certain rights to non-senate members. Over the course of the year, the Council received reports from Chair Greenblatt on the work of the Division. To address the disparity in representation, the Council revised its bylaws to expand rights, privileges and representation on non-senate faculty. The Council will continue to monitor work on expanding senate membership and provide feedback to the Division, as needed, in the 2013-2014 academic term.

**Standing Committee Reports**
The standing committees reported on the following items:

**Admissions**
- Council members approved the UCSF Pharmacy Technical Standards.
- The admissions committee implemented the use of a new multiple mini interview/activity process to replace more traditional applicant interviews. After the first iteration of the process was complete, Associate Dean Vogt informed the Council that the method was efficient and overall worked very well.
- In April, Associate Dean Vogt provided the following admissions report. Points of interest include:
  - 135 offers of admission;
  - 104 applicants accepted;
  - 5 declined;
  - 26 pending;
  - Deadline to accept is April 5 at 4pm;
  - Of the Post Baccalaureate applicants, three were offered admission; two accepted and one declined and was accepted at USC.
Educational Policy

- The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) formed working groups to examine the use of 198 designations, role of electives guidelines for TAs, role of research projects in PharmD and the pass/no pass grading system.
- EPC launched a comprehensive review of curriculum
- The Assessment Subcommittee reviewed a report on the Pathways Projects. The report was shared with the EPC and a draft was later shared with the Council.
- The school implemented the use of Examsoft, a test administration software package. This new service should allow faculty to collect robust analytics on student learning.
- In anticipation of upcoming accreditation review, the EPC worked to develop a plan to implement curriculum changes. Multi-departmental teams were created to recommend short-term changes necessary to accommodate accreditation while preparing for longer-term change. The Dean and Associate Deans associated with Education (Youmans, Watchmaker, Kishi, Brock) coordinated input from students and faculty.
- The Council was informed that Conan McDougall would be the next Chair of EPC. He will be taking maternity leave in July, so the committee asked Tina Brock to remain as the Chair through the remainder of the accreditation process. Conan would then take over as Chair in January.

Student Status and Honors

The Student Status and Honors group met in January to review cases.

Student Discipline

During the 2011-2012 academic term, Associate Dean Robert Day and the Faculty Council started work to bolster the school’s Student Conduct policy. To finish the remaining tasks, the Council created a subcommittee to draft a recommendation. In November, Shuvo Roy volunteered to serve as the Chair and to assemble the membership of the committee. In December, the Student Discipline Task Force met and determined that more legal review was necessary before any steps could be taken. The subcommittee also spent time surveying the other schools for similar student conduct information.

Student Reports

Throughout the year, Association Students of the School of Pharmacy (ASSP) President Christine Bui, and ASSP Vice President, Michael Yang, reported on the following topics:

- **Reductions in the Number of Student Events:** Students feel that obligations such as school events have added to workload and contributed to a tremendous amount of stress. To address the issue, ASSP has worked to find ways to eliminate the number of events by consolidation and collaboration. Using several methods and incentives, students have successfully made reductions. Over the course of the year, students reported that reductions in events help to elevate student workload and improve student well-being.
- **Outreach and Skit Night:** At the beginning of the year, ASSP made it a goal to make P1 students feel more welcome and relaxed. One activity designed to help welcome the students to the community was the production of the Outreach and Skit Night. This event proved to be a success.
- **P1 Concerns with Event Participation:** During the year the student government learned that P1 students were feeling as if they were being used as labor for events. The P2 and P3 student groups were concerned to hear the feedback because the intention is to create learning opportunities for the P1s, not to have them feel like they are staff. Work was later done to address the concerns of the P1s.
- **Student Conduct Policy:** In response to the Faculty Council’s work to review and revise the Student Conduct Policy, the students informed the Council that they look forward to participating in providing feedback once a draft proposal is complete.
- **Curriculum Reforms:** Students appreciated the effort of administration to reach out and ask for their feedback on curriculum reforms. They feel that the town halls are effective. They look forward to providing administration and faculty with input throughout the curriculum reform process.
- **Student Auction:** In April, a student auction was held to help raise funds for student events and projects and education. All members of the UCSF community were invited.
Task Forces and Other Committee Service

Task Forces and Other Committee Service:
- Coordinating Committee (Ruth Greenblatt)
- Education Policy (Tina Brock)
- Faculty Welfare (Shuvo Roy)
- Rules and Jurisdiction (Patrick Finley)
- Task Force on Student Conduct Policy (Shuvo Roy-Chair, Donald Kishi, Ellie Vogt)
- Task Force on Indirect Costs (Ruth Greenblatt)
- Task Force on the new Health Sciences Compensation Plan (Ruth Greenblatt, Pamela England)

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions that the Council will continue into 2013-2014:

- Accreditation
- Faculty Workspace and Campus Space Planning
- Indirect Costs
- Operational Excellence
- Senate Membership
- School’s Strategic Plan
- Student Conduct Policy Reform

Appendix
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This space governance policy supersedes all previous policies and applies to all UCSF space, without exception.
PREAMBLE and PURPOSE

The mission of UCSF is to advance health worldwide through excellence in Education, Research, and Patient Care. In order to achieve this mission at a time of shrinking resources and growing competition, it is essential that the faculty and leadership maximize the use of all available assets. One of the major assets at UCSF is space, both academic and clinical. Thus, the Chancellor has created a university-wide space committee responsible for developing and implementing policies that promote the effective and optimal utilization of space, for overall good stewardship of the enterprise.

The policy developed in this document was created with two goals. First, to ensure that space is allocated, used and managed, with a view to promoting UCSF’s overall vision and strategic goals, and second, to provide a framework for uniform, equitable, transparent and effective governance of all space throughout UCSF.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SPACE RESOURCES

The Chancellor has overall responsibility for the equitable and optimal use of space resources, with final authority over all UCSF space assignments and designations. The Chancellor may delegate implementation of recommendations to the Chancellor’s Direct Reports. The Chancellor’s Direct Reports are responsible and accountable for the use of space within their Units, and to ensure that said use is in alignment with the Principles laid out in this Document.

UCSF Space Committee

The Chancellor appoints a Committee comprised of the Chancellor’s Direct Reports and/or their representatives, including but not limited to, senior administrators, Deans, Medical Center leaders and faculty leaders, to make recommendations to address principles, processes and issues regarding space management for all campus space, including related to areas such as emerging research, patient care, educational and administrative programs.

Documentation

The Campus Space Inventory, to be managed by Campus Planning, and the Medical Center Space Inventory, managed by Medical Center Facilities, will provide and maintain the documentation necessary for space reviews and assessments. The Campus Space Inventories will be kept as comprehensive, up to date, and accurate as possible, to be able to inform these decisions. The accuracy of the database will require consistent due diligence by each of the Chancellor’s Direct Report Units.
GOALS

1. Develop policies that seek to provide each of the Chancellor’s Direct Reports and his/her corresponding Unit, with space that is optimally suited to the type of activity/is pursued
2. Identify principles that are fair, consistent, transparent, and flexible and enable the following:
   a. Securing of quality space for all of the Chancellor’s Direct Reports and their Units
   b. Facilitating of activities across all Units that hold UCSF resources and that contribute to the achievement and advancement of UCSF as a whole
   c. Recognizing and responding to changing enterprise wide needs of UCSF that enable the achievement of UCSF goals and priorities across areas
   d. Helping to maintain and further strengthen organizational excellence where it exists, and enabling it where it does not
   e. Enabling the rigorous pursuit of emerging opportunities, where they are strategic and lead to realization of UCSF’s vision and goals
   f. Reallocating of underutilized space; as well as space that may not be optimally configured to facilitate meeting of UCSF strategic goals
   g. Encouraging the renovation or remodeling of space that is unused
3. Implement processes that are transparent, fair, consistent and flexible in allocating and evaluating space across all types of activities
4. Adopt and leverage an enterprise wide view of space, considering the use and allocation of space as a whole across all Units and recommending the optimal course of action for UCSF as a whole

Principles and Processes

The following Principles and Processes for space allocation, evaluation and retention, for all uses related to aspects of UCSF’s mission (Educational, Research, Clinical Care, and Administrative) will be implemented across UCSF beginning no later than January 2013, using both retrospective data and prospective planning information. These Principles and Processes themselves will be evaluated following implementation, and modifications may be recommended to this document by the UCSF Space Committee.

The Principles fall into the following categories and are listed below and detailed in the following pages. Each Principle is accompanied by a set of processes for implementation.

1. General Space Accountability and Governance
2. Fairness, Consistency, Transparency, Economic Sustainability and Strategic Prioritization in the Deployment of Space
3. Non Permanence of Space Allocation, Retention and Use
4. Operational Cost Responsibility for Space
PRINCIPLE 1- GENERAL SPACE ACCOUNTABILITY AND GOVERNANCE

The UCSF Space Committee provides overall governance of space policies and procedures at UCSF and ensures that space related decision-making is aligned with the principles laid out in this document. The UCSF Space Committee does not determine space allocations for individual programs, entities or faculty members. Each Chancellor Direct Report is responsible for ensuring that his/her Unit has its own Space Plan that is consistent with the overall UCSF Space Governance Policy, Principles and Processes, as laid out in this document by the UCSF Space Committee. The Unit specific Plan may include additional criteria to be used when considering space utilization and assignments within the Unit.

All Units will be held accountable for the same economic performance for the same type of space (for example, wet lab economic performance should be identical across Schools).

The Direct Report is responsible for resolving space issues within his or her Unit, according to the Principles and Processes laid out in this document. All programs and areas within a Unit requesting space or with space resolution issues, will first take their concern to the Direct Report. If the issue is not resolvable through the Unit itself, and/or if the space issue in question requires addressing issues and needs that cross Units, then the issue may be brought to the Committee for consideration.

Direct Reports are also responsible for identifying opportunities for collaboration, in particular in instances where there is an urgent priority or need for the campus that has not been met by the current space allocation and utilization.

The Senior Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, with the help of Campus Planning, will collect reports from the Chancellor Direct Report Units approximately once every three years for review by the Space Committee. These Reports will provide information according to a consistent set of guidelines, developed through the Space Committee, and that provides information on and updates the criteria above. In addition to these regular Reports, Units will report any significant changes in utilization or financial support from the previous year in a shorter document or communication to the Space Committee at least once a year. Space and financial data used for review will cover the current year plus the previous three fiscal years. The Campus Space Inventory, to be housed within Campus Planning, (or the Medical Center Inventory, housed within Medical Center facilities) will provide the information that will be incorporated into the abovementioned Reports. However, it is the responsibility of the individual units to verify, with faculty, department chairs, and subordinate units the accuracy of said reports and update and maintain information as required.

Reports will highlight current utilization, and key elements of space utilization, including the extent to which the space use is aligned with the mission and goals of the Unit as well as institutional priorities. The report should also highlight plans for future utilization and any
anticipated or planned change. As the institution’s goals and priorities will shift over time it is important that the Chancellor’s Direct Reports continually re-assess to what extent space utilization is in keeping with the key space principles highlighted above, and provide an accurate assessment in the Report to be provided to the Space Committee.

PRINCIPLE 2: FAIRNESS, CONSISTENCY, TRANSPARENCY, ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY and STRATEGIC PRIORITIZATION in the DEPLOYMENT OF SPACE

The following criteria will be considered in the allocation of all UCSF space of all types (Clinical, Educational, Research, and Administrative) and in periodic evaluation of its use and retention.

a. Alignment with overall UCSF Vision, Mission and Strategic Goals and priorities
b. Alignment with specific the Chancellor’s Direct Report Units goals
c. Demonstration that space is being utilized optimally for its stated purpose. Where appropriate, demonstration of collaboration and strategic work that transcends disciplines and programs
d. Demonstration of existing space being used optimally in instances where additional space is requested
e. For requested space, communication of a clear plan, including a funding component, that addresses the costs of renovating, equipping and operating the requested space
f. Space needs to be economically sustainable:
   1. For research space, ability to demonstrate extramural funding (direct and indirect cost expenditures per asf, asf research space, large institutional grants); for relevant programs.
   2. For non-research space, ability to generate revenue from patients, the State, auxiliary activities, any source, including but not limited to those that are sufficient to pay the operating costs of maintaining the space, and the capital costs for routine replacement of equipment and fixtures.
g. Proposed uses of space should generally be consistent with the uses of adjacent space
h. Uses of space within licensed facilities must conform to licensing regulatory requirements.

Process

• Chancellor will appoint the UCSF Space Committee, composed of leadership from all the Chancellor Direct Report Units.
• UCSF Space Committee will interact with the Chancellor’s Direct Reports, or their designate, and not with individual faculty, programs or departments.
• In instances where space is utilized by a program that crosses multiple Units, the Direct Reports will be responsible for managing this space between themselves, in alignment with the Principles in this Document.
• UCSF Space Committee will recommend new or revised space assignments to the Chancellor as well as process, such as space assessment, for implementation by the Chancellor and the Chancellor’s Executive Council (CEC). This includes
recommendations related to space that the Committee deems is under or inappropriately utilized, after having reviewed space reports from Direct Reports.

**PRINCIPLE 3- NON PERMANENCE of SPACE ALLOCATION, RETENTION, and USE**

Space assignments to Direct Report Units and space assignments for Units, are not designated in perpetuity. All space assignments and usage will be reviewed periodically, approximately every three years, by the UCSF Space Committee, with guidance and input from the appropriate Chancellor’s Direct Report. In keeping with the Chancellor’s overall responsibility for all space assignments at UCSF, in recognition of the existing repositories for data on space uses, the Campus Space Inventory and/or Medical Center Space Inventory will provide the comprehensive information necessary for these reviews and for the reports which will be provided to the Committee. The Space Inventories will be kept as comprehensive, up to date, and accurate as possible, to be able to inform these decisions.

All released or relinquished research or office space that is equal to or greater than 2000 square feet of contiguous space must be reported to the UCSF Space Committee to determine if it is to be returned to the Chancellor or made available to other units through a reallocation process. The UCSF Space Committee agrees to revisit the above noted threshold for space notification, in approximately six months’ time, and to evaluate to what degree this threshold is the appropriate number. The Committee reserves the right to adjust the threshold accordingly.

There are two types of space that fall into this category. *Release* space is defined as space made available due to a program relocating to other spaces not currently listed within the Direct Reports inventory. The availability of such space will be made known, by the Direct Report in whose unit it is in, as soon as possible after such an event. (An example of relocation would be when program space moves physically elsewhere (i.e. to a new building where it has been assigned equivalent space.)

*Relinquished* space is defined as space made available by a program closing. Such space will be held by the Chancellor for reassignment.

**Process to Reallocate Space**

a. All released/relinquished space must be reported to the UCSF Space Committee, as soon as possible after the Direct Report is made aware of its availability. The Chancellor may retain up to 10% of the space in a Reserve Fund for future allocation. The UCSF CEC (Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet), in consultation with the UCSF Space Committee, will determine if it is to be returned to the Direct Report, or made open to a process of reallocation.

b. The Chancellor may assign UCSF Space to Chancellor’s Direct Reports. The Chancellor’s Direct Reports in turn may assign space within his/her own Unit as they see appropriate, as long as they do so in keeping with the Principles of this document.
c. Requests for new space must come from a Chancellor's Direct Report(s) to the Space Committee.

d. In keeping with Principle 2, the process for determining allocation of released space should be transparent, fair, consistent, and aligned with UCSF strategic imperatives. The expectation, of all Chancellor's Direct Reports, is that they will be transparent and forthcoming about their available and released space, and provide such information to the Committee. In turn, the Chancellor's Direct Reports can expect that, if they demonstrate a clear and tangible need for space according to the Principles in this Document, the Committee will strive to make appropriate recommendation/s to the Chancellor to enable them to meet that need.

e. An example of a process that may be used to determine the allocation of released space is that of a formal RFP process. The Committee may decide to put together and issue an RFP for the use of released space, in instances where the Committee deems that there is a key unmet campus need. The RFP process will require a clear plan for use of the space that conforms to the Criteria laid out in Principle 1 of this document.

f. The Chancellor's Direct Reports are responsible for managing their assigned space, including determining allocations for their own programs within their Unit, and ensuring that their overall Unit space information is updated and accurate in the Campus Space Inventory. If space is requested for programs that cross units or entities, the respective leaders are responsible for working together to construct a plan for the space requested, in keeping with the criteria laid out in Principle 1 of this document.

g. There may be instances where space is assigned to a Unit for a temporary period only. In these instances, the receiving Unit will be required to abide by the guidelines of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to be developed between the entity that is the primary owner of the space, and the temporary occupant. This MOU will include, among other items, guidelines for a process to be followed. The MOU will lay out timelines, criteria for the rights or entitlements of the temporary occupants as well as the stewards of the space, and a dispute/conflict resolution process.

h. Overall, the process for the Committee to review and make decisions on released or relinquished space will be as transparent, nimble, and efficient as possible, so as not to create undue delays or administrative burden. The Committee will continue to evaluate and assess overall procedure and process to ensure minimal bureaucracy and delay as space related decisions are brought before it.
PRINCIPLE 4- OPERATIONAL COST RESPONSIBILITY FOR SPACE

Chancellor Direct Report Units will be responsible for covering the operational costs of their assigned space.

Process

a. The Medical Center will be directly responsible for making capital improvements, maintaining, and paying the other operational costs of the space used for clinical activities that are under the purview of the Medical Center.

b. Outside the space for clinical activities, Campus Administration (Budget and Resource Management) will determine operational costs including administrative, building operations and maintenance, interest and depreciation on buildings and equipment, for all space in order to define and address the financial responsibilities for all Chancellor’s Direct Report Units. To do this requires that the Campus Space Inventory remain as accurate and up to date as possible. It is a joint responsibility of the Chancellor’s Direct reports and Campus Planning to verify the accuracy if the space allocations. This Inventory will also specify building, room and occupancy data.

c. For appropriate spaces (e.g. Research) a standard expected level of extramural funding (indirect costs; $/asf) will be defined for such space based on operational costs. Based on this level, total expected funding will be computed for total asf assigned to each Chancellor Direct Report, and compared to the actual funds generated within the assigned Unit space. Failure to meet the overall expected level of funding for a Unit is one criterion that could support a Space Committee recommendation to decrease the total asf assigned to the Unit. Conversely, Units that exceed the total expected funding level could cite that achievement in any request for additional space, although that criterion alone may not be sufficient justification for additional space. Units may compare their internal programs to each other and to the Unit as a whole, as well as to other relevant cohort groupings, in their requests for additional space.

d. Units holding underutilized space will be expected to develop, within two months of notification by the Space Committee, a plan for addressing the underutilization. The criteria to assess utilization of space will vary based on type of space (i.e. research, educational, administrative, and clinical). The Reports provided to the Committee will contain the elements that will be evaluated. These reports will be based upon the regularly updated Campus Space Inventory and Database.

The following are key elements that will need to be in the Reports, and that the Committee would evaluate to help assess utilization:

• Research space performance compared to an agreed upon economic criteria, such as indirect cost recovery
• Administrative (including academic offices) space: performance compared to an agreed upon people density standard (i.e. 150 sf per person) for the amount and type of space.
• Educational performance compared to an agreed upon standard for classroom hour usage, including time and distribution
• Clinical open space over 2000 square feet would be flagged to this Committee, and its allocation subject to the same Principles as outlined in this document. Criteria for performance will include comparisons to an agreed upon standard for clinical productivity and complexity
• Office space will be treated according to criteria aligned to the type of office space it is (administrative or research) as determined by a space committee working group to be created following approval of this document by the CEC.

Overall: Utilization of space should be aligned with the specific mission/goals of the Direct Report Unit and of UCSF’s strategic priorities.

e. For the first year, as space information is vetted and validated, all units will be expected to demonstrate extramural F&A recovery in excess of $90 per assigned square foot (asf). This figure is based on a general averaging of F&A recovery across schools and departments, and is intended to be used as a starting point only, by the Committee. The Committee will reassess this figure on an annual basis at a minimum, and adjust as appropriate. As per Principle 4c above, Campus administration will maintain and update operational costs for all space, and as such, updates may also lead to reassessment of this figure as required. Should any space use assessment be implemented, it will not affect any operational costing information in the UCSF general ledger and will be maintained and managed on a separate basis than any ledgered F&A cost pool information.

f. If a Unit fails to execute on its Space Utilization Plan for space made available using the principles above, the UCSF Space Committee could recommend that remaining underutilized space be returned to the Chancellor.
November 16, 2012

Dean Featherstone, MSc, PhD
School of Dentistry, UCSF
San Francisco, CA  94143

Dean Hawgood, MBBS
School of Medicine, UCSF
San Francisco, CA  94143

Dean Vlahov, RN, PhD, RAAN
School of Nursing, UCSF
San Francisco, CA  94143

Interim Dean Guglielmo, PharmD
School of Pharmacy, UCSF
San Francisco, CA  94143

Re: Faculty Concerns Regarding Changes to 19900 Fund Distribution

Dear Deans:

The Academic Senate’s Faculty Welfare Committee has fielded some concerns from faculty, this Fall 2012, regarding possible changes in the way 19900 fund allocations might affect faculty fringe benefits. The specific concerns stem from the change in the way benefits are being paid, from a system where they were allocated from a “central pool”, to the new model in which the campus allocates 19900 funds as a lump sum from which both salary and benefits are to be paid.

Since the allocation only covers base salaries, and not benefit costs, this new system is causing some faculty to reduce their additional compensation or cut paid personnel from their grants. While many departments at UCSF may be able to make up this shortfall through clinical income or extramural funding sources, other academic departments have limited outside revenue sources. Those faculty without other income, such as from clinical activity (e.g. those who have major teaching commitments), may be adversely affected and incur significant hardship.

The decision to withhold fringe benefits budgets is apparently being made at the school financial control points, with fringe benefits funds returned to these financial control points. A faculty member in the School of Medicine has been told by his department MSO that the School will fund about 19% of FTE benefits.

The primary issues raised are both an effective decrease in FTE base salary, which is in conflict with APM 190 (Appendix F): “In the event of shortfalls, ladder-rank faculty salaries shall be ensured by the campus”, and inappropriate use of State funds intended for fringe benefits.
I would be grateful if you could provide clarification on how your school is addressing these changes, and plans for financing benefit obligations.

Sincerely,

Paul Green, PhD  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
UCSF Academic Senate
School of Pharmacy Faculty Council
Ruth Greenblatt, MD, Chair

May 24, 2013

School of Pharmacy Faculty Council Proposed Bylaw Revisions

Separately bylaw language has been revised regarding:

1. Addition of new sections that further describe the functions of the Council
2. Addition of details on the rights and privileges of both Academic Senate members and non-members
3. Allowance of more non-senate members to serve on the Council
4. Addition of new descriptions for the standing committee membership
5. Addition of section outlining the Council's oversight over the Chairs of the standing committees
6. Removal of numerous outdated or unnecessary bylaw citations and references
7. Removal of an Order of Business section

The School of Pharmacy Faculty Council submits these modifications to the Academic Senate committee on Rules and Jurisdiction for review and approval before submission to a vote of the full faculty.

Justifications

Bylaws of the Faculty of the School of Pharmacy

Removal of Numerous Outdated and Cumbersome Bylaw References (all pages)

Compared to the other Council bylaws, the School of Pharmacy bylaws have a substantial amount of references to Systemwide, Division and School bylaws. With such a high number of references, the Council bylaws are riddled with outdated references to bylaws that have been changed or removed. To ensure that the bylaws references are as relevant as possible, the Council reviewed and removed many of the unnecessary references.

Part I.2 and 1.3 Functions (page 3)
The Council inserted Section 1.2 to proclaim the powers that have been delegated to the members by the Faculty of the School of Pharmacy. Section 1.3 was inserted to state the responsibility of the Council to inform the entire Faculty of the School about the affairs of the School.

Part II.2.1 Membership and Voting Eligibility (page 3)
The Council inserted a new section to describe the membership of the Faculty at the School of Pharmacy.

Part II.2.3 and 2.4 Membership and Voting Eligibility (page 3)
Council members added two new sections to explicitly list the rights and privileges of Academic Senate members and non-members. In particular, these two new sections were added to clarify the voting eligibility of non-senate faculty on a wide-variety of school matters not pertaining to Academic Senate business.

Part VI.6.3 Meetings: Order of Business (page 4)
Council members removed the numerous bylaw citations, most of which were outdated, and replaced the rules for the Order of Business to be governed by the provisions of Sturgis’s Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedures.

Part VII.1.2.1 Faculty Council (pages 4 and 5)
Following the campus movement to expand rights and privileges to faculty members from HS Clinical and Adjunct series, the Faculty Council would like to increase the future representation of non-senate members. To do this the Council removed most of the Representative section and made all faculty “elected” members of the Council. To ensure that the Council still would always have a majority of Academic Senate members on the Council when voting on Academic Senate business, the Council added Section 7.1.2.1 which requires that the Faculty Council’s membership must include at least five Academic Senate members of the eight elected members.

Part VII.7.2.1 Faculty Council (page 5)
To ensure that the Council can retain institutional knowledge over the course of each academic term, members would like to allow the Chair from the previous year to remain on the Council the next year as a permanent guest – a non-voting member who is invited to every meeting.

Part VII.7.3.3 Faculty Council (page 5)
The Representative section, which provided details on the election and nomination procedures for non-senate faculty members, was removed because the Council grouped all members into the elected category. Now only the student representative is considered a representative on the Council. This move was made to be consistent with the changes made in the Membership and Voting Section and the removal of most of Section 7.1.4.

Part VII.7.4.3 Faculty Council (page 6)
Council members removed the Faculty Council’s Order of Business section (Section 7.5.2 Order of Business) because it provided unnecessary detail on how the Council should construct the agenda. Furthermore, none of the other Faculty Councils have the same requirement detailed in the Council’s bylaws.

Part VIII.8.1.2 Committees (page 7)
Council members added a new section that outlines the authority of the Council to appoint the Chairs of the standing committees. The Council also added a requirement that each standing committee Chair should undergo a stewardship review every three years to ensure the Chair is still effective in the position.

Part VIII.8.2 Committees (page 8)
Currently the bylaws do not equally define the membership and responsibilities of each of the standing committees. To resolve this issue, the Council has expanded on the rules for each committee. The bylaws now include details on the Admissions Committee, Student Status and Honors and Campus Interface committee.

It is the request of the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council that the Academic Senate’s Rules and Jurisdiction Committee approve these revisions. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at ruth.greenblatt@ucsf.edu and Artemio Cardenas at artemio.cardenas@ucsf.edu.

Sincerely,
Ruth Greenblatt, MD
Chair, School of Pharmacy Faculty Council
Bylaws of the Faculty of the School of Pharmacy
(University of California, San Francisco)

PART 1. FUNCTIONS

1.1 The Faculty of the School of Pharmacy shall govern and supervise the School in accordance with San Francisco Divisional Bylaw 95 (Powers of the Faculties).

1.2 The Faculty may delegate portions of its authority to its committees or its executive officers (Academic Senate Bylaw 50).

1.3 The officers and committees of the Faculty will be responsible for keeping the entire Faculty of the School informed about the affairs of the School.

PART II. MEMBERSHIP AND VOTING ELIGIBILITY

2.1 The Faculty shall consist of academic appointees who hold titles in the series of Ladder Rank, In-Residence, Clinical-X, Health Sciences Clinical, and Adjunct.

2.2 When functioning as a committee of the Academic Senate (S.F. Divisional Bylaw 100), the Faculty of the School of Pharmacy, consists of:

2.2.1 The President of the University of California;

2.2.2 The Chancellor of the University of California, San Francisco;

2.2.3 The Dean of the School of Pharmacy;

2.2.4 All members of the Faculty of the School of Pharmacy who are members of the Academic Senate.

When the Faculty of the School of Pharmacy functions as a committee of the Academic Senate, all Academic Senate members may vote (S.F. Divisional Bylaw 100); all other members of the Faculty have the privilege of the floor for discussion.

2.3 When the Faculty of the School of Pharmacy is not functioning as a committee of the Academic Senate, all Faculty have full voting privileges.

One representative from each of the departments in other schools which offer courses necessary to satisfy requirements in the curricula of the School of Pharmacy. These members, recommended by their departments, shall be appointed by the Dean with the approval of the Faculty Council. They shall serve for one year and may be reappointed.

PART III. OFFICERS
3.1 Chair. The Chair of the Faculty Council shall serve as Chair of the Faculty.

3.2 Vice Chair. The Vice Chair of the Faculty Council shall serve as Vice Chair of the Faculty.

PART IV. DUTIES OF THE OFFICERS

The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Faculty and of the Faculty Council. The duties of the Chair, when presiding, shall be restricted to the role of Presiding Officer, as described in the official parliamentary manuals of Sturgis and of Roberts. (See Appendix to these Bylaws.)

4.1 The Chair shall consult with the Dean in arranging the agenda of meetings of the Full Faculty.

4.2 The Vice Chair shall preside at meetings of the Faculty in the absence of the Chair.

PART V. DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE

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

5.1 Maintaining proper records;

5.1.1 Sending advance notice (call) for meetings and presentation to the Faculty, in advance of any meetings, of adequate information regarding matters to be considered;

5.1.2 Providing minutes of each Faculty Meeting;

5.1.4 Conducting all elections;

5.1.5 Keeping a valid roster of voting members of the Faculty.

PART VI. MEETINGS

6.1 Frequency. Meetings of the Faculty shall be held at least once each half-year (based on the start of the Fall term) and at such other times as the Faculty may determine, or upon written request of five members of the Faculty, or upon the call of any of its officers, or the Dean.

6.2 Quorum. Fifteen members of the Faculty of the School of Pharmacy shall constitute a quorum.
Order of Business. The meetings of the faculty will be guided by the provisions of Sturgis's Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedures. Questions of order not covered there will be governed by Robert’s Rules of Order.

PART VI. FACULTY COUNCIL

7.1 Membership. The Faculty Council shall consist of eight elected and six ex officio members.

Elected: There must be at least two members each from the Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry and the Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences, and three members from the Department of Clinical Pharmacy.

7.1.1 At least five of the eight elected members must be members of the Academic Senate.

Ex Officio. The ex officio members shall be: The Dean, the Assistant/Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, the Assistant/Associate Dean of Student and Curricular Affairs, the Chair of the Admissions Committee, and the Chair of the Educational Policy Committee and the Assistant/Associate Dean for Finance.

7.1.4 Representative. The Student Body President of the School shall be invited to the Faculty Council meetings.

7.2 Terms of Office. Terms of office for Council Members shall start with the first day of September.

Each elected member and representative shall serve a term of two years. If necessary, the previous Council Chair may serve an additional year as a non-voting member.

There are four elected member seats to be filled in even numbered years and four in odd numbered years with normal terms of two years. Additional members shall be elected to serve terms of one year when-ever needed to bring the total of elected members to eight.

Chair. The Chair shall be one of the elected members and shall be appointed by the Faculty Council. He/she shall be chosen by a vote of the faculty at the Spring meeting or by electronic voting in advance of the spring meeting.

7.2.3 He/she will assume office between July 1 and the first day of instruction in the Fall term with the date set by mutual agreement between the outgoing chair, incoming chair and council.

Vice Chair. The Vice Chair shall be appointed by the Faculty Council. The term of office is one year; Council may choose to extend the term on an annual
basis, based on a vote.]

7.3 Nominations and Elections

Nominations. Thirty days prior to the last Faculty meeting of the Spring term the Executive Office shall inform, in writing, each member of the Faculty that nominations to the Faculty Council must be submitted within ten days. At least two candidates must be nominated by the faculty of each Department. Council may recruit candidate members via an electronic call to service to occur early in the Spring. The Faculty Council shall complete the slate of candidates if this requirement is not met.

Elections. The Executive Office shall submit a ballot (either paper or electronic) to each member of the Faculty not less than ten days before the last meeting of the Spring term. The outcome of the election shall be determined subject to the constraints of S.F. Divisional Bylaw 65 and shall either be announced at the last meeting of the Spring term or transmitted to the Faculty in writing.

7.4 Vacancies

If a vacancy occurs among the elected faculty members or representatives, for any reason (for example, long-term illness, becoming an ex officio member, sabbatical leave), it shall be filled by the candidate who received the next largest number of votes in the most recent election. It is the option of the originally elected member to resume the vacated seat when able to do so.

Should no candidate be available from the most recent election to replace the vacancy (of an elected member or a representative), the Faculty Council shall appoint a replacement, who shall be confirmed at the next Faculty meeting.

If an appointment is not confirmed by the Faculty, the Executive Office or the Chair shall conduct a special election. The election shall conform, in principle, to the procedures prescribed in the nominations and elections section of these bylaws and should retain the ten-day nomination period. The total process shall be completed and the Faculty informed of the results in writing within three weeks from the date of the meeting at which the negative vote for confirmation occurred.

Meetings. The Faculty Council should meet as necessary and must meet at least once each regular term at the call of the Chair, the Dean, or any three members of the Council.

Quorum. A quorum shall consist of six members provided that among the six at least three are elected members, four of the six are members of the Academic Senate and that the Dean or an Associate Dean is present.
Duties and Powers. In accordance with S.F. Divisional Bylaw 95, the government and supervision of each school is vested in its faculty. The Faculty Council shall have the authority to act for the Faculty in the following matters:

7.6 Approving petitions of students to graduate under suspension of regulations;
7.6.2 Approving the award of degrees, certificates and honors at graduation;
7.6.3 Exercising jurisdiction over scholastically disqualified students;
7.6.4 Dismissing students for causes other than scholastic disqualification.

The Faculty Council shall aid the Dean at his/her request and shall make recommendations to the Faculty pertaining to matters concerning the government, the policies and curricula of the School. It shall report to the Faculty all germane actions and policy decisions, and give an account of its stewardship at appropriate times each year.

Mail Ballots. A mail ballot may be conducted via traditional mail or electronically. Proposals for ballots on curricular, policy, bylaws, or procedural matters that require approval of the Faculty of the School of Pharmacy before the next scheduled meeting must be submitted to the Faculty Council if they originate from any of the standing committees, the Dean, or the officers of the Faculty. The Faculty Council may amend the proposed ballot, in consultation with the proposer, and must assure that, if appropriate, pro and con arguments are provided. If it is impossible to convene a quorum of the Faculty Council within the time required, the Chair of the Faculty (or the Vice Chair in his/her absence), after weighing the consequences of a delay, may act for the Faculty Council in implementing the proposed mail ballot. These options, which preclude the full discussion and the debate of a regularly constituted meeting of the Faculty, are justified only for emergency conditions or non-controversial matters.

PART VIII. COMMITTEES (General Provisions)

The Chair of the Faculty Council, with concurrence of the Faculty Council, shall appoint the Standing Committees of the Faculty established by these Bylaws and shall also appoint to the Committees such representatives as may be deemed necessary.

Special or ad hoc committees of the Faculty may be authorized by majority vote of the Faculty or the Faculty Council. The Chair and the members of the ad hoc committee shall be appointed by the Chair of the Faculty subject to concurrence by the Faculty Council via mailed, electronic or in-person voting.
8.1.2 Chairs of the Standing Committees shall be appointed by the Faculty Council. Each Chair shall be appointed to serve a one year term starting on the first day of instruction in the Fall term. If the term of the Chair extends past three consecutive years, the Chair is subject to a stewardship review by the Council.

Tenure of Committees Appointed by Faculty Council. Members of Committees shall be appointed to serve one year, starting with the first day of instruction in the Fall term. The tenure of an ad hoc committee extends only until the first day of instruction of the ensuing fall term unless a definite term is stated in the authorizing motion.

Elected members of the Faculty Council are eligible for appointment to standing committees including the chair. Each Standing Committee may appoint such sub-committees as it deems necessary to conduct its business. The membership of sub-committees is not restricted to Senate members.

Standing Committees. Four Standing Committees exist in the School. Each may create subcommittees composed of members of the Faculty to address specific issues, be they on-going or short lived.

Educational Policy Committee. (Not less than six members including a Chair and Vice Chair, a minimum of three members must be appointed from each of the three School of Pharmacy departments (Clinical Pharmacy, Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences and Pharmaceutical Chemistry)). This committee is charged with continuous study of the long-range plans of the School as these relate to the profession of pharmacy and the educational program leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) degree. It shall maintain liaison with other long-range educational planning bodies within the University.

This committee shall review and make recommendations regarding the PharmD curriculum and subsidiary questions including the initiation, alteration, or discontinuance of courses of instruction. All proposed significant changes to the PharmD curriculum must be submitted to the Committee for approval. The Committee shall also consider any matters in the jurisdiction of the Faculty submitted to it by the Faculty, any officer or committee of the Faculty, the Dean, or any Department. At least once each year, the committee shall meet with representatives of the student body. The Committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty at each regular meeting. All substantive actions of the Committee require approval by the Faculty and must be submitted to the membership of the Faculty in writing at least five days prior to Faculty action. Approval requires an affirmative vote by the majority of faculty (electronic vote).

8.2.2 Admissions

8.2.2.1 The Executive Committee-Admissions: The Executive Committee shall consist
of not less than six members including the Chair and Vice Chair and a minimum of one member to be appointed from each of the three School of Pharmacy departments (Clinical Pharmacy, Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences and Pharmaceutical Chemistry). The Committee shall also have one student representative. The Chair is responsible for the overall operation of the committee and serves as primary liaison with the School of Pharmacy’s Admissions Director and staff. This committee is charged with developing methods for assessing applicants to the PharmD program, and selecting the best possible applicants to be offered admission. The Committee shall also consider any matters in the jurisdiction of the Faculty submitted to it by the Faculty, any officer or committee of the Faculty, the Dean, or any Department.

General Membership: Membership of the Admissions Committee shall consist of the Executive Committee plus faculty appointed from all three departments of the school for a minimum total of thirty-two. The Chair and Vice Chair of the Executive Committee also chair the General Membership Committee. Responsibilities of the General Members include the rating of applicants and advising the Executive Committee on the final applicant selections.

Student Status and Honors: (Not less than four members, including a Chair and Vice Chair, each Department within the School must be represented). This Committee shall be responsible for monitoring the academic progress of PharmD students and shall make appropriate recommendations to the Dean. The Committee shall also be responsible for the awarding of scholarships and prizes to the PharmD students in accordance with any targets or restrictions of the specific funding source.

Campus Interface: (The Campus Interface Committee shall consist of no less than four members, including a Chair, with representation from each Department within the School). This Committee shall be responsible for monitoring, assessing and advising the Council, the Faculty and the Dean regarding campus initiatives that may impact School and Faculty functions. For example, this committee would address:
- initiatives involving research, clinical and educational space;
- initiatives related to infrastructure services such as grant administration, human resources and technologies.

Members may be selected from Council or recruited by the Council.

PART IX. AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

The regulations of the Faculty governed by Divisional Bylaw 95 may be suspended by vote of the Faculty, provided not more than three voting members present object to such suspension. The Chair shall always state the
question as follows: "Those who object to a suspension of the Regulations will raise a single hand."

The bylaws may be amended at any regular or special meeting of the Faculty or by a mail or electronic ballot. A two-thirds vote of the votes cast is required for any amendment. Written notice of the amendment accompanied by statements of the purpose and effect of the proposal shall be sent to each member of the Faculty at least five days prior to the vote.

9.3 A proposal for a major revision of these Bylaws can be voted on only at a meeting subsequent to its presentation.

PART X. MODIFICATION OF REGULATIONS

The Regulations of the School may be modified by a vote of the Faculty provided the proposed modification has been distributed to the Faculty at least five days before the end of voting. Approval requires a majority of the voting members of the Faculty.

PART XI. GOVERNANCE OF VOTING

With the exception of major revisions of these Bylaws, Faculty votes will be conducted by electronic means, and require the specified number of faculty participants. Requests for voting may occur no more than twice a month, though multiple items may be included in each ballot. Votes must occur at least five days following posting of the ballot. All ballots must be accompanied by summaries of the arguments in favor of and opposed to the proposed item. The Faculty Council shall insure that the posted arguments are complete and faithfully reflect the key considerations.
APPENDIX
Intent of Bylaws - Duties of Officers – Chair:

"The President or head of an organization, whatever his title, usually has three roles - leader, administrator, and presiding officer." (Sturgis, p. 160)

A guiding principle was endorsed by the Faculty accompanying approval of these Bylaws, namely, to organize the government of the School of Pharmacy in such a manner as to have it exercise the powers and discharge the duties of academic administrative and faculty government jointly and in a unitary form of governance.

It is understood that the Faculty Council is de facto and de jure, a joint academic administrative advisory committee to the Dean and a faculty governance committee. The role of the Chair at meetings of the Faculty Council and the Faculty shall be defined as the role of "presiding officer." Serving in this capacity he/she shall be restricted by the description of that role given in the current edition of Sturgis' The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure.

95. Powers of Faculties

A. The government and supervision of each school at San Francisco is vested in the Faculty concerned, provided that all graduate study and higher degrees under the Graduate Council shall be administered in accordance with the rules and coordinating powers of the Graduate Council.

B. A Faculty may delegate portions of its authority to its committee or executive officers. [Academic Senate Bylaw 50 (B)]

C. In individual cases of minor curricular adjustments, a Faculty may approve petition of students to graduate under suspension of the regulations.

D. Final responsibility for approving the award of degrees, certificates, and Honors at Graduation on behalf of the San Francisco Division, rests with the Faculty concerned, or with the Graduate Council in the case of higher degrees under the Graduate Council. This duty may be delegated to a committee of the Faculty or administrative officer who is a member of the Academic Senate. The list of candidates approved for degrees or certificates is to be transmitted in turn to the Registrar and to the Chair of the Division. [Divisional Bylaw 10 (B)(7)]

E. In the exercise of its jurisdiction over scholastically disqualified undergraduate students, a Faculty may suspend the regulations regarding dismissal, or specify conditions for such suspension, and may permit the students dismissed under these regulations to return to the University. (See also Academic Senate Regulation 900)

F. A Faculty may dismiss a student for causes other than scholastic disqualification following due process. [Am 1 Sep 03]

G. Agencies and administrative officers empowered by a Faculty to exercise its authority to suspend regulations regarding graduation and scholastic disqualification shall report periodically to the Faculty concerning the discharge of their responsibility.

H. The Faculty of a Division shall be considered a committee of that Division, to which it shall be directly responsible. (An exception is the School of Public Health, Berkeley-San Francisco, which is directly responsible to the Assembly.) [Academic Senate Bylaw 50 (A)]
**Timeline:** The Desktop Support program will roll out over a 2 year period. Clinical Pharmacy is already participating in the program. If BTS or Pharm Chem wants to delay entry into the program, this option is possible, however, this decision must be made at the department level (i.e. not a faculty-by-faculty personalized discussion). The campus goal is full participation by December 2014, pending assessment of quality of service during these 2 years. Early adopters (such as the Department of Clinical Pharmacy) who now utilize the service have been evaluating whether Desktop Support is meeting the service level requirements. You might find it useful to discuss the current quality of Desktop Support service with Lynn Olinger (and Lisa Kroon) before you review the pros and cons with your respective departments.

**Machines covered:** Basic service will cover machines that are < 5 years old. You will note in the link at the bottom of the page, there is also a premium service that may or may not be something we want. The service will not support computers that are > 5 years old. For those machines not under the basic service contract, if Desktop Support is used, hardware failure and repairs will be on a time and materials basis likely at $75/hr. IT advises against keeping these older computers due to the higher cost of maintenance and the difficulty in finding replacement parts.

**Types of Support:** The overall intent of the program is to provide an integrated IT support As you know, this includes the HBS Timekeeping system, Advance, VPN, reporting systems (Weblinks, PI Portfolio, Cognos), educational programs (eValue, Ilios, and Moodle), and research specific systems (IDR, MyResearch). In addition, commonly used applications like Microsoft Office, Acrobat Reader, Skype, Internet Explorer, Firefox, Chrome, Endnote, Adobe Illustrator, and Photoshop are included. A complete list can be found in the presentation to the Chancellor’s Executive Committee referenced at the bottom of this summary. Other services include computer deployment imaging, data transfer between workstation, asset tracking and inventory, incident tracking, laptop encryption, media disposal, support for all UCSF Security and Policy procedures, peripheral setup and supports for network printers and multifunction printer/scanner/copier units, and asset life cycle management (procurement, deployment, aging, surplus/disposal).

**Additional Benefits:** The Microsoft Office Suite and Adobe Acrobat pro are included in the basic desktop support package. Faculty and staff will not have to purchase an annual license. The support model is based on a per person charge, not a per machine charge. Consequently, faculty and staff with a desktop computer, a laptop, a tablet and a smart phone will have one monthly charge for all of these devices. Students and postdocs will not be charged, however, will receive the service. Provision of consistent anti-virus, firewall, and encryption software for all faculty, staff, postdocs, students will substantially improve the overall campus security. As an aside, since the School of Pharmacy installed a reverse proxy firewall on our major web properties we have observed serious risks similar to that seen by Campus IT Security, i.e. systems with targeted attacks that appear to be looking for scientific data.

The service will provide data storage, backup and disaster recovery. If your hard drive crashes, the service will allow your data to be immediately retrieved to any machine. An additional aim for this service will be integration of cloud storage for storage and backup allowing access of your data from any device. However, I don’t know what the status or timeline of that aim is at this moment.
The service will ensure compliance with current security standards and software licensing agreements, and as standards evolve, the service will ensure compliance and compatibility with existing and future software. As an example, when the new phone systems migrate to Microsoft Lync, Desktop Support will ensure that it will work with your system.

**Funding Model Intent:** The funding model was intended to provide a simple way of charging similar to that used for our network infrastructure. When the decision was made to move in this direction, it was recommended that all faculty, staff, postdocs, students be included and this was in consultation with the Academic Senate, the SOP faculty council, the SOM Department Chairs and the SOM basic science faculty last December. I don’t know if your respective departments directly consulted with the group.

**Savings:** Currently the School of Pharmacy spends $675k in desktop support costs associated with the ITS DLS service. (Does not include the current costs incurred from individual laboratories, such as Andre, Tom F, others). Under the proposed model, that cost will be approximately half, saving the School around $337,000 per year.

The presentation to the CEC is available at [http://operational excellence.ucsf.edu/files/downloads/IT/031312_IT_CEC_presentation.pdf](http://operational excellence.ucsf.edu/files/downloads/IT/031312_IT_CEC_presentation.pdf)
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Agenda

• Overview of Changing Environment within Higher Education

• Educational Initiatives and Advances at UC –
  • UC System
  • UCSF School-wide
  • Efforts within SOP

• Educational Technology at UCSF
Rapidly Changing Environment

- **Factors influencing higher ed**
  - Escalating cost of higher education
    - Students ➔ cost-conscious “consumers”
  - Rapid technological advances
  - For-profit institutions, online courses –
    - “Virtual” universities + open access courses
  - Focus shifting from teaching ➔ learning
    - Emphasis on outcomes, competencies, experiential training
Rapidly Changing Environment

• Shifts in course content
  • Integration of concepts across the curriculum
  • Increased emphasis on practical applications

• Shifts in delivery of course content
  • “Flipping” the 50 minute lecture
    – Self-directed learning outside of classroom
    – Breaking topics into more manageable pieces

• Use of tech and online learning
  • Enhance learning + maximize efficiency
    • Integration of “e-” and “m-learning” w/ face-to-face teaching
Rapidly Changing Environment

- **Massive and rapid shifts in delivery of courses**
  - Online Education (e-learning and m-learning)
    - “Hybrid” models – online + in-person
  - 100% Online courses
    - Tuition-based – >1000 programs nation-wide
      - University of Phoenix model
        - Full range of degrees
          - accredited AA, BA/BS, MA, PhD degrees + CE
      - UCSF Extension and CTSI, UCB Extension
        - Credit-bearing courses; CE
      - UCLA – MS of Engineering Online
Rapidly Changing Environment

- 100% Online courses
  - Massive Open Online Courses or “MOOCs”
    - Coursera, Udacity, EdX, etc.
      - **UCSF has partnered with Coursera**
        - 3 courses
          - 2,500 enrolled in 24 hr, 10,000+ in <1 month
        - **CP planning first Coursera offerings 2013**
          - ID – Conan MacDougall (2/2013)
          - Diabetes – IPHE w/ Lisa Kroon
  - Online tutorials
    - Kahn Academy
      - Non-profit organization
      - 3300 videos/~10 min each, constructed for viewing online
      - Challenges/Assessments; tracking and reporting tools
    - Even… **“Calculus in 20 minutes”** - Thinkwell
Rapidly Changing Environment

• Shifts in student and teacher assessment
  • Rise in use of novel assessment methods
    • Self-reflection, feedback and peer group discussions
      • Learning goals, personal accomplishments, areas for improvement
        • Promotes transition from student to practitioner
  • Portfolios
    • Students compile work over time
      • intended to show depth and breadth of understanding
  • More frequent assessments throughout course
  • Online surveys/ tools for teacher/course evaluation
Educational Initiatives: UC System

• UC Online
  • Initiative to provide high caliber, online instruction
    • 1 course in development/ campus
    • 1 company provides marketing
    • 1 system for student access and centralized instructional designers
    • http://www.ucop.edu/appc/online-instruction/

…these students will feed into UCSF w/in 3 years!
Educational Initiatives: UCSF

• Education is one of the Chancellor’s top 5 priorities

…… education drives us toward excellence – students are the first ones to know when you’re off your game – and ultimately determines the quality of our next generation of caregivers and scientists. Sue Desmond-Hellman

• Educational goals on campus
  • Attract/support talented and diverse trainees in health sciences
  • Deliver highest quality educational experience to our professional and graduate students
  • Create graduates who are prepared and differentiated
Educational Initiatives: UCSF

• To meet these goals, we must:
  • Take comprehensive and bold steps
    • Update our teaching + course delivery methods
      • Online learning
      • Educational technology
  • Capitalize on opportunities for experiential, team-based, inter-professional education
  • Employ the latest assessment tools
  • Apply CQI principles to development, delivery of curriculum
Educational Initiatives: UCSF

- Online Education
  - Online Education Coordinating Group
  - SOM
    - 27 online courses, CME
      - 15 -Smoking Cessation Leadership Online
        - Lisa Kroon - Medical Director of Smoking Cessation from the UCSF Tobacco Education Center
  - CTSI
    - Online education group
      - Courses
        - w/in TICR, RCR course available 100% online
        - MCR program moving modules to online
  - SON
    - Masters in Leadership
      - Hybrid program with 80% online content
Educational Initiatives: UCSF

- Online Ed and Ed Advancements w/in SOP
  - SOP-wide
    - Centralized Education Support Services
      - CLE support, exam scheduling, copying
  - Ilios project
    - Mapping to Programmatic outcomes
    - Look across curriculum
      - Consolidation, efficiencies
      - Allow for increased experiential education

- Dept. of Clinical Pharmacy
  - Coursera courses in ID and Diabetes
  - Smoking Cessation Leadership Center

- Dept. of Pharm Chem
  - Concept of MAS in Drug Discovery
Educational Initiatives: UCSF

• Online Ed and Ed Advancement w/in SOP
  • BTS
    • Educational outreach efforts
      • ACDRS and Colloquy
        • Goal: phased approach
          • Initially, convert ~30 hours of content to online by 2/2013!
          • Eventually, convert up to 50% of content to online

• PKPS Course
  • MTM hybrid DDRS “track”

• Working to create training modules/CE
  • Regulatory Sciences
  • Pharmacovigilance
  • eVideo lectures/symposia by Quantitative Pcol faculty/post-docs
Educational Initiatives: UCSF

- Online Ed and Ed Advancement w/in SOP
  - BTS
    - Educational outreach efforts
      - Regulatory Sciences
      - Pharmacovigilance
      - eVideo lectures/symposia by Quantitative Pcol faculty/post-docs
  
- Expand hands-on training in the “tools” of Quantitative and Systems Pharmacology
  - Application of M&S tools
    - PharmD and PSPG program, post-doc education
      - E.g., SimCyp, WinNonlin, NONMEM, PBPK
Educational Initiatives: UCSF

• Modernize content *and* delivery in PharmD courses
  • BPS115
    • Incorporating PharmGKB and *online learning modules*
  • BPS111/121/122
    • Smart Podium + lecture capture technology
  • BPS122
    • CLE-based assessments - students on track/engaged
    • Workshops in TLC
    • Videos of practitioners ➔ podcasts
    • Creation of “Kahn Academy” style videos
      • short infusion model, non-linear PK, hysteresis
Educational Technology

- Library Services
  - Learning Technologies
    - CLE
    - Podcasts@UCSF
    - Eluminate Live!
      - enables instructors and students **interact and collaborate online in real time**
      - Enables real-time, online meetings
        - project groups and research teams
  - Technology lending
    - Laptops
    - ipads (up to 1 mo)
    - + digital video cameras, audio recorders, and other A/V accessories for developing instructional content
Educational Technology

- **Library Services**
  - **The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC)**
    - Tech-enhanced rooms
    - Tech Commons
      - Multimedia workstations – students/faculty to create video projects; “Kahn Academy”- style videos
      - Articulate Studio – allows creation of narrated video presentations
    - Kanbar Simulation Center
  - LRDP includes TLC learning spaces at PH and MB

http://edtech.ucsf.edu/
Educational Technology

• Educational Technology Services
  • Easier connectivity in class – new “touch” control system
  
  • Lecture Capture
    • Goal is for 100% capture
  
  • Smart podium “pilot” in HSWs
  
  • Recording studio in S-16
    • Faculty, students may record captures outside of class
    • Instructors create short tutorials, instructional modules
Resources

UCSF Educational Technology Services
http://edtech.ucsf.edu/

UCSF Library
- Learning Technologies
  http://www.library.ucsf.edu/services/cit
- Teaching and Learning Center
  http://tlc.ucsf.edu/
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