Primary Focus Points for the Year:
- Campus Space Governance
- Chancellor Selection
- Faculty Workspace in the Clinical Science Building
- Indirect Cost Waiver Task Force Recommendations
- Gift and Endowment Assessment Proposal
- UCSF Rebranding Efforts
- UC Academic Senate Bylaw 55
- Bylaw Revisions
- Clinical Staffing
- Credentialing and Privileging Policy Implementation Update
- Curriculum Reform
- Regulation Revisions
- Student Status
- Work Group Report Reviews

Task Forces, Special Committees and Subcommittees
- None

Issues for Next Year (2014-2015)
- Axium
- Campus Space Planning Governance
- Clinical Staffing
- Credentialing and Privileging
- Curriculum Reform
- Gift and Endowment Assessment
- Student Status Dismissal Policies
- Working Group Report Review and Recommendation Evaluation

2013-2014 Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mehran Hossaini, Chair</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Orellana, Vice Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Giblin</td>
<td>John Featherstone, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael McMaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snehlata Oberoi</td>
<td>Permanent Guest(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Pollick</td>
<td>Natalie La Rochelle, ADS Student Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Ramos</td>
<td>Amin Abdallah, ADS Student Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Shiboski</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsten Wittmann</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Meetings: 12
Senate Analyst: Artemio Cardenas
The School of Dentistry Faculty Council took up the following Divisional issues this year:

**Campus Space Governance**

In July, the UCSF Academic Senate learned of the university leadership’s intentions to establish a new campus-wide space committee. The group would include significant Academic Senate representation, including members from each of the Faculty Councils as well as other Senate committees.

**Chancellor Selection Committee**

In February, the representatives from the Academic Senate meet with the Chancellor Selection Committee to discuss the criteria that should be used to select the next chancellor. Selection Committee membership includes President Napolitano and representatives from the UC Regents, Academic Senate, Medical Center, Staff, Students, and Alumni. Before the meeting, Chair Hossaini asked the Council members if they had any input they would like to provide the Senate representatives. Council members noted that the selection committee should put an emphasis on candidates with fiscal experience.

In April, School of Dentistry faculty, students and staff were invited to attend a series of Town Hall events to have another opportunity to voice their opinion on the characteristics the search committee should consider when selecting the new chancellor.

In July, Chair Hossaini announced that Interim Chancellor and Dean of the Medical School Sam Hawgood, has been selected to be the new Chancellor.

**Faculty Workspace in the Clinical Sciences Building**

At the beginning of the year, Chair Hossaini reported that the leadership of UCSF had created a space planning committee to develop recommendations for how to allocate space after the retrofits of Clinical Sciences Building and UC Hall. In November, it was reported that the group reviewed three designs for the floors: 1) a space with private offices; 2) a space with no offices (open space plan with cubicles); and 3) a mixed plan. After several meetings and through discussion, the space committee decided to go with a mixed use plan. The Dean’s of each school would be responsible for deciding who would get have private and open space offices. The Faculty Council agreed that while they would like all faculty to have their own offices, the space committee made the best decision given the circumstances.

**Indirect Cost Waiver Task Force**

At the beginning of the academic year, the Council learned that EVCP Jeff Bluestone had charged a group of administrators and faculty to develop a policy for how to collect indirect cost funds from grants that did not provide indirects. In February, Associate Vice Chancellor Teresa Costantinidis, and former member of the Indirect Cost Waiver Task Force Stuart Gansky, provided the council with details on the proposed changes to the university’s waiver policies. It was explained that indirect cost collection has declined over the past several years, while at the same time, the administrative costs have risen. As a result, UCSF leadership has proposed changes to the policy that will require a certain amount of indirect cost to be recovered for all grants. This change would mostly have an effect on grants solicited from non-profits and foundations that historically do not provide for indirects.

In March, Chair Hossaini and Task Force member Stuart Gansky worked to produce a communication on the Faculty Council’s behalf ([Attachment 1](#)). Chair Hossaini asked the Council to review the communication and vote to endorse the document. The Council members approved.

**Gift and Endowment Assessment**

In December, the Faculty Council learned of a new proposal from campus leadership to increase the amount assessed to the spending of donor gifts and endowments from 1% to 6%. Council members acknowledged the need to increase the assessment, but recommended that increase not be retroactively charged on all prior gifts given to the university. The concern was that faculty would have to go back to
donors and explaining to them that UCSF will be reducing the effective amount of the gift to pay for administrative fees.

Over the course of the year, the Faculty Council offered support to the other Academic Senate committees reviewing the issues. In April, a set of recommendations were drafted by the Academic Planning and Budget Committee. The five recommendations included

1) ease the tax in progressively;
2) tax smaller gifts less;
3) take funds being cut from any faculty-related programs and invest it back into faculty;
4) reject a tax on gifts related to student support; and,
5) grandfather existing gifts and endowments and tax only new gifts.

In June, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Jeff Bluestone informed the Senate that the administration agreed to the following changes: To phase in the assessment, at 2% each year; to exempt all student support; and to grandfather existing gifts, with the exception of endowments.

**UC Academic Senate Bylaw 55**

At the beginning of the year, the members of the UC San Diego Division of the Academic Senate proposed to revise Systemwide Bylaw 55 to allow non-senate faculty to vote on departmental actions. Since the provision of voting rights to non-senate series faculty has been a controversial issue across the system, UC San Diego proposed that campuses should at least have the option of whether to implement the policy or not. This would allow the campuses to have the freedom to opt out. Unfortunately the systemwide Senate voted down the proposed revision. Chair Hossaini expressed that he strongly disagreed with the opinion of the Systemwide Senate and he believes that faculty from the HS Clinical and Adjunct series should have the same rights as Senate series faculty.

**UCSF Re-Branding Efforts**

In June, Vice Chancellor of Communications and University Relations Barbara French presented to the faculty on the university's branding effort. She explained that while the UCSF brand is well known and respected in academic circles, recent surveys have shown that the general public does not have a strong understanding of the important work and care that the university is providing. In an effort to promote the school, former Chancellor Sue Desmond-Hellmann commissioned a project to develop a bold new brand for UCSF that will help market itself better. The brand will focus on telling the UCSF story to increase understanding and encourage engagement. Vice Chancellor French then reviewed some of the preliminary concepts for the new brand with the faculty. In the discussion session, faculty members praised the effort and provided feedback on how they see the brand helping the school and university.

**School Business**

**Bylaw Revisions**

At the September Faculty Retreat, members were asked to approve of bylaw revisions that would make the third-year of service optional for faculty serving on the Admissions committee. The proposed revision came as a result of faculty concern that a three year term was a considerable amount of time to be devoted. Faculty held a vote, but a motion was not passed and faculty requested that more analysis be done.

In May, the Faculty approved a comprehensive set of bylaw revisions. Included in the changes was an increase in the years faculty are required to serve on the Admissions Committee (from two years to three years). After the passage of the bylaws some faculty members expressed concerns that faculty would not be able to serve the full three-year term. To resolve this issue, new bylaw revisions are being proposed that will make the last year optional. Council members discussed the problems with ensuring increased participation. The issue will be further discussed at the Fall Faculty meeting.
In October, after further discussion on the bylaw revisions, Council members agreed and voted to approve the following language:

7.2.2.1 Membership. The Admissions Committee will consist of at least 15 members, including a Chair and a Vice Chair. Membership shall fairly reflect the distribution of faculty in the School of Dentistry’s departments. To ensure continuity of the committee, members can be reappointed by the Faculty Council Chair for additional service beyond the required two years. The Dean or his/her designate will serve as an ex-officio member.

The revision was later approved by the Full Faculty via email (Attachment 2).

**Credentialing and Privileging Policy Update**

In May, Dr. Richard Smith, Chair of the Credentialing and Privileging Task Force, and Peter Sargent, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Research, provided the Faculty Council with an update on the recent effort to implement credentialing and privileging policies in the School of Dentistry. Dr. Smith informed the Council that the process for implementing a credentialing policy moved forward well. All clinical faculty members received pre-applications and most of these applications have been completed. However, due to the small number of completed final applications, the deadline for applications will be extending.

In regarding to implementing a privileging policy, Associate Dean Sargent informed the Council that the school has encountered some challenges. In order to implement a policy for privileging, the school was advised that a “Dental Staff” would have to be formed and that specific staff bylaws governing the staff would need to be drafted. These bylaws would be independent to the Academic Senate bylaws. Dr. Smith informed the Council that the Medical Center retains the necessary types of bylaws for their clinical operations and that similar bylaws could be used by the Dentistry Clinic. Associate Dean Sargent added that more investigation is needed to determine how long it would take to implement a privileging policy and whether the benefits outweigh the costs.

**Clinical Staffing**

In August, the Council invited Sheila Brear, Division Chair for General Dentistry, and Mark Kirkland, Associate Dean for Clinical Affairs, to attend a meeting to discuss faculty and student concerns with staffing in the pre-doctoral clinical. The three main issues discussed included the training of new faculty, addressing procedure for periodontal consults and the hiring of new faculty. The following solutions were discussed:

- **Training of New Faculty**: Dr. Brear explained that part of the problem behind a shortage in faculty staffing in the pre-doc clinic is attributed the time it takes to train a new faculty member to serve on the clinic floor. For example, new faculty need a significant amount of training from others on how to instruct the students and on how to properly use Axium. With different learning styles, she feels that the online module that faculty have been using is not working as intended. Council members recommended that D4 volunteers could help in providing assistance and training to the new faculty. Dr. Brear acknowledged that this would help, but it would not solve the problem.

- **Faculty Hiring**: Dr. Brear informed the Council that there is a 6-8 month lag time to hire new faculty. She stated that this delay is mainly attributed to Operational Excellence and the reforms within the HR office. Even though the Dean has allocated resources to hire new faculty, she is still in the process of working with HR to bring them on. In a couple of months, there should be more faculty to provide relief. She and the Dean assured the Council that staffing will get better. The Dean also informed the Council that Chancellor Hawgood is working hard to resolve problems with OE.

- **Periodontal Consults**: Mark, Sheila and Dean Featherstone all agreed that perio consults are a big reason for delays in patient treatment. They informed the Council that they have tried multiple times to resolve the procedural issue. However, they have not come up with any luck. Council member and Orofacial Sciences Department Chair Caroline Shiboski informed the group that she
will discuss the issue with the perio faculty and try to come to a solution. Student representative Amin Abdallah was asked to provide assistance in defining the specific problem.

**Curriculum Reports**

In preparation for a reform of the School of Dentistry curriculum, two groups were created and charged developing separate proposals. The first group, the “Gemini team,” developed a proposal by making minor and major reforms to the current curriculum. The second group, the “Dream Team” developed a completely new curriculum. In August, group leaders Sophia Saeed and Joel White, reviewed the process each group followed and presented the preliminary results from the two groups. Dr. White presented the following “Gemini Team” presentation (Attachment 1) and Dr. Saeed reviewed the “Dream Team’s” group’s report (Attachment 2). Highlights of the Gemini presentation included:

- Review of whether the issues with the current curriculum required structural changes or content changes
- Recommendation to retain the current streams
- Review of structural changes to the weekly course schedule for the D3 and D4 classes
- Review of structural changes to the clinic experience
- Review of content reforms, some of which could be made immediately

Highlights of the Dream Team presentation included:

- Review of why UCSF needs to change methods of instruction to meet a new generation of students and learners
- Review of the basic structure of a new curriculum
- Review of the needs for buy-in and implementation

At the end of the presentations, Dean Featherstone requested that part of the Faculty Retreat in September should be devoted to the presentation of the preliminary proposals and the collection of feedback from the faculty.

**Regulation Revisions**

In February, the faculty approved revisions of student dismissal language (Attachment 3).

**Student Status**

Over the course of the year, the Faculty Council worked to address faculty concerns that every year there are a small number of students who are not prepared, academically or professionally, when they reach the clinical years. Starting in October, the Faculty Council resolved to send the item to the Education Policy Committee standing committee for a recommendation, and to invite members of the Student Status committee to discuss the issue. In November, Student Status Committee joined the Faculty Council to discuss how school policies. Members expressed that they have been challenged in evaluation of students because there is a lack of available indicators. Options for a solution include collecting more information on student performance and providing data to the student status committee and the faculty council on a regular basis.

In June, the Education Policy Committee provided a recommendation report to the Council (Attachment 4). Council members resolved to review the recommendation report in the following academic year.

**Work Group Presentations**

During the 2011 – 2012 academic year, the Dean hired a group of consultants to provide recommendations to the school for ways to improve business practices, reduce costs and increase operating revenue. In 2012 -2013, the consultants provided a list of recommendations for the school to consider. In 2013 – 2014, the Dean created eight working groups to evaluate the ideas. Each working group consisted of faculty, students and staff. Over the course of the year, the faculty received the following working group reports:

- **Marketing and Communications:** To help promote the school, the group recommended that a Marketing Director be appointed. The Dean agreed and a director was hired.
• **Faculty Practice at Mission Bay:** The working group reported that a faculty practice and School of Dentistry at Mission Bay was needed. After further analysis, it was determined that the establishment of a practice is potentially viable for general and pediatric dentistry.

• **Instrument Leasing:** The group recommended that the school should perform further cost analysis on how much students would be charged and whether the school has enough funds to support the new model.

• **Online Instruction:** Group members did not feel online instruction would be a financially viable initiative for the school.

• **Offshore Lab Purchasing:** The group reported that the potential savings would be negligible since local purchasing has recently markedly improved.

• **Satellite Teaching Programs:** The group determined that the teaching programs would not be financially viable for the school.

• **Increasing Clinical Teaching Sessions:** The working group recommended that the school should consider extending clinical teaching hours during the week. While the group admitted that the addition of new hours might not bring in additional revenue for the school, it will really improve the availability of hours for student learning and would serve the educational mission of the school. The Dean and faculty agreed with the recommendation and the school is now planning Tuesday and Thursday night pre-doctoral clinics in 2015.

• **Coordination of Specialty Clinics:** The group will be providing a report soon.

**Department Reports**

**Cell and Tissue Biology**

- The department engaged in a search for a mid-level faculty member who is devoted to cell biology.
- The department welcomed Michelle Mendoza, a cell biologist who studies cell and cancer biology.
- Shingo Kajimura received a Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers.

**Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery**

- A new clinic opened.
- The department recruited new faculty.
- Two new faculty members were hired to serve in the GPR program.
- Chair Pogrel explored a possible collaboration between the UCSF School of Dentistry and UC Davis Medical Center. More discussions are planned.

**Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences**

- The department is working to address budgetary challenges and a shortage of faculty.
- The department worked to fill several faculty vacancies.
- Sophia Saeed joined the department.
- Ben Chaffe joined the department.
- The department evaluated potential changes to the APU structure.
- Work was done to enhance preceptorships.
- Peggy Walsh was awarded a National Hygiene Association Award.
- Sally Marshall was awarded the Irwin Mandel Distinguished Mentoring Award.

**Orofacial Sciences**

- Chair Deborah Greenspan retired at the end of the year.
- Thanks to all Division Chairs for their hard work.
- The department prepared for the Clinical Sciences Building decant.
- There was a search for a full-time director for the Post-graduate program.

**Student Reports**

Student Representatives Natalie La Rochelle and Amin Abdallah reported on the following items:

- **Letters of Recommendations and Commendations and Honors:** In December, the students held a meeting with Associate Dean Perry to discuss how to address concerns with the criteria for...
honors awards. Students agreed that faculty should provide the criteria for honors before the class starts. The students also recommended that there should be town halls to provide students with more information.

- **Students Role in Professional Evaluations:** In January, the students discussed the idea of peer evaluations and decided that they do not want to play a role in evaluating their peers in the first or second year. They feel it would be more appropriate in the third and fourth year. Students feel the clinical coach should be the best person to evaluate student professionalism.

- **Chancellor’s Search Committee:** In April, Student Representative Natalie La Rochelle informed the Council that the students had submitted a letter to the Chancellors Selection Committee. The two issues that were highlighted included student housing capacity issues and limited campus transportation. The students highlighted the importance of Chancellor’s funding for both issues.

- **Elections for New Student Government:** UCSF students voted to join the Associate Students of UC with the Graduate Student Association into one united student government. A couple of Dentistry students are running to serve on the Executive Board.

- **Purchase of X-ray Machine:** In an effort to reduce the wait time for endodontics treatment, the D4 students purchased an X-ray machine. The problem is that the machine was purchased a long time ago, yet the device has not been assembled or installed. The Dean responded that someone should be working on the issue soon.

## Going Forward

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

- Axium
- Campus Space Planning Governance
- Gift and Endowment Assessment
- Student Status
- Clinical Staffing
- Working Group Report Review and Recommendation Evaluation
- Credentialing and Privileging

## Appendices

This Annual Report is posted on the School of Dentistry Faculty Council Web page on the Academic Senate Web site. Appendices are embedded into this PDF document.

- **Appendix 1:** Indirect Cost Waiver Communication
- **Appendix 2:** Bylaw Revisions
- **Appendix 3:** Regulation Revisions
- **Appendix 4:** Education Policy Committee Recommendations

Senate Staff:
Artemio Cardenas, Senate Analyst
Artemio.Cardenas@ucsf.edu; 415/476-4245
Communication from the School of Dentistry Faculty Council
Mehran Hossaini, DMD, Chair

March 13, 2014

TO: Farid Chehab, PhD, Chair, San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate
FROM: Mehran Hossaini, DMD, Chair, School of Dentistry Faculty Council
RE: School of Dentistry Faculty Council Response to UCSF’s Indirect Cost Proposal

Dear Chair Chehab:

At the School of Dentistry’s regularly scheduled Faculty Council meeting on February 13, Associate Vice Chancellor of Budget and Capital Resources Teresa Costantinidis presented the recommendations proposed by the Indirect Cost Waiver Task Force. Task Force member, School of Dentistry Professor Stuart Gansky also joined the Council to provide further detail and context around the Task Force’s recommendations. Upon review of the policy, the Faculty Council expressed the following concerns:

• Requiring an account number for a proposal to a funder that pays less than the minimum indirect rate (currently proposed as 10%) is not compatible with other Just-In-Time activities which occur after reviews when funding seems eminent and could actually increase administrative burden on administrators, faculty and staff since less than 100% of these applications would be selected for funding.
• Although the data presented showed a relatively small number of awards and small total direct costs from junior faculty PIs, junior faculty will not be exempted from the minimum indirect cost policy. Not excluding junior faculty from this policy is tantamount to reducing or eliminating investment in junior faculty for these awards, which are necessary steppingstones to extramural awards, which generate indirects at full federal rates.
• It is unclear how departments will save enough on grants that include more than the minimum indirect rate amount as direct costs to actually pay the minimum indirect rate. As you probably are aware, School of Dentistry departments are paying more for Operational Excellence activities (pre-award, HR, and IT) than they did before OE was implemented and do not have budgetary flexibility to realize savings to pay the indirects on these grants. Perhaps a target amount (percent or dollar amount) of administrative costs (not allowed in federal awards) to be included as direct costs in lieu of the minimum indirect rate should be established. (For example, would an application with 20% non-allowable federal administrative costs as direct costs be sufficient to be paying its own way and therefore be exempt from the minimum indirect rate?)
• A campus formulary of costs (e.g. HR, IT, IRB fees, clerical assistance, post-award account set-up, post-award monthly financial management, post-award financial closeout) that are not federally allowable but suggested for grants submitted to foundations would facilitate PIs including these costs in their non-federal applications thereby saving the campus the costs that would have been incurred.

The Council respectfully implores you to emphasize these important faculty comments in the Senate’s role in revising the policy and promulgating a final policy. If you have any questions, please contact me at mehran.hossaini@ucsf.edu or Council analyst Artemio Cardenas at artemio.cardenas@ucsf.edu.

Sincerely,

Mehran Hossaini, DMD
BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY
(University of California, San Francisco)

1. FUNCTIONS

1.1 The Faculty of the School of Dentistry will govern and supervise the School in accordance with San Francisco Divisional Bylaw 95, Powers of the Faculties.

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

1.3 Responsibility to Inform. 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, and will encourage expression of views of the Faculty on matters of policy affecting the School.

2. MEMBERSHIP AND VOTING PRIVILEGES

2.1 Membership. The Faculty of the School of Dentistry consists of academic appointees who hold titles in the series of Ladder Rank, In Residence, Clinical X, Health Science Clinical, and Adjunct.

2.1.1 Should any additional titles be established in the Professor or Lecturer series, appointees holding the new title(s) will be members of the Faculty of the School of Dentistry.

2.2 Voting Privileges. The Faculty of the School of Dentistry, functioning as a committee of the Academic Senate (SF Bylaw 100), consists of the following persons:
   a. The President of the University;
   b. The Chancellor at University of California, San Francisco;
   c. The Dean of the School of Dentistry;
   d. All members of the Faculty of the School of Dentistry who are also members of the Academic Senate;

2.2.1 When the faculty of the School of Dentistry functions as a committee of the Academic Senate; or eligible faculty members (School of Dentistry Bylaw 2.2 a-d) may vote (SF Bylaw 100); all other member of the faculty have the privilege of the floor for discussion. In all other matters, all faculty have full voting privileges.

3. OFFICERS AND THEIR DUTIES
3.1 Chair. The Chair of the Faculty Council will serve as Chair of the Faculty.

3.1.1 Duties. The Chair will preside at all meetings of the Faculty and of the Faculty Council, and his/her role will be restricted to that of the Presiding Officer as described in the current edition of Sturgis' The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure. Questions of order not covered there will be governed by Robert's Rules of Order.

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

3.2.1 Duties. The Vice Chair will preside in the absence of the Chair at meetings of the Faculty and of the Faculty Council.

4. EXECUTIVE OFFICE

4.1 The Executive Office of the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate provides professional, analytical, and administrative support; guidance; coordination; communication; and assistance (Division Bylaw 25). Its duties shall include:
   a. Maintaining proper records;
   b. Sending advance notice (call) for meetings and presentations to the Faculty, including adequate information regarding matters to be considered;
   c. Maintaining minutes of Faculty and Faculty Council meeting;
   d. Conducting all elections;
   e. Keeping a valid roster of voting members of the Faculty.

5. MEETINGS

5.1 Frequency. Meetings of the Faculty will be held at least once each half-year, based on the start of the Fall term. Other meetings may be held as necessary at the request of the Dean, or upon the written request of six members of the Faculty, or when called by any of its Officers.

5.2 Attendance. Attendance at Faculty meetings will be governed in accordance with San Francisco Divisional Bylaw 31.

5.3 Quorum. When functioning as a committee of the Academic Senate, fifteen members of the Ladder Rank, In Residence and Clinical X series constitute a quorum.

5.4 Order of Business. Meetings of the Faculty will be guided by the provisions of the current edition of Sturgis’ The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure. Questions of order not covered there will be governed by Robert's Rules of Order.

6. FACULTY COUNCIL

6.1 Membership. The Faculty Council of the School of Dentistry consists of the following members:
6.1.1 Elected Members
   a. One Faculty member from each department of the School of Dentistry;
   b. Three Members At-Large from the series of Ladder Rank, In Residence, and Clinical X, with no more than two members from the same department;
   c. Two Members At-Large who hold appointments of 50% or more and who are from the series of Health Science Clinical and Adjunct;
   d. At least five of the nine elected Faculty Council members should be members from the series of Ladder Rank, In Residence and Clinical X.

6.1.2 Ex-Officio Members
Ex Officio members include the Dean of the School of Dentistry or a representative designated by the Dean in the Dean's absence.

6.1.3 Student Representative. The President of the Associated Dental Students may attend all meetings of the Faculty Council as official representative of the students.

6.1.4 Other Representatives. Recognized organizations within the School may present their credentials to the Council, and send a representative who would be permitted to attend Council meetings and have the right of the floor for discussion of matters before the Council. Representatives of recognized organizations cannot vote. Such organizations should have a defined function or mission, a constitution, defined categories of members and voting rights and a regular schedule of meetings with recorded official minutes.

6.2 Voting Privileges. When the Faculty Council functions as a committee of the Academic Senate, only members of the Academic Senate may vote; all other members and representatives of the Faculty Council may have the privilege of the floor for all discussions. However, the vote of the entire Council will be recorded alongside the Academic Senate vote. In all other matters, all faculty members have full privileges to vote. Votes may be conducted electronically.

6.3 Nominations and Elections

6.3.1 Departmental and At-Large Representatives. Candidates for election as representatives to the Faculty Council must be nominated and seconded by their respective constituents. All nominees must sign the nomination form, indicating their willingness to serve their full term if elected. The Academic Senate Executive Office will call for and verify the nominations, and will prepare, mail, collect, verify, and count the ballots. Departmental and At-Large members will be chosen at annual elections to replace members whose term is expiring. Members can be re-elected to ensure continuity of Faculty Council membership. Results of annual elections will be reported promptly to the Faculty.

6.3.2 Terms of Office. All elected members of the Faculty Council will serve three-year terms that take effect as of September 1. Elected officers may serve no more than two consecutive three-year terms.
6.3.3 Vacancies. Vacancies in elected terms will be filled by vote of the Faculty Council if the unexpired term is less than one year. If the unexpired term is more than one year, the place will be filled by a special election.

6.3.4 Attendance. All elected members of Faculty Council are expected to attend meetings. Four or more unexcused absences in one three-year term may result in replacement by a majority vote of Faculty Council with the vacancy filled as in Section 6.3.3.

6.4 Officers

6.4.1 Eligibility. All members of the Faculty Council are eligible to serve as officers of the Faculty Council.

6.4.2 Election of Officers. The Faculty Council will annually elect a Chair and a Vice Chair no later than July 31 each year. These Officers will serve one-year terms, and may be re-elected to a consecutive term.

6.5 Meetings. The Faculty Council must meet at least once each regular academic term. Additional meetings may be called as necessary by the Dean, the Chair, or any three members of the Council. Attendance at meetings will be governed by the provisions of SF Divisional Bylaw 31.

6.5.1 Quorum. When acting on Academic Senate business, five Faculty Council members from the Ladder Rank, In Residence and Clinical X series constitute a quorum. When considering school business, quorum requires five elected members to be present.

6.6 Duties and Powers

6.6.1 Authority. In accordance with Academic Senate Bylaw 50 and SF Bylaw 95, the Faculty of the School of Dentistry delegates to the Faculty Council its authority and responsibility for educational matters within the School, including but not restricted to educational policy, conditions of admission, academic status of students, and recommendation of candidates for degrees (Senate Bylaw 312). Ultimate authority rests with the Faculty Council, but the full Faculty can appeal with a written petition from at least 15 full time Faculty members.

6.6.2 Reporting. The Faculty Council will report to the Faculty all germane actions and policy decisions at least twice each academic year.

7. COMMITTEES

7.1 Ad Hoc Committees. Ad Hoc Committees of the Faculty may be authorized by the Faculty Council and their members will be appointed by the Chair, subject to concurrence by the Faculty Council.
7.2 Standing Committees

7.2.1 General Provisions

7.2.1.1 Membership. The Chair of the Faculty Council will consult with the Dean and, with the concurrence of the Faculty Council, appoint the Standing Committees of the Faculty as established by these Bylaws. Members of the Faculty, including elected members of the Faculty Council, are eligible for appointment to Standing Committees. Chairs and Vice Chairs of Standing Committees are appointed by the Chair of Faculty Council.

7.2.1.2 Terms of Office. Members of Standing Committees will serve one-year terms taking effect September 1, and may be reappointed for up to three consecutive one-year terms unless otherwise specified.

7.2.1.3 Subcommittees. Each Standing Committee may appoint, with concurrence of the Faculty Council, such subcommittees as it deems necessary to conduct its business.

7.2.1.4 Reports. Each Standing Committee will present regular oral reports of its activities at Faculty Council and full Faculty meetings.

7.2.1.5 New Committees. New Standing Committees of the Faculty may be authorized by amendment of these Bylaws.

7.2.2 Admissions Committee

7.2.2.1 Membership. The Admissions Committee will consist of 15 members, including a Chair and a Vice Chair. Membership shall fairly reflect the composition of the School of Dentistry’s faculty, and members of the committee must have at least a 50% appointment. The Dean or his/her designate will serve as an ex-officio member.

7.2.2.2 Functions

a. Evaluate the records of all applicants to the school;
b. Recommend to the Faculty Council the selection of students for the Dentistry, Dental Hygiene and International Dentist Program curricula;
c. Maintain a continuous record of admissions policies and procedures, and recommend changes to the Faculty Council.

7.2.3 Educational Policy Committee

7.2.3.1 Membership. The Educational Policy Committee will consist of at least six members, including a Chair and a Vice Chair. At least one member shall serve from each department. The Dean or his/her designate will serve as an ex-officio member.

7.2.3.2 Functions
a. Maintain continuous record of the curricula for Doctor of Dental Surgery, Bachelor of Science in Dental Sciences, and Bachelor of Science in Dental Hygiene.

7.2.4 Scholarship Committee

7.2.4.1 Membership. The Scholarship Committee will consist of at least five members, including a Chair. At least one member shall serve from each department. At least one member should also serve on the Admissions Committee to integrate the work of the Scholarship Committee and recruitment of new students for DDS and DDS/PhD programs. The Dean or his/her designate will serve as an ex-officio member.

7.2.4.2 Functions
a. Award undergraduate scholarships and honors, including competitive awards, according to the terms of the individual programs with the objective to recruit the best students, support students with hardship backgrounds, encourage the continuing students based on their contributions, financial needs, performance reports and recommendations from mentor faculties.

7.2.5 Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

7.2.5.1 Membership. The committee on Academic Planning and Budget shall consist of at least six members with at least one member from each department in the school. All members will have voting privileges and will be at the rank of Associate level or higher. Members of the committee must have at least a 50% appointment. The Vice Chair of the School's Faculty Council and the Dean or his/her designate will serve as ex-officio members. If possible, the School of Dentistry representative to the Academic Senate Divisional Committee on Academic Planning and Budget shall be a member of this committee. This committee shall meet at least quarterly or more frequently as required.

7.2.5.2 Functions
As directed by the Faculty Council, the committee on Academic Planning and Budget shall:
a. Confer with and advise the Dean and administrative officers on academic planning, budgets, resource allocations, physical planning, and teaching environments affecting the School.
b. Pursue budget and planning matters as directed by the Faculty Council and advise the Faculty Council of matters which require study and/or action.
c. Maintain liaison with the Academic Senate Divisional Committee on Academic Planning and Budget.
d. Maintain liaison with the School of Dentistry Educational Policy Committee.

8. AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

These Bylaws may be amended at any meeting of the Faculty by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty present or voted on electronically, provided that written notice of amendment be sent to each member of the Faculty at least five days before the meeting at which the vote is held.
Approved by the Faculty on March 5, 1986. Revised on April 28, 1986; January 23, 1996; and May 15, 2013.
1. Choice 1 Comment Section: If you would like to provide comments on the bylaws changes, please provide them here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minor: it should say at least 15 members for the admissions committee; there can be more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I approve of 1-1 and 1-2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 1 (item 5.3 Quorum) proposed changes do not include Health Sciences series faculty when acting as a committee of the Academic Senate. I guess we haven't yet achieved parity for those in the Health Sciences series.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seem to be two different issues and should be voted on separately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that an admissions committee officer should be on the faculty at least 1/2 time because they have a paid position and any outside influence would jeopardize their paid position. Limiting this position as a committee member to 3 years helps eliminate burnout and any outside influence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what is proposed quorum?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Choice 1: Proposed SOD Bylaw Changes Definition of quorum for Full Faculty and Faculty Council meetings when school business is being considered. Removal of the required 3-year term for Admissions Committee members. Please provide your vote to approve, disapprove or abstain. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Choice 2: Proposed changes to the "Academic Status of Students"
Regulations Change in the language for student dismissal from "barred from further registration" to "dismissed." Change in the requirement of notifying student from "oral and in writing" to "in writing only." Please provide your vote to approve, disapprove or abstain. Thank you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Choice 2 Comment Section: If you would like to provide comments on the changes to the regulations, please provide them here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I approve 2-1, I do not approve of 2-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment 2 does not include section 7.1.8.1 changes: see http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-bylaws/sodb.html#sodreg Current status: 7.1.8.1 If a student chooses to appeal, the Student Status Committee must be notified in writing of this decision within three working days of the student’s receipt of the Committee’s notification. If students appeal decisions to repeat terms or to be barred from registration, these actions will not be in effect during the appeal process. However, the student should be notified that he/she may proceed with no assurance of acceptance of work done in the event of an unfavorable decision on the appeal.

This ballot had incorrect wording for issue 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SOD Committee on Educational Policy**
*Michael McMaster, Sophia Saeed, Dan Ramos, Howard Pollick*

**Student Status Committee reform - Draft Recommendations**

**Background:**

There is an ongoing discussion about evaluating the progress of students through the curriculum beyond the level of Pass/No Pass. Since we don’t have GPAs or class ranking, the faculty gets limited information about how well students are doing. It is particularly important to identify students who are having difficulty or performing poorly at multiple stages of the curriculum, or across several competencies although they may be passing their courses. In some cases students have progressed through the curriculum with significant deficiencies that threaten or delay their graduation. Identifying these students and addressing their difficulties early is a high priority.

This falls under the purview of the Student Status Committee. The committee consists of course directors and meets after the completion of each quarter. In these meetings grades are compiled and students who receive NPs are discussed, overall performance for the quarter is compiled and letters are generated for students in academic difficulty. However, there is often discussion of student deficiencies that do not rise to the level of a No Pass. This valuable information is often lost and could be used to identify issues early and seek solutions.

**Typical deficiencies:**

- **Academic:**
  - Failed exams
  - Multiple remediations to achieve minimum passing scores
  - Lack of understanding for their level of training
  - Consistent low (if passing) performance

- **Professionalism issues:**
  - Failure to complete paperwork in a timely manner
  - Failure to respond to emails or other communication
  - Failure to follow through on promised assignments/remediations
  - Mismanagement of patients/chair utilization
  - Poor interpersonal skills (w/ patients, peers, faculty, staff)
  - Difficulty taking direction, criticism

**Solutions:**

Changes to the procedures and responsibilities of the Student Status Committee could be used to address these issues and insure that we identify low performing students and address their issues.

- Each course director should be required to submit a simple form that includes 1) students earning NP 2) students who earn a P but are at or near the bottom of the class 3) brief but specific description of student issues that underlie their poor performance. (Sample form attached.)
• Student status committee could be charged with producing a report that captures the discussion that takes place at the meeting describing what the problems are. If deemed appropriate, students with difficulties or specific issues would receive a “letter of concern” that states that although they received a Pass for the class their performance has led to concerns that must be addressed. The students would be required to meet with course directors/coaches and discuss the issues. Students would then be required to establish a plan for improvement in consultation with the appropriate faculty members.

• Utilize professionalism write-ups. These can easily be filed and should be used more. They would come to the attention of the SS committee at their quarterly meetings. Faculty would need to be encouraged to use this mechanism and the committee would need to be informed when they are filed.

  Faculty need to know that these will be taken seriously and not swept under the rug, and what the follow-up will be. They also need to know how they are protected so that utilizing this mechanism will not affect their teaching evaluations in a manner that will prevent their own career progress. This is likely more of an issue for junior and mid-level faculty or faculty.

• Notify all course directors in any given quarter that a student is in academic difficulty or a professionalism issue has surfaced. This information should be shared in real time. For example if a student fails a midterm exam the other course directors should hear about it right away in order to assess their performance in other components of the curriculum. In this way we distinguish students who are having difficulty in one particular domain vs. those who are generally doing poorly.

• Include in the student status report individuals that, while passing, are at the bottom of the class. In this way we can identify students who repeatedly have difficulty. Once identified, appropriate interventions should be initiated for students who struggle in multiple domains. In this way the reasons for their poor performance can be identified and addressed. The overall goal is to provide resources for students to insure they improve or at least do not continue making the same mistakes.

Summary:

In general, more information about low performing students should be collected and documented by the Student Status Committee. Better communication among course directors and Stream Leaders could address the problem of students who consistently perform poorly. Appropriate interventions should be initiated so these students don’t fly under the radar. This will require education of course directors and faculty with regard to an expanded role for the Student Status Committee, a new mindset (for students and faculty) in terms of monitoring our students as they progress through the curriculum and resources to support appropriate interventions.