Committee on Educational Policy
Annual Report 2006-2007

Henry Sanchez, MD
Chair

During the 2006-07 academic year, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) met as a Committee seven times. The Committee's primary foci this year were the issues of educational technology and educational policy for both the Division and the UC system. In addition, members of CEP served on various UCSF committees and participated in conjunction with members of other Academic Senate committees on Academic Senate Task Forces reviewing campus-wide or system-wide initiatives. Such external committees or task forces included:

- Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Steering Committee
- Academic Information System Board (AISB)
- UCSF Strategic Planning Initiative
- Task Force to Review the UCEP/CCGA Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction
- Task Force to Review the UCSF Five-Year Perspective (2007-2012)
- Task Force to Review the Proposed New and Revised Senate Regulations 694 and 695 Regarding Graduate Programs

The Committee benefited from a variety of informational presentations pertaining to educational issues given throughout the year. These presentations included:

1. Online Grading System
2. Resource 25 web-based application for managing classroom assignments
3. Proposed Classroom Food Policy

Issues reviewed and acted on by the Committee included:

1. Increased School Educational Policy Committee representation
2. Committee response to the UCSF Strategic Planning Initiative
3. Educational technology

Systemwide Issues

CEP Chair Henry Sanchez served as the UCSF representative to the systemwide University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP). Senate Member gave regular reports to UCSF CEP regarding issues at the systemwide level. The following issues were of particular interest to CEP.

1. The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction

2. The Public Availability of Grades and Grade Point Averages

Henry Sanchez chaired the Task Force to Review the UCEP/CCGA Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction. ([Appendix 1](#))

Task Force to Review the UCSF Five-Year Perspective (2007-2012)
Lynn Verhey and Claudia West served on the Task Force to Review the UCSF Five-Year Perspective. ([Appendix 2](#))

Task Force to Review the Proposed New and Revised Senate Regulations 694 and 695 Regarding Graduate Programs
William Bird served on the Task Force to Review the Proposed New and Revised Senate Regulations 694 and 695 Regarding Graduate Programs. ([Appendix 3](#))

Division Issues

School Educational Policy Committee Representation
In 2006-07, CEP invited as Permanent Guests representatives from the Educational Policy Committee (or its equivalent) from each School.

Educational Technology at UCSF
Transition from WebCT
Over the course of the 2006-07 year, the Library considered a number of options for upgrading the campus from the current version of the WebCT software. By June 2007, the Library had begun a process of evaluating two different platforms to replace Web CT with one of the open-access systems, Sakai or Moodle. The Library will make a decision by early Fall and will seek input from CEP on the kinds of issues to be considered for the transition from Web CT to the next platform.

Podcasting at UCSF
In 2006-07, the University of California signed an agreement with Apple to manage podcasts within the UC system to manage the public content contained in UC podcasts, while each campus will manage restricted content for their faculty, staff and students. At UCSF, the campus-level management of restricted content and other digital multimedia files is overseen by the Library's Center for Instructional Technology. This management includes workshops and training for podcast users. The Center for Instructional Technology (CIT) has two digital audio recorders and microphones available for borrowing for faculty who would like to try out podcasting before buying their own equipment.

Currently, educators may have secured the copyright to use material for lecture, but not necessarily for electronic distribution of the lecture. Henceforth, it will become important for users to request the podcasting copyright when purchasing or acquiring copyright for images and other kinds of information. A permission form is under development for all of the schools to use for instructors and guest instructors to grant the University permission to make their material available as Podcasts, with the option of making the material available only to students enrolled in the specific class.

Electronic Portfolio
The School of Medicine is working to develop a plan to implement electronic portfolios for students. The electronic portfolio is a way for students to capture and display documentation about their career as a student. The information presented in this format could be used by students when applying to residency programs. It will also facilitate writing letters of recommendation for faculty members. The Library is participating in the planning process and information is being shared across school through the new Interschool Education Technology Committee (ITEC). G. Persily and Chris Cullander are members of this new committee and will keep CEP informed of its activities.

Audience Response System
Audience response systems allow instructors to give paperless quizzes and exams. Each remote unit can be issued a unique ID. Some programs require that students buy their remote device as part of their learning materials. Chair Sanchez demonstrated the use of the Turning Point software for the Committee.

UCSF Strategic Planning Initiative

In September 2006, CEP reviewed the proposal for the UCSF Strategic Planning Initiative (Appendix 4) and transmitted their response to Academic Senate Chair Deborah Greenspan (Appendix 5). In October 2006, Henry Sanchez was selected to participate in Design Team C - Education and Training for the Future of the UCSF Strategic Planning Initiative. Throughout the year, H. Sanchez reported to CEP on the Strategic Planning process and solicited the Committee's feedback on the issues discussed at the meetings.

At the conclusion of the strategic planning process in March 2007, Design Team C: Education and Training for the Future made the following recommendations:

High Priority
- Develop educational facilities, including an education center, smart classrooms, facilities for faculty and students
- Ensure that UCSF continues to attract the best students, including ensuring adequate financial aid, support, and housing

Medium Priority
- Develop interdisciplinary programs across schools
- Recognize and reward faculty for teaching and mentoring

Low Priority
- Secure more reliable and more transparent funding for educational programs
- Improve health science school enrollment

The UCSF Strategic Plan was published in June 2007 and is available at http://strategy.ucsf.edu/.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accreditation Steering Committee

In 2006-07, Sergio Baranzini served as the CEP Representative to the WASC Steering Committee. The task of the Steering Committee was to submit a 15- page proposal to WASC by April 2007. The report included four themes which included:
- The challenge of operating multi-site campus (IT, communication, etc.)
- New technology in education
- Student learning outcomes
- Student and campus diversity.

The proposal was the first of three phases of the process. It will be followed by a report 18 months later and a subsequent site visit. It was submitted to WASC in April 2007 and accepted by WASC.

Academic Information Systems Advisory Board (AISB)

In 2006-07, Henry Sanchez served on the Academic Information Systems Board and communicated with CEP the issues discussed in their meetings. A new videoconferencing system will be implemented that will simultaneously record the lecture and the lecture slides or images. Systems are being developed to bring live webcasts of lectures held at the Mission Bay campus to the Mt. Zion and Parnassus campuses. These technologies will help improve communication across campus locations at UCSF. AISB also discussed the future of technologically up-to-date classrooms, referred to as 'smart classrooms'.

Library Issues

Library Space Planning
At the request of Executive Vice Chancellor Eugene Washington, in 2006 the UCSF Library determined that approximately 10,000 square feet could be repurposed on the second floor of the Parnassus Library. The space will be used for education-related purposes, but the specific details need to be made in this recommendation.

In 2006-07, University Librarian Karen Butter convened a committee to determine the new space use strategy for the Library. The committee considered various reports already prepared on space, as well as the PRIME telemedicine proposed uses for the space, such as a Clinical Simulation Center. Committee consisted of a representative from each school plus the Graduate Division, Campus Planning, Budget Office and Academic Senate. The evaluation will emphasize the following two priorities: library space should benefit the whole campus and library space should focus on education and shared learning. The evaluation included the review of data from faculty responses to the survey on library space use. The data collected from the student survey on library space use demonstrated that the students use the space more frequently than faculty.

The Committee drafted the following criteria stating that the repurposed Library space should:
- Leverage existing services, architecture and technology with new functions to create a state of the art learning environment
- Support campus education programs
- Support functions that serve the entire campus
- Respond to directions of the Library's strategic plan
- Support a design that is flexible and allows multi-purpose use
- Preserve the unique architectural and functional character of the building (views, open areas for study and assembly, and interior design elements) that make the Library a showcase for the campus

Furthermore, plans for these spaces should include as appropriate:
- Technology-enhancements for multi-purpose use
- "Smart" classroom technologies
- Videoconferencing capabilities
- Program support staff and facilities

This Committee recommended these priorities for the use of the second floor Library space:
- Clinical simulations/skills space
- Small group classrooms (~20 seats)
- Smaller group spaces (6-8 seats)

Simultaneously, the School of Medicine is considering options that would include some portion of the library perhaps in conjunction with an education building on Parnassus campus to house PRIME/Telemedicine program and other education programs.

Funding is not yet available for the repurposing of the Library space, however some money will be available from Proposition 1D funding.

Resource 25 Web-Based Classroom Scheduling System

Starting in the Spring 2007 term, the Registrar's Office began using new web-based software to schedule classroom use on campus and asked CEP to provide feedback regarding its implementation.

Online Grading System

The Registrar's Office began using the Online Grade Reporting System in November - December 2004. By the end of 2006, about 200 faculty members were using the system, representing about one-third of the faculty. Faculty users have requested the ability to upload grades to the system, the ability for a staff member to input grade information with faculty approval and the ability to download information from WebCT. The Library will work with the Registrar's Office to incorporate the faculty requests.

Proposed Classroom Food Policy

The Registrar's Office presented a proposed classroom food policy for CEP review. The Committee responded to the proposal and the Registrar used CEP's feedback to refine the proposed policy.

Issues for the 2007-2008 Academic Year

1. Continued support for educational policy for UCSF and the UC system.
2. Continued support for the WASC Accreditation Steering Committee
3. Continued support for the Library Space Planning process

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Educational Policy

Henry Sanchez, MD, *Chair*	Su Guo, PhD
Linda Chafetz, RN, DNS, *Vice Chair*	Joseph Rabban, MD
Sergio Baranzini, PhD	Jason Satterfield, PhD
William Bird, DDS, DPH	Lynn Verhey, PhD
Joan Etzell, MD	Claudia West, RN, MS

Prepared by:
Heather Alden, Senate Analyst
(415) 476-8827, heather.alden@ucsf.edu

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Communication from the Task Force Reviewing Joint University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction (*December 2, 2006*)

Appendix 2: Communication from the Task Force to Review the Draft Campus Five-Year Perspective for New Academic Programs 2007-2012 (*January 25, 2007)*

Appendix 3: Communication from the Task Force Reviewing Proposed New and Revised Senate Regulations 694 and 695 Regarding Graduate Programs (*March 8, 2007*)

Appendix 4: UCSF Strategic Planning Phase III: Strategy Development

Appendix 5: Committee on Educational Policy Response to the UCSF Strategic Planning Phase III: Strategy Development (*September 19, 2006*)

ACADEMIC SENATE   www.ucsf.edu/senate

Communication from Task Force Reviewing Joint University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction
Henry Sanchez, MD, Chair

December 1, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: **Suggestions for Divisional Response to the Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction**

Dear Chair Greenspan:

The Task Force to Review and Recommend Comment to the Joint Universitywide Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction, consisting of one member of the Committee on Educational Policy (Chair), one member of the Graduate Council, one member of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, and representatives of the Faculty Councils of the Schools of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy met to review the Proposal and to suggest a possible response from the San Francisco Division.

The Task Force supports the effort to clarify and strengthen the role of Graduate Students within the University of California by creating a uniform policy across campuses. This Proposal is an important step toward this goal, however, we are concerned that Graduate Students should receive adequate oversight, supervision and support while teaching at the University. To that end, we make the following recommendations for the response from the San Francisco Division:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The document should clearly define the faculty role in supporting Graduate Students in University Instruction, ensuring that the language is consistent throughout the document.
2. The document should include a process for faculty to record their supervision of the Graduate Student in their role as an instructor.
3. The document should delineate Graduate Student teaching responsibilities in their capacities as Graduate Teaching Assistants or Graduate Teaching Fellows.

4. The document should include a method to list both the Instructor of Record and the Graduate Teaching Assistant in the Course Catalog to prevent a misrepresentation of the actual instructor of the course to potential students.
5. The document should clearly differentiate the responsibilities for grading and entering student grades, particularly between the Graduate Teaching Assistant and Graduate Teaching Fellow categories.
6. The document should clarify that the Instructor of Record will have ultimate responsibility for the student grades.
7. The document should clearly state that a Post-Doctoral Fellow may not supervise a Graduate Teaching Fellow as the Instructor of Record.
8. The document should clearly state that the Academic Senate Divisions should not be able to override the need for faculty supervision of the Graduate Teaching Assistants and Graduate Teaching Fellows.
9. The document should define how the University should act if a Graduate Student becomes a Graduate Teaching Fellow without the specified qualifications.

To better understand the proposed changes, we also recommend generating a table to compare and contrast the existing criteria for Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Instructors with the proposed criteria for the Graduate Teaching Assistant and Graduate Teaching Fellow categories.

We recognize the importance of training Graduate Students as future academicians. To support both Graduate Students and Faculty Members in this process, it is essential to create a clear and uniform policy for Graduate Students in university instruction. We hope that the suggestions presented here will help strengthen the proposed document.

Sincerely,

Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Comment to the Joint Universitywide Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction
Henry Sanchez, MD, Committee on Educational Policy, Chair of the Task Force
Richard Shafer, PhD, Graduate Council
Paul Green, PhD, Academic Planning and Budget
Daniel Fried, PhD, School of Dentistry
Nancy Byl, PhD, PT, School of Medicine
Nancy Donaldson, RN, DNS, School of Nursing
Cathi Dennehy, PharmD, School of Pharmacy

COMMUNICATION FROM THE TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE DRAFT CAMPUS FIVE-YEAR PERSPECTIVE FOR NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS 2007-2012
Farid Chehab, PhD, Chair

January 25, 2007

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS, Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Re: Task Force Response to the Draft Campus Five-Year Perspective for New Academic Programs 2007-2012

Dear Chair Greenspan:

At your request, the Task Force reviewed the Campus Five-Year Perspective for New Academic Programs 2007-2012 submitted to the Academic Senate for feedback by Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Sally Marshall. The concerns and recommendations of the Task Force are summarized below with the headings used in the draft Five-Year Perspective.

1. Anticipated creation of new academic programs, academic units, and research units

Proposed New Programs and Units 2007
School of Dentistry

None.

School of Medicine
Joint Doctorate in Physical Therapy (D.P.T.) with CSU Northridge and UCSF -- Under Departmental and Dean's Office Review

The Task Force has no comment.

Program in Global Health Sciences
School of Global Health -- In Program Development Stage
The Task Force recommends that all items regarding Global Health be reorganized within the document. The Global Health information currently listed at the end of Section 2 could be moved to the beginning of the section. The Task Force suggests including in Section 1 the PhD in Global Health Sciences following the description of the Executive Master in Global Health, as well as any other degrees planned for the School of Global Health.
The Task Force recommends clarifying the proposed structure for the School of Global Health, in particular how the existing Institute for Global Health and Program for Global Health will be

incorporated into the new School. The Task Force recommends that eventually all programs related to Global Health at UCSF should be housed in the School of Global Health. The Task Force Members noted significant confusion among their respective Committees with regard to the disparate entities using the words "Global Health" in their titles.

<u>Executive Master in Global Health -- In Program Development Stage</u>

The Task Force recommends clarifying the following information regarding this program:
1. If the proposed degree will be a graduate degree (overseen by the Graduate Division) or if it will be a professional degree offered by one of the Schools,
2. If the program will share curricula with other proposed or existing degree programs,
3. How it will use resources in relation to other degrees in the program,
4. If the proposed program will depend on the existence of the proposed School of Global Health,
5. How long the program is expected to last (i.e. one year, 18 months, two years),
6. And if the courses will be offered during the day, in the evening or both.

2. Status of anticipated creation of new academic programs, academic units, and research units included in the 2006 list:

Status of Proposed New Programs

School of Dentistry

<u>Master's of Science Degree in Dental Hygiene (MSDH) -- Under Review by the Department of Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences (PRDS) and the Dean, School of Dentistry</u>

The Task Force has no comment.

School of Medicine

<u>Doctor of Audiology Degree – Under Departmental Review</u>

The Task Force has no comment.

<u>Ph.D. Degree in Developmental Biology – Approved by UCOP 03/23/06</u>

The Task Force has no comment.

<u>Joint Doctorate in Physical Therapy (D.P.T.) with UCSF and CSU Fresno – Approved by CCGA 11/07/06</u>

The Task Force has no comment.

<u>Joint Ph.D. Degree in Epidemiology with UCSF and UC Berkeley – Under Departmental Review</u>

The Task Force has no comment.

Ph.D. Degree in Trans-disciplinary Health Policy Research – Under Departmental Review (Institute for Health Policy Studies)

The Task Force has no comment.

Program for Global Health

Master's of Science Degree in Global Health Sciences – Under Divisional Senate Review (Graduate Council) (the Program is currently not housed in a school or department and reports directly to the Chancellor)

The Task Force suggests replacing the second sentence, "The degree is designed to produce health scientists committed to the reduction of infectious diseases in developing countries." with the following text taken from the Aims and Objectives section of the report recently submitted to the Graduate Council for review, "Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group and a Program of Graduate Studies in Global Health Sciences for the MS Degree at the University of California, San Francisco":

> The mission of the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) Global Health Sciences is to integrate unique faculty expertise in basic sciences, clinical research, anthropology, behavioral sciences, epidemiology, social sciences, economics, and global health to improve the health of vulnerable people in all countries of the world through research and training. This proposal seeks to establish a Graduate Group in Global Health Sciences (GGGHS) at UCSF. The GGGHS will be the home for a multidisciplinary graduate program that will initially provide a new curriculum developed for the Master of Science (MS) degree in global health sciences. After this MS is established, a PhD program will follow with a focus on global health science research, unique to health sciences schools in the United States.

PhD Degree in Global Health Sciences – In Program Development Stage

The Task Force recommends that this section be moved to Section 1 following the description of the Executive Master in Global Health.

Status of Proposed ORUs/MRUs

School of Medicine

Institute for Human Genetics – Approved by Divisional Senate and Campus 10-06
The proposal to extend ORU status for the Institute for Human Genetics was reviewed and approved.

The Task Force suggests that information regarding any plans to develop a PhD program in the Institute for Human Genetics be included in this section.

Anticipated transfers, consolidations, discontinuances, or disestablishments (TCDD) of academic programs, academic units and research units

None.

Status of anticipated TCDD actions

None.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this important document. We ask that the Executive Vice Chancellor share the final draft of the Five-Year Perspective submitted to Provost and Executive Vice President Hume with the Task Force and the Academic Senate. Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the Task Force Chair, Farid Chehab at (415) 476-0310 or chehabf@labmed2.ucsf.edu.

Sincerely,

**Task Force to Review the Draft Campus Five-Year Perspective
for New Academic Programs 2007-2012**

Farid Chehab, PhD, Chair (Graduate Council)
Nancy Boudreau, PhD (Committee on Academic Planning and Budget)
H. Jeffrey Lawrence, MD (Committee on Research)
Susan Sniderman, MD (Committee on Academic Planning and Budget)
Lynn Verhey, PhD (Committee on Educational Policy)
Elizabeth Watkins, PhD (Graduate Council)
Claudia West, RN, MS (Committee on Educational Policy)

ACADEMIC SENATE

www.ucsf.edu/senate

Communication from the Task Force Reviewing Proposed New and Revised Senate Regulations 694 and 695 Regarding Graduate Programs
Jeffry Lansman, PhD, Chair

March 8, 2007

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Dear Chair Greenspan,

The Task Force Reviewing the Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulations 694 and 695 consisted of one Member of the Graduate Council (Chair), one member from the Committee on Educational Policy, one member from the Committee on Courses of Instruction, and Members of the Faculty Councils of each of the four schools. The Task Force met on February 28, 2007 to review these Proposed Amendments and to suggest a possible response from the San Francisco Division. After review and discussion, the Task Force makes the following recommendations for a response from the San Francisco Division.

Regarding Proposed Changes to Senate Regulation 694
The Task Force supports the proposed modification to Senate Regulation 694. In addition, the Task Force reached a consensus that the term "significant participation" in regards to defining "off campus" needs to be clarified. The Task Force feels that "significant participation" is far too nebulous and can be interpreted in a myriad of different ways.

Regarding Proposed Changes to Senate Regulation 695.
The Task Force recommends that either "individual" or "collective" be stricken as both ideas are implied by "student(s)".

Lastly, the Task Force offers these suggestions for portions of the regulations that were not specifically under review: instead of "afford distinct advantages to society," the Task Force suggests "further educational objectives of a department or school and/or facilitate access to degree granting programs."

The Task Force hopes you find this review and these recommendations helpful in forming a response from the San Francisco Division.

Sincerely,

The Task Force Reviewing Proposed New and Revised Senate Regulations 694 and 695 Regarding Graduate Programs
Jeffry Lansman, PhD, Chair of the Task Force, Graduate Council
William Bird, DDS, DPH, Committee on Education Policy
Chris Cullander, PhD, School of Pharmacy Faculty Council
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, School of Dentistry Faculty Council
Beth Phoenix, RN, PhD, CNS, School of Nursing Faculty Council
Patty Robertson, MD, School of Medicine Faculty Council
Christian Vaisse, MD, PhD, Courses of Instruction

Coordinating Committee of Graduate Affairs (CCGA)
Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 694

Present Wording

694.

A school, department, or group of departments which offers a program leading to a Master's degree under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division, may, in cooperation with University Extension, provide at a center or centers other than a campus of the University, a program of graduate instruction designed to satisfy, in full or in part, the requirements for that degree. Such off-campus graduate instruction shall be authorized, on the recommendation of the school, department, or group of departments concerned, only if, in the judgment of the Graduate Council concerned, the proposed program will afford distinct advantages to society and will not be detrimental to the standards ordinarily required for the degree. Programs of off-campus graduate instruction and study are subject to the following provisions:

   A. Requirements for a professional Master's degree may be satisfied in full by off-campus graduate study unless the Graduate Council concerned determines that a substantial part of those requirements may be more effectively satisfied by resident study on a campus of the University.
   B. No more than one-half of the total unit and residence requirements for the degree of Master of Arts or Master of Science may be satisfied by off-campus graduate study.
   C. Each proposed program of off-campus graduate instruction must be approved by the Graduate Council of the Division concerned, and such approval shall be granted only if the Council shall have determined that the proposed course offerings, facilities, and staff are at least equivalent to those available on the campus of the University where the program leading to the degree is ordinarily offered.
   D. Each course to be included in an off-campus graduate program, and each instructor in such a course who is not a member of the department of the University in which the corresponding course is offered, must be approved by the Graduate Council of the Division concerned, and in accordance with the usual University procedures and with such special procedures as the Council may determine. The Council shall make an annual review of all programs of off-campus graduate instruction with respect to course offerings, facilities, and staff.
   E. No student may enroll in an off-campus graduate program who has not been admitted to a Graduate Division.

Proposed Wording

694.

A school, department, or group of departments ~~which~~ **that** offers a program leading to a Master's degree under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division may~~, in cooperation with University Extension,~~ provide at a center or centers other than a campus of the University, **and optionally in cooperation with the University Extension,** a program of graduate instruction designed to satisfy, in full or in part, the requirements for that degree. Such off-campus graduate instruction

shall be authorized, on the recommendation of the school, department, or group of departments concerned, only if, in the judgment of the Graduate Council concerned, the proposed program will afford ==distinct advantages to society== and will not be detrimental to the standards ordinarily required for the degree.

For the purpose of SR 694, the term "off-campus" shall not refer to any remote center or satellite campus that enjoys ==significant participation== of faculty with membership in the Academic Senate (as defined by Standing Order 105.1 of the Regents of the University of California) and for which the main campus provides a significant and ongoing multi-departmental administrative role. Instruction delivered electronically is classified as off-campus or on-campus according to SR 695.

Programs of off-campus graduate instruction and study are subject to the following provisions:

A. Requirements for a professional Master's degree may be satisfied in full by off-campus graduate study unless the Graduate Council concerned determines that a substantial part of those requirements may be more effectively satisfied by resident study on a campus of the University.

B. No more than one-half of the total unit and residence requirements for the degree of Master of Arts or Master of Science may be satisfied by off-campus graduate study.

C. Each proposed program of off-campus graduate instruction must be approved by the Graduate Council of the Division concerned, and such approval shall be granted only if the Council shall have determined that the proposed course offerings, facilities, and staff are at least equivalent to those available on the campus of the University where the program leading to the degree is ordinarily offered.

D. Each course to be included in an off-campus graduate program, and each instructor in such a course who is not a member of the department of the University in which the corresponding course is offered, must be approved by the Graduate Council of the Division concerned, and in accordance with the usual University procedures and with such special procedures as the Council may determine. The Council shall make an annual review of all programs of off-campus graduate instruction with respect to course offerings, facilities, and staff.

E. No student may enroll in an off-campus graduate program who has not been admitted to a Graduate Division.

F. **Should a Master's program, previously approved by the Regents, propose to shift greater than one-fourth of the unit value of its instruction from an on-campus to an off-campus venue, or from an off-campus to an on-campus venue, the program shall notify the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs of its intent to do so, regardless of whether the shift has been considered by the concerned Graduate Council(s). The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs will consider the impact of the proposed change in the delivery of the program's instruction, and provide comments for the consideration of the program and the Regents.**

JUSTIFICATION:

SR 694 determines the residency requirements for students enrolled in graduate programs. In the current wording of this regulation, it is unclear as to whether the involvement of University Extension is a necessary component of off-site instruction. This redrafting makes it clear that a University Extension component is optional. In addition, CCGA should be notified if any component of a program is moved from on- to off-campus. CCGA also wanted to make a clear distinction between legitimate satellite campuses and "off-site" instructional venues. For the purposes of a proper delineation of these terms, a satellite campus should "enjoy significant participation of faculty with membership in the Academic Senate and for which the main campus provides a significant and ongoing multi-departmental administrative role."

Coordinating Committee of Graduate Affairs (CCGA)
Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 695

Present Wording

No current wording; this is a new regulation.

Proposed Wording

695.

Subject to the approval of the appropriate Divisional Senate committee, classes delivered electronically by instructors employed by the University may be counted for regular credit towards graduate degree and residency requirements. Electronic delivery of graduate instruction may take place through real-time transmission of didactic instruction, through interactive contact between students and University instructors via electronic forums, and/or through archival media originated by University instructors that is accessed under the individual or collective discretion of the enrolled student(s). Electronically-delivered instruction incorporating archival media must include opportunities for interactive contact commensurate with the unit value of the associated class. Electronically-delivered instruction is to be classified as either on-campus (in residence) or off-campus (not in residence) according to the following criteria.

> A. **Participation by a student in an electronically-delivered class for which the primary mode of contact is real-time delivery of didactic instruction shall be deemed on-campus provided that, for the majority of the contact time, either the instructor or the student is present on the main campus or at a remote center or satellite campus as described in SR 694.**

> B. **Participation by a student in an electronically-delivered class for which the primary mode of contact is through interactive forums shall be deemed on-campus provided that either the instructor or student is present on the main campus, or at a remote center or satellite campus, for a substantial fraction of the days for which the term during which the course is provided is in session.**

A graduate program proposing to shift any component of its instruction from locally-attended classroom instruction to electronically-delivered instruction shall seek approval from the local Graduate Council. If this shift involves a shift from on- to off-campus instruction, as defined above, the stipulations of SR 694 also apply.

JUSTIFICATION:

SR 695 is a completely new regulation, and would regulate the residency requirements for students enrolled in on-line programs and courses. The wording of the new regulation attempts to ensure appropriate contact time for students enrolled in such courses. Such time could be in the form of direct face-to-face contact or electronic correspondence.

UCSF – STRATEGIC PLANNING PHASE III
STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

Strategy Development (Phase III) will be completed through six "Design Teams" as proposed below. These design teams will be comprised of appropriate combinations of faculty, staff, students, residents, fellows, and post doctoral scholars. The teams will be charged with developing specific strategies and tactics within their respective theme that support the vision and goals defined for UCSF's future.   These goals and team themes are reflective of all of the strategic planning work completed to-date, including the planning interviews, the on-line survey, environmental assessment, and preliminary mission, vision and goals discussed at Board meetings.

Proposed team assignments, or "charges," are presented on the following pages for each of the Design Teams. These charges are based on each of the UCSF goals that have been assigned to the six teams as part of their strategy development.

PROPOSED STRATEGY DESIGN TEAMS

Team A:	**Recruitment and Retention**
Team B:	**Research Directions**
Team C:	**Education and Training for the Future**
Team D:	**Clinical Care: Quality, Safety, Access and Patient Satisfaction**
Team E:	**Infrastructure and Resources**
Team F:	**Leadership and Governance**

We are asking the Board to provide input on the following questions:

- *Do the proposed themes for the six teams reflect the priority areas identified through the strategic planning work completed to-date? Are there refinements you would recommend?*
- *Are there charges (assignment questions) that are missing or should be revised, given the strategic planning discussions to-date?*
- *What are your recommendations for membership for any of these strategy design teams (either Board or non-board members)?*

Please return your initial input to these three questions to Julie Kuznetsov (JKuznetsov@chanoff.ucsf.edu) by noon on September 11th so that we can summarize input for discussion at the September 14th Board meeting. At that meeting, Board members will also begin the process of assembling the teams. Thank you.

TEAM A: RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

GOAL #1: Recruit, mentor and retain faculty, staff, students, resident, fellows, and post doctoral scholars of the highest caliber.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What are the factors that attract top recruits to UCSF? Are any of these factors deteriorating? What needs to be done to address deteriorating factors? How can we capitalize on existing strengths?

b. What are the factors that cause top candidates to choose another institution over UCSF? What can UCSF do strategically to overcome these obstacles?

c. What strategies should UCSF implement to <u>recruit</u> top:

- Faculty?
- Staff?
- Students?
- Residents?
- Fellows?
- Post doctoral scholars?

d. What strategies should UCSF implement to <u>retain</u> top:

- Faculty?
- Staff?
- Students?
- Residents?
- Fellows?
- Post doctoral scholars?

e. How can UCSF ensure that effective mentoring takes place for faculty, staff, students, residents, fellows and post-doctoral scholars? What programs and systems need to be established to reward good mentoring?

GOAL #2: Educate and employ a diverse workforce.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What methods for improving diversity have been successful at UCSF?

b. Are there specific obstacles at UCSF that inhibit recruitment and retention of a representative community?

c. What new strategies should be implemented to create a more diverse campus community? Differentiate between students, residents, fellows, post doctoral scholars, faculty and staff, as needed.

GOAL #3: Provide a supportive work environment that fosters communication and collaboration.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal (note that ALL teams will address this Goal):

     a. What strategies should be employed to protect the culture of collaboration at UCSF?

     b. How best can UCSF address the challenges of communication, which is increasingly taxed as UCSF grows across multiple campuses and diversifies its missions?

     c. What steps should be taken to provide a supportive work environment that fosters the core values identified for UCSF's future?

     (Note: The top ten values identified through the strategic planning work are Excellence, Integrity, Leadership, Innovation, Collaboration/Collegiality, Respect, Scholarship, Diversity, Supportive Environment, Community Service. Most of these values are being addressed elsewhere in all six team charges)

TEAM B: RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

GOAL #4: Foster the UCSF research enterprise across multiple sites; determine priority research areas, as well as the criteria for defining priorities, for further development.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What criteria should be used to select priority research areas for the future? Rank the criteria in order of importance.

b. What research areas should be considered for further development?

c. How does each research area rate relative to each criteria recommended above under question a?

d. How best can the UCSF research enterprise be fostered across multiple campuses and schools in the short- and long-term?

GOAL #5: Build novel interdisciplinary and inter-school approaches towards education, <u>research</u> and health care that prepare UCSF for the future.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. Given the priority research areas identified for UCSF's future (under Goal #4 charges above), what novel interdisciplinary and inter-school approaches should be developed to ensure success of the research enterprise?

b. What, if any, other resources (faculty, space, cores, etc.) are needed to ensure these approaches are successfully implemented?

GOAL #6: Develop innovative education and <u>research</u> programs across professional schools that support the vision for UCSF of promoting global health.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What specific strategies are needed to advance innovative research in global health across professional schools at UCSF?

b. How can this best be accomplished across UCSF's professional schools?

GOAL #7: **Strengthen relationships with other University of California campuses that provide collaborative opportunities with other science disciplines.**

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. Given the priority research areas as well as the novel interdisciplinary and inter-school approaches identified above, what disciplines are not available at UCSF that will be needed in the future to advance the UCSF research agenda?

b. Which UC campuses have these disciplines as institutional strengths and represent potential collaborators?

c. What mechanisms and infrastructure are needed to facilitate these collaborations?

GOAL #8: **Work in partnership with the community to reduce health disparities.***

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. How do we define "community" with respect to this goal?

b. In what ways, from a research perspective, is UCSF most likely to contribute to the reduction of health disparities?

c. Through which community partnerships can this goal be achieved? How can current community partnerships be strengthened to achieve this goal?

d. What are the objective measures to assess progress in meeting this goal?

GOAL #3: **Provide a supportive work environment that fosters communication and collaboration.***

Team Charges to Address the Goal (note that ALL teams will address this Goal):

a. What strategies should be employed to protect the culture of collaboration at UCSF?

b. How best can UCSF address the challenges of communication, which is increasingly taxed as UCSF grows across multiple campuses and diversifies its missions?

c. What steps should be taken to provide a supportive work environment that fosters the core values identified for UCSF's future?

   (Note: The top ten values identified through the strategic planning work are Excellence, Integrity, Leadership, Innovation, Collaboration/Collegiality, Respect, Scholarship, Diversity, Supportive Environment, Community Service. Most of these values are being addressed elsewhere in all six team charges.)

---

* Goal will be addressed by more than one Strategy Design Team: Please see Appendix for a complete list.

TEAM C: EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR THE FUTURE

GOAL #5: Build novel interdisciplinary and inter-school approaches towards <u>education</u>, research and health care that prepare UCSF for the future.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What are the educational needs of future students, residents, fellows, and post doctoral scholars?

b. Were interdisciplinary and inter-school educational programs and/or curricula identified as important pursuits for UCSF's future in response to question a?

c. What, if any, are the obstacles at UCSF to enhancing interdisciplinary and inter-school education? How should these be addressed to enhance interdisciplinary and inter-school education at UCSF?

d. What other steps need to be taken to build new educational programs and approaches?

GOAL #6: Develop innovative <u>education</u> and research programs across professional schools that support the vision for UCSF of promoting global health.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What types of educational programs are needed in global health and population sciences at UCSF and why are they needed?

b. What steps need to be taken to institute these programs at UCSF?

c. Are there strong models or examples of these programs elsewhere that UCSF may want to emulate?

GOAL #9: Enhance cross-training for faculty, students, residents, fellows and post-doctoral scholars that provides greater exposure to basic science training for clinicians and to clinical and health sciences training for researchers.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What strategies can UCSF implement to provide greater exposure to basic science training for clinicians?

b. What strategies can UCSF implement to provide greater exposure to clinical and health sciences for researchers?

c. How will success be measured in attaining this goal?

GOAL #8: Work in partnership with the community to reduce health disparities.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. How do we define "community" with respect to this goal?

b. In what ways, from an educational perspective, is UCSF most likely to contribute to the reduction of health disparities?

c. Through which community partnerships can this goal be achieved? How can current community partnerships be strengthened to achieve this goal?

d. What are the objective measures to assess progress in meeting this goal?

GOAL #3: Provide a supportive work environment that fosters communication and collaboration.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal (note that ALL teams will address this Goal):

a. What strategies should be employed to protect the culture of collaboration at UCSF?

b. How best can UCSF address the challenges of communication, which is increasingly taxed as UCSF grows across multiple campuses and diversifies its missions?

c. What steps should be taken to provide a supportive work environment that fosters the core values identified for UCSF's future?

   (Note: The top ten values identified through the strategic planning work are Excellence, Integrity, Leadership, Innovation, Collaboration/Collegiality, Respect, Scholarship, Diversity, Supportive Environment, Community Service. Most of these values are being addressed elsewhere in all six team charges.)

TEAM D: CLINICAL CARE: QUALITY, SAFETY, ACCESS AND PATIENT SATISFACTION

GOAL #10: **Develop systematic approaches that enhance health care quality and patient safety, access and satisfaction.**

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What mechanisms are in place at UCSF to monitor and manage each of these parameters?

b. What evidence do we have of success or failure in these domains?

c. What strategies should be implemented to enhance UCSF's performance in health care quality and patient safety, access and satisfaction? Specifically consider both inpatient and outpatient care at all sites.

GOAL #5: **Build novel interdisciplinary and inter-school approaches towards education, research and <u>health care</u> that prepare UCSF for the future.***

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What interdisciplinary and inter-professional approaches towards health care are important pursuits for UCSF's future?

b. What, if any, are the obstacles at UCSF to enhancing interdisciplinary and inter-professional health care? How should these be addressed to enhance interdisciplinary and inter-professional health care at UCSF?

c. What steps need to be taken to accomplish this Goal from a health care perspective? What resources may be required for successful implementation?

GOAL #8: **Work in partnership with the community to reduce health disparities.***

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. How do we define "community" with respect to this goal?

b. In what ways, from a health care perspective, is UCSF most likely to contribute to the reduction of health disparities?

c. Through which community partnerships can this goal be achieved? How can current community partnerships be strengthened to achieve this goal?

d. What are the objective measures to assess progress in meeting this goal?

GOAL #3: Provide a supportive work environment that fosters communication and collaboration.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal (note that ALL teams will address this Goal):

    a. What strategies should be employed to protect the culture of collaboration at UCSF?

    b. How best can UCSF address the challenges of communication, which is increasingly taxed as UCSF grows across multiple campuses and diversifies its missions?

    c. What steps should be taken to provide a supportive work environment that fosters the core values identified for UCSF's future?

    (Note: The top ten values identified through the strategic planning work are Excellence, Integrity, Leadership, Innovation, Collaboration/Collegiality, Respect, Scholarship, Diversity, Supportive Environment, Community Service. Most of these values are being addressed elsewhere in all six team charges.)

TEAM E: INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES

GOAL #11: Secure sustainable and diversified funding to carry out the vision.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

  a. Considering all of UCSF's funding sources (EA pgs IV-2 and IV-3), what sources are the most likely targets for growth in the future?

  b. What steps should UCSF take to secure those funds?

  c. What alternatives should UCSF pursue in the event that these funds cannot be reliably secured?

  d. How can UCSF foster its development efforts and increase endowments?

  e. Should UCSF strengthen partnerships with private industry to diversify funding, and if so, how?

GOAL #12: Develop communication systems, including information technologies, that bridge missions, campuses, schools and departments, that allow all to operate efficiently, facilitate collaboration, and build community.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

  a. What systems are already in place at UCSF to facilitate communication, efficiency and collaboration? How can these systems be enhanced?

  b. What duplicative systems are maintained by different schools, campuses and operating units that should be centralized?

  c. Are there systems that are currently centrally administered that should be decentralized?

  d. What new technology and/or infrastructure is needed to enhance efficiency, collaboration, and communication across campuses and schools?

GOAL #13: Increase recognition of UCSF's contributions and status in the local community, the state, nation and the world.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

  a. What has UCSF already done well to improve its recognition and status?

  b. What strategies can UCSF implement that would increase recognition of its contributions and status:

  • Locally?

  • State-wide?

  • Nationally?

  • Internationally?

* Goal will be addressed by more than one Strategy Design Team: Please see Appendix for a complete list.

c. What additional steps are needed to enhance the stature of UCSF?

d. How will we know that UCSF's recognition has improved?

e. How should UCSF address the following recommendations, which surfaced during the Strategic Planning interviews, if at all?

- Strengthen public relations and marketing to promote UCSF's strengths and contributions to the Bay Area.

- Effectively utilize advisory groups, grateful patients and donors.

- Prepare an economic impact/community benefit analysis and statement.

- Improve communication and involvement with the Bay Area community and UCSF's neighborhoods.

GOAL #14: Provide facilities and infrastructure that accommodate planned growth, academic strategic priorities and UCSF's vision.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. Given that UCSF has increased its total available square footage by 36 percent in the last five years, is more space needed? If so for what purpose and where should it be located?

b. Describe an optimal process for allocating space. How can space-related decisions be more transparent?

c. What types of infrastructure will be needed to ensure that top priority strategies (as recommended by each of the Strategy Design Teams) are successfully implemented at UCSF? What already exists or is planned for, what needs improvement and what would be new resource requirements?

d. Assuming that a multi-campus configuration is likely to exist for several more years, if not permanently, what steps should be taken to maintain unity and ease the difficulties caused by geographic dispersion?

GOAL #15: Streamline or enhance management practices to ensure accountability and transparency throughout UCSF.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. What processes and practices at UCSF need to be streamlined or enhanced?

b. Does "streamlining" necessitate greater centralization or decentralization? If so, how will departments be convinced/compelled to relinquish control and perhaps customization and flexibility and/or accept additional responsibility and accountability? If not, what is the definition of streamline?

c. What principles and techniques should be employed to streamline or enhance processes identified in question a?

d. What is currently obscured that should be made more transparent? What techniques should be used to increase transparency?

GOAL #3: Provide a supportive work environment that fosters communication and collaboration.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal (note that ALL teams will address this Goal):

a. What strategies should be employed to protect the culture of collaboration at UCSF?

b. How best can UCSF address the challenges of communication, which is increasingly taxed as UCSF grows across multiple campuses and diversifies its missions?

c. What steps should be taken to provide a supportive work environment that fosters the core values identified for UCSF's future?

    (Note: The top ten values identified through the strategic planning work are Excellence, Integrity, Leadership, Innovation, Collaboration/Collegiality, Respect, Scholarship, Diversity, Supportive Environment, Community Service. Most of these values are being addressed elsewhere in all six team charges.)

TEAM F: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

GOAL #16: Ensure top quality institutional leadership for UCSF to excel.

Team Charges to Address the Goal:

a. How does UCSF currently select senior institutional leaders? Outline an ideal selection process for the future.

b. What strategies should UCSF implement to recruit and retain top executive leadership?

c. What mechanisms are in place to evaluate leadership performance? What process and criteria should be considered to evaluate leadership across UCSF? Should specific rewards or consequences be assigned to enhance accountability? If so, what are they?

d. How does the current organizational structure inhibit or encourage strong leadership and accountability? What changes are needed to enhance these?

e. How should UCSF go about sustainably grooming next generations of leadership?

f. How can UCSF generate and foster a culture of leadership?

GOAL #3: Provide a supportive work environment that fosters communication and collaboration.*

Team Charges to Address the Goal (note that ALL teams will address this Goal):

a. What strategies should be employed to protect the culture of collaboration at UCSF?

b. How best can UCSF address the challenges of communication, which is increasingly taxed as UCSF grows across multiple campuses and diversifies its missions?

c. What steps should be taken to provide a supportive work environment that fosters the core values identified for UCSF's future?

   (Note: The top ten values identified through the strategic planning work are Excellence, Integrity, Leadership, Innovation, Collaboration/Collegiality, Respect, Scholarship, Diversity, Supportive Environment, Community Service. Most of these values are being addressed elsewhere in all six team charges.)

APPENDIX - PRELIMINARY UCSF GOALS

GOAL #1:   **Recruit, mentor and retain faculty, staff, students, resident, fellows, and post doctoral scholars of the highest caliber.**

GOAL #2:   **Educate and employ a diverse workforce.**

GOAL #3:   **Provide a supportive work environment that fosters communication and collaboration.***

GOAL #4:   **Foster the UCSF research enterprise across multiple sites; determine priority research areas, as well as the criteria for defining priorities, for further development.**

GOAL #5:   **Build novel interdisciplinary and inter-school approaches towards education, research and health care that prepare UCSF for the future.***

GOAL #6:   **Develop innovative education and research programs across professional schools that support the vision for UCSF of promoting global health.***

GOAL #7:   **Strengthen relationships with other University of California campuses that provide collaborative opportunities with other science disciplines.**

GOAL #8:   **Work in partnership with the community to reduce health disparities.***

GOAL #9:   **Enhance cross-training for faculty, students, residents, fellows and post-doctoral scholars that provides greater exposure to basic science training for clinicians and to clinical and health sciences training for researchers.**

GOAL #10:   **Develop systematic approaches that enhance health care quality and patient safety, access and satisfaction.**

GOAL #11:   **Secure sustainable and diversified funding to carry out the vision.**

GOAL #12:   **Develop communication systems, including information technologies, that bridge missions, campuses, schools and departments, that allow all to operate efficiently, facilitate collaboration, and build community.**

GOAL #13:   **Increase recognition of UCSF's contributions and status in the local community, the state, nation and the world.**

GOAL #14:   **Provide facilities and infrastructure that accommodate planned growth, academic strategic priorities and UCSF's vision.**

GOAL #15:   **Streamline or enhance management practices to ensure accountability and transparency throughout UCSF.**

GOAL #16:   **Ensure top quality institutional leadership for UCSF to excel.**

* Goal will be addressed by more than one Strategy Design Team: Please see Appendix for a complete list.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO

ACADEMIC SENATE   www.ucsf.edu/senate

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF
THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Henry Sanchez, MD

September 19, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: Committee Response to "UCSF – Strategic Planning Phase III, Strategy Development"

Dear Chair Greenspan:

The Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the document "UCSF – Strategic Planning Phase III, Strategy Development" on September 13, 2006. The Committee suggests that the following issues be included in the document:

- Key problems with the practicalities of educating such as classroom space, resources for teaching and lack of classroom support.
- Ongoing incorporation of advancing technology to bring the campus to the level expected of a leading medical research university.
- Instructional technology needs related to communication systems. (Not discussed in Goal #12.)
- Sharing information and knowledge resources across schools and departments and using technology to remove barriers to movement of educational information.

The Committee also found that the questions described are too general and would like the directives to be more clearly articulated.

Sincerely,

Henry Sanchez, MD
Chair, Committee on Educational Policy