



Department of Radiology  
Program in Bioengineering  
University of California San Francisco

**Sarah J. Nelson, Ph.D.**  
Margaret Hart Surbeck Distinguished Professor, Radiology  
University of California  
Co-Chair, Department of Bioengineering & Therapeutic  
Sciences (BTS)  
Byers Hall, Suite 303, MC 2532, 1700 4<sup>th</sup> Street  
San Francisco, California 94158-2330

---

June 6, 2008

Deborah Adey, MD  
Professor, Department of Nephrology  
Box 0780 , M 884  
University of California, San Francisco  
San Francisco, CA. 94143 - 0780

Dear Dr. Adey,

My future co-Chair and I would like to thank you and the task force for your thoughtful review of our proposal for forming the Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences. Here are our responses to the issues that you raised.

1. In the event of a conflict between the co-Chairs, please articulate how the dispute will be resolved, particularly with regard to disagreements over the structure and function of the proposed department.

*It is our expectation that conflicts will be resolved by discussion between the two co-Chairs, in the spirit of cooperation that has been a hallmark of their interactions in the past two years while they have been refining the fundamental concepts of the department. Defining the structure and function of the department has been and will continue to be a shared responsibility between the co-chairs and the faculty. These issues are discussed openly and broad input is solicited before decisions are made in a democratic manner through a faculty vote. If there are conflicts that are not resolvable in this manner they will be brought to the deans of the two schools for resolution.*

2. In the event of a conflict between the Deans of the Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy, please specify how the dispute will be resolved.

*The attached MOU has been developed between the deans and co-chairs to describe the operation and allocation of resources in the new department. It also explains how assets and debts would be handled, if there were a need for dissolution of the department. It is hoped that there will be few, if any, conflicts between the deans or any of the other parties involved. If problems between the deans do occur, there are established procedures to resolve disputes in the University. In particular, as they ultimately serve at the behest of the Chancellor, it is assumed that he would be the arbitrator of any unresolved disagreement.*

3. Please define to whom the proposed department will be ultimately responsible.

*Departments are entities of Schools and this one will be responsible to both the School of Pharmacy and the School of Medicine.*

4. Please present information from each of the Deans about how resources to support the proposed department will be managed.

*There have been extensive discussions about the financial management of the new department and the budget projections have been fully reviewed by the financial managers in the two schools. The outcome of these discussions is presented in the MOU.*

5. Please state clear budgetary guidelines for the responsibility of the proposed department versus other programs in supporting graduate education.

*The new department will house the administrator for the Biophysics graduate program, the UCSF branch of the graduate program in Bioengineering, the BMI and the PSPG programs. Although fiscal oversight for Bioengineering, BMI and PSPG will reside in the department, multiple sources have and will continue to contribute to their financial health. These sources include NIH training grants, faculty mentors and the Graduate Division. The assumptions used in developing the department budget were conservative in that the levels of support required by the graduate programs was extrapolated from the actual costs incurred in previous years, While we are aware that the schools and the graduate division have been considering alternative approaches to distributing the burden for supporting these programs between different academic units in a manner that relates to the number of students associated with their faculty, any of the plans being considered would have the effect of reducing the contribution required from the new department. Bringing the Bioengineering staff into the same administrative unit as PSPG, BMI and Biophysics will have the positive effect of consolidating expertise, streamlining common procedures and improving communication between four groups that already have overlapping curricula and faculty participation.*

6. Please indicate how faculty and heads of the graduate groups in the proposed department have expressed support for or objections to the proposal. If this information has not been gathered, please indicate how it will be done.

*There has been extensive discussion with members of the four graduate programs involved during the last two years. These have indicated that there is broad support for the proposed department and that the faculty is pleased to have access to the expanded venue and improved infrastructure. Although we did not get specific letters from them, Graduate Program Directors Frank Szoka (PSPG) and Tejal Desai (Bioengineering) are both members of the new Department, who enthusiastically supported the formation of the department. Tom Ferrin (BMI), is not a voting member of the Department, but has been an advocate of the formation of the new department and Patsy Babbitt, who is the Associate Director of BMI, is a member of the proposed new department and has also been a strong supporter of the new department. David Agard, who is the current director of Biophysics, and the Matt Jacobsen, who will be taking over as the director next year, both have without salary positions in the new department and are supportive of the proposed structure. There will be no attempt to change the academic policies or procedures*

*associated with the four graduate programs, which will remain the responsibility of the individual program directors and their executive committees.*

7. Please outline how the proposed department will manage two compensation plans, faculty salary equity and teaching responsibilities.

*Compensation Plan: We are currently in the process of developing a single compensation plan. This will be presented to the faculty at its retreat, which is being held in September. It will be discussed and voted on by the faculty. Maria Friciello, Department manager has been working with our Chief Financial Officer to develop a robust compensation plan. We have met each week with her to discuss the proposed plan and have received feedback from faculty.*

*Faculty Salary Equity: The co-Chairs are committed to achieving faculty salary equity within the department. They have been working on guidelines to use in negotiating salaries. These guidelines will be presented to the faculty at the retreat in September and voted upon there.*

*Teaching Responsibilities: Similar procedures will be used as already exist in the Department of Biopharmaceutical Sciences. This has involved an annual review and assignment of teaching responsibilities to the faculty. Proposed teaching assignments are first sent out to the faculty for comment and then finalized in the spring before the next academic year. This system has worked well and teaching responsibilities are reasonably balanced.*

I look forward to coming to your meeting on Tuesday and would be pleased to answer any further questions that you may have.

Yours sincerely,



Sarah J. Nelson, Ph.D.  
Co-Chair of the proposed Department of Bioengineering & Therapeutic Sciences  
Margaret Hart Surbeck Distinguished Professor of Advanced Imaging  
Professor, Department of Radiology  
Director, Program in Bioengineering