

**School of Pharmacy Faculty Council**  
**Thomas Ferrin, PhD, Chair**

**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**2014-2015**

**Primary Focus Points for the Year:**

- Chancellors Fund
- Faculty Salary Plan
- Faculty Salary Equity Review Results
- Guidelines on Accepting and Managing Equity
- IT Security Presentation
- Meeting with the New Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
- Proposed Space Allocation Policies for Clinical Science Building
- Strategic Plan
- Student Dismissal Policy
- Student Genetic Testing Policy
- Student Status and Honors Committee Reforms
- UC Health Benefits
- UCSF and School of Pharmacy Space Policy

**Issues for Next Year (2015-2016)**

- Chancellors Fund
- Curriculum Reform
- IT Security
- Strategic Planning
- Student Conduct Policies
- UCSF and School of Pharmacy Space Policy

---

**2014-2015 Members**

**Thomas Ferrin, PhD, Chair**

**Patrick Finley, PharmD, Vice Chair**

Esteban Burchard, MD, MPH

Al Burlingame, PhD

Michael Fischbach, PhD

Janel Long-Boyle, PharmD, PhD

Brian Shoichet, PhD

Glenn Yokoyama, PharmD

**Ex-Officio Members**

Joseph Guglielmo, PharmD, Dean

Thomas Kearney, PharmD, Assoc. Dean Ac. Affairs

Conan MacDougall, PharmD Assoc. Dean Teaching

Don Kishi, PharmD, Assoc. Dean Student and Curricular Affairs

Ellie Vogt, PhD, RPh, Chair, Admissions

Michael Nordberg, Assoc. Dean Finance and Admin.

---

**Number of Meetings: 10**

**Senate Analyst:** Artemio Cardenas

---

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

### **Chancellors Fund**

In June of 2014, the Chancellor announced that he would be awarding the Academic Senate with a annually reoccurring \$500,000 fund. The intention of the fund would be to improve faculty life and the administration for the fund would be at the Senate's full discretion. In February, the Council discussed ideas for the use of the fund, but the group could not come to an agreement on an idea that would work for the School of Pharmacy as well as the other schools.

In late February, the UCSF Academic Senate formally adopted a plan to distribute the funds. Asked again for ideas, the Council discussed and agreed to supported the School of Dentistry's idea of creating a fund for faculty development.

In March, the Council was informed that the Chairs of the Faculty Councils, Clinical Affairs and Academic Planning and Budget had all agreed to use the \$91,604 allocation of the Chancellors Fund to develop a new Faculty and Learning Development Fund. Under this plan, the funds would be divided equally across the schools (\$22,901 per school) and would give all faculty members an opportunity to participate in a broad range of development activities. These include, but are not limited to, formal training courses to improve teaching or to develop new professional skills; leadership development programs; academic and training courses; leadership programs; and external professional development consultation. Preference would be given to applications that benefit other faculty and/or the school.

In April, the call for proposals went out to faculty. At the request of the Council, Dean Joe Guglielmo provided matching funds of \$22,901.

In June, the application period for faculty to apply for Faculty Development Funds had ended. Despite several calls for proposals, the Senate did not receive any proposals from School of Pharmacy faculty for the Faculty Development Fund. At the June Full Faculty meeting, faculty explained that they were confused between the similar Faculty Enrichment Fund and the Development Fund. To address the confusion, the Academic Planning and Budget committee and the Faculty Welfare committee decided to fund all SOP Enrichment proposals using the Development Fund. With this decision, \$9,204 of the Development fund was used to fund 6 faculty proposals. Subtracting from the \$22, 901 allocated to the school, a total of \$13,697 was left over after the year. When including the Dean's matching funds, \$36,598 is still available for faculty development.

### **Faculty Salary Plan**

Last year, a systemwide total remuneration study reveled that Ladder Rank faculty salaries lagged competitor universities by 12%. To address this lag, President Napolitano announced plans for a 3% faculty increase over the next few years, for all faculty members. A task force was formed to determine how this could be done at the campus level. At the May Coordinating Committee meeting, it was announced that the proposal was dwindled down to a one-year increase, with a multi-year plan only aspirational. The final decision is to break apart the 3% increase into two portions. 1.5% will go to increasing the salary scales and the other 1.5% will go for to address salary inequities. Since this is an unfunded mandate, it will be up to the campus administration to determine what to do and how to pay for the increases.

### **Faculty Salary Equity Review Results**

In January, the Academic Affairs Office released the 2015 Faculty Salary Equity Review Report. Based on recent data, it showed that female faculty salaries lagged their male counterparts by 3%. The report can be found on the Academic Affairs website - <http://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu/academic->

[personnel/other/fser/fser.php](#). Faculty Council members were informed that the next step is to have a school-wide review. If there are any inequities, the school will need to develop a plan.

### **Guidelines on Accepting and Managing Equity In Return for Access to University Facilities and/or Services**

In April, the Council was informed that the President's Guidelines on Accepting and Managing Equity in Return for Access to University Facilities and/or Services was up for systemwide Academic Senate review ([Appendix 1](#)). Council members reviewed and offered support for the guidelines. Members cited the success of the QB3 initiative and suggested that expanding the incubator model across the UC system might be a good thing. Chair Ferrin also informed the Council that UCSF Professor Regis Kelly was appointed to serve as an advisor to the President. Council agreed that Dr. Kelly's appointment is great news and that they believe he will be a great representative for the school and the Academic Senate.

### **IT Security Presentation**

In November, Director of IT Security Patrick Phelan provided a report on the status of IT security and what the campus leadership plans to do to address gaps in security ([Appendix 2](#)). Director Phelan reported on the following issues:

- **Background and Context:** UCSF recently commissioned an assessment of UCSF-wide information security risk. The findings from the report indicated that UCSF's risk level is high and that there are risks throughout the organization. Adding to the risk level, UCSF is a popular target for hackers and others interested in obtaining information from the University. In a recent evaluation of access points to UCSF, the university found that in a five-day period, there were several hundred thousand attempts to access open ports. Out of the access attempts, it was deemed that over 75 percent were malicious. It was also found that 90 percent of the connection attempts were coming from China. To address the situation, a Data Security Compliance Program is being developed.
- **Federal HIPPA Breach Data:** When it comes to data leaks, UCSF is ranked second nationally in reported data breaches. With federal enforcement activities increasing over the past decade, there is a good chance UCSF could be hit with a fine.
- **Overall Campus Compliance:** While most of the campus is compliant, there is a lot of work to be done.
- **What is Driving the Risk Profile:** Some of the main issues that are driving such a high risk profile include: highly variable work practices across control points; no IT security compliance oversight to drive progress across the control points; lack of security-related procedures and practices; lack of technical controls; and, an IT funding system that requires that individual departments make decisions about investing in security controls and the widespread use of personally owned devices for UCSF work.
- **Data Security Compliance Program (DSCP):** The DSCP is an IT risk management program to secure UCSF's sensitive data. The goal of the program is foster collaboration between UCSF IT and the school control points and departments. To aid in the program administration, each control point has designated a champion.
- **Changes to Expect:** Director Phelan informed the group that changes should be expected. All organizations should be expected to adhere to standards of operation to improve security. These include more regulations on granting access to data, physical security of equipment, and consistent patching of management systems. There should also be technical controls such as enforcement of encryption on all computers. Director Phelan noted that one of the hot topics in regard to changes is the recommendation that UCSF requires periodic password changes.
- **Actions Taken to Date:** Some of the changes that have already taken place in the new IT security policy are mandating encryption; mandatory annual online training and security; process for firewall security tightening; and the Data Security Compliance Program.
- **Next Steps:** The next steps to increase security include a plan to resource the encryption rollout of the campus; identify and training control points DSCP champions; present at chairs

committees, present quarterly updates to the IT Governance committee; and visit constituent groups.

### **Meeting with new Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP)**

In May, new EVCP Dan Lowenstein attended the Faculty Council meeting to introduce himself to the School of Pharmacy faculty and listen to faculty comments, ideas and concerns. The meeting was held as part of his campus-wide listening tour. EVCP Lowenstein started the conversation by reviewing his career as a School of Medicine faculty member and he explained why he was interested in the EVCP position. He then informed the Council that from his listening tour, he has learned that financial stress is the greatest issue for all those who are part of UCSF - students, faculty, staff, post-docs and residents. To address concerns, EVCP Lowenstein has been working with university leadership to come up with potential solutions to address tuition, financial aid and transportation.

In addition, to address campus needs, EVCP Lowenstein noted that he would personally like to see the university develop a strategic plan for education. He wants the university leadership to start thinking about what the campus will look like to student in 10 to 20 years. Will all of the student resources be here at Parnassus or Mission Bay? EVCP Lowenstein believes that we have been making decisions over the past several years without thinking about context of education. We need to make a strategic decision sooner rather than later. One of the areas we are lagging is with a learning center. Many of UCSF's competitor institutions have a learning center on campus. We need to find a way to establish one at UCSF. This could be part of the educational strategic process.

Finally, EVCP Lowenstein noted that he has come to realize the stresses that reductions in NIH funding have put on UCSF faculty. To help relieve this problem, EVCP Lowenstein and Chancellor Hawgood have charged a committee to find alternative sources of funding. The development office is also working hard on this issue. With all of the great work going on at UCSF, the hope is that we can spur interest from private donors.

### **Proposed Space Allocation Policies for the Clinical Sciences and UC Hall Buildings**

Two years ago, a campus committee was formed to determine how the Clinical Sciences Building (CSB) workspace would be designed after the planned retrofit and remodel. Last year, based on feedback received from the use of Mission Hall, the group recommended that the CSB include a hybrid space including both private office space and open activity-based workspace. The group was then charged with the responsibility of developing policy recommendations for how the limited number of offices would be allocated. In February, the Faculty Council was informed that the group recommended that offices should be given to faculty and staff who have the greatest number of private personal and phone meetings.

### **Student Genetic Testing Policy**

In December, Professor Dan Dohan, Chair of the Workgroup on Precision Medicine Regulation and Education Policy, attended the Council meeting to discuss UCSF's efforts to develop guidelines for genetic testing of students. He informed the Council that the effort to develop campus policies began two years ago after UCSF announced had a new precision medicine initiative. To address concerns with a lack of guidelines, a working group was formed to identify, analyze and provide solutions to the diverse regulatory and policy issues that could be raised with the advancement of precision medicine. The membership of this working group included faculty and administrators at UCSF and at UC Hastings. To start the process of developing campuswide, evidence-based policies, the working group engaged the following stakeholder groups:

- BioPharm SC 115 Genetics and Pharmacogenetics Instructors and TAs
- Associated Students of UC and the Graduate Student Association student representatives
- Administrators: Deans, Vice Chancellors, Student Affairs Staff
- Academic Senate

Based on the comments from stakeholders, the working group developed a draft policy for genetic testing of students for educational purposes. Council members asked how the workgroup decided how defined a student. Dr. Dohan responded that a student is defined as someone who is enrolled in a graded course with a syllabus listing expectations. However, there are concerns that there might be other arrangements for graduate students who may not meet this definition. Council members requested to see more information on the policy before taking any additional action.

In February, School of Pharmacy faculty comments on the proposal were submitted to Dan Dohan and the student policy committee for consideration.

In April, responses to faculty comments were provided back to the Council ([Appendix 3](#)). Council members reviewed and determined that if the faculty who were involved with the policy were satisfied with the Graduate Division's responses, than the Council would endorse. Hearing no other concerns, the Council voted to support the policy.

### **UC Health Benefits Discussion**

In February, Council members noted concerns with the current and future state of faculty health benefits systemwide. With recent changes to medical plan options, faculty have become concerned that benefits may have been cut, or options may decline in the near future. Members noted recent communications from UC Santa Cruz and UC Santa Barbara faculty outlining the problems that the UC Care transition has caused. To address faculty concerns, UCSF Health Care Facilitator Sue Forstat was invited to a Council meeting to provide more details. In March, Sue attended and informed the Council members that no benefits have been cut for UCSF faculty. For those on campuses without Medical Centers, there have been changes and challenges, but UCOP is working with local providers to find ways to ensure their coverage. Council members asked who makes the decisions on health benefits. Sue informed the group that all decisions are made at the systemwide level. Sue provided the Council members with details on her office and offered to answer any questions faculty have regarding health benefits.

### **UCSF and School of Pharmacy Space Policies**

In February, the Dean was asked to comment on UCSF space policies, process and governance. In particular, he was asked to comment on the plan to assign an operational cost to research space. To provide background, he informed the group that a few years ago, a committee was formed to address space concerns on campus. After several meetings, the committee decided to adopt the School of Medicine's system of assigning an operational cost to wet and dry lab space. The goal was to provide a tool for the evaluation of space and to determine whether a department was reserving space that was unused. When the campus adopted the new policy, they set the cost benchmark at \$90 per sqft. This value has now been moved up to \$120 per sqft. The Dean added that while the campus has adopted the SOM's space evaluation mechanism, the new policy leaves it to the schools to develop their own process and procedures. In an effort to respect shared governance, he proposed that a committee be formed which includes members of his office and the Faculty Council and that a school policy be developed.

In April, the Council was informed that a space committee had been formed and members have been appointed. This group has been charged with interpreting the campus-wide space policy and developing recommendations for how the school can implement the requirements. The department representatives on the committee collected concerns from faculty and all feedback will be considered. The Dean noted that Pharmacy is the first school discussing the details of implementing the new space policy, and he feels being that being a leader will pay big dividends in the future.

### **Strategic Plan**

In January, Dean Guglielmo updated the faculty on the status of the Strategic Planning process. Since the start of the planning process in January of 2014, all constituencies have been contacted and consulted to collect feedback. Based on the results, a draft was developed and submitted back to faculty, students, and staff for review. Faculty comments on the draft included:

- Too many themes: Some respondents felt that the plan had too many themes and that the school was trying to be too inclusive. Others felt there were not enough themes included.
  - Genomics: Some felt there was an inadequate focus on drug use in areas like genomics
  - Education: Respondents felt there was not enough emphasis on inquiry and that there were too many education goals
  - Students: Student feedback was divided. Some students supported changes while others felt that the status quo was fine
  - Patient Care: Respondents felt that there is an over emphasis on the use of medication and not on the patient
  - Staff: The plan lacks an emphasis on staff and faculty development
- The next step is to take these comments and make changes. The goal is to finalize the plan by the end of the month.

In May, the Dean's Office sent out the final draft of the Strategic Plan for approval. After review, a majority of faculty approved.

### **Student Dismissal Policy**

In October, Associate Dean Don Kishi provided a report on the school's effort to align the current student dismissal and grievances policies with the recently revised Academic Senate Student Grievance procedure, Appendix VII (<http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-bylaws/stugr.html>). Associate Dean Kishi informed the Council that before any changes can be made to existing policies; a comprehensive review of multiple policies ranging from the Student Handbook to the Faculty Council Regulations needs to be done. Associate Dean Kishi will provide an update at the next Council meeting.

A question was asked about the student dismissal and grievance policies for the Graduate Division. Council members were informed that Dean Liz Watkins is currently in the process of developing a policy.

In December, Associate Dean Don Kishi informed the Council that continues to work on the drafting of new student dismissal policy. This effort is being made in order to align the school's student policies with the new campuswide student grievance procedure. Associate Dean Kishi informed the Council that he has gone through all the related policies and is determining how to move forward. He also added that this process has encouraged faculty to consider whether the role of the student status committee should be expanded. Over the course of the year, the school continued to work on the policies.

### **Student Status and Honors Committee Reforms**

In April, Dean Guglielmo and Associate Dean Don Kishi informed the Council that they had reviewed the structure of the Student Status and Honors committee and they believe changes must be made to improve the effectiveness of the group. Currently, members feel that the committee is not effective and is overall under-utilized. The Dean and Associate Dean believe that, if reformed, the Student Status and Honors committee can provide needed advising, mentoring and monitoring that will improve student success in the program. To start the process of reforming the committee, Associate Dean Kishi has developed a new charge and the School of Medicine has been consulted. Council members supported the idea of reforming the standing committee and asked whether bylaw revisions are necessary. Once a committee charge is agreed upon, the Council will be informed whether changes are necessary.

## **Standing Committee Reports**

The standing committees reported on the following items:

### **Admissions Committee**

In May, Chair of the Admissions Committee Ellie Vogt provided the following report:

- **General:**
  - For a class size of 122:
  - 122 Students are identified and expected to matriculate (Original offers = 140)
- **Waitlist/Alternates:**
  - 10 Number of students offered admission from waitlist (included in 122 above)
  - 26 Current number of students remaining on waitlist
  - **About the Entering Class as of 5-6-15:** (subject to change)
    - Gender: 65% - Female, 35% - Male
    - Underrepresented students:
      - 21% Underrepresented (Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latino, Filipino, and American-Indian)(Last year's entering class also included 21% under-represented students)
  - Countries of birth represented by the entering class include:
    - Afghanistan
    - Armenia
    - Brazil
    - Canada
    - China
    - Côte d'Ivoire
    - India
    - Indonesia
    - Iran
    - So. Korea
    - Mexico
    - Nigeria
    - Philippines
    - Russia
    - Taiwan
    - United States
    - Vietnam
  - **Ongoing/Talking Points:**
    - Prerequisite Requirements: Admissions staff are evaluating all coursework of entering students to ensure prerequisite requirements are met; collecting transcripts, AP scores, required documents, etc.; monitoring in-progress coursework to ensure completion by September 1.
    - PCAT: (Pharmacy College Admission Test) Admissions revisited the idea of accepting the PCAT (along with several other schools in CA) to see whether this exam can provide us any valuable data/insight in our applicant selection process. The soonest the school could incorporate this would be for those who apply for entry in Fall 2018.
    - PharmD Post-Baccalaureate Program: Chair Vogt informed the Council that the post-baccalaureate program continues to be an important program that provides a pipeline for underserved students to gain entry into a professional program.
      - Cohort #4: All four students applied and were admitted to UCSF's PharmD program. Will enter this fall!
      - Cohort #5: (4 students total) Will finish the post-bac program this month and will apply for entry in Fall 2016.

- Cohort #6: We are currently interviewing prospective students for entry in the program.

#### Educational Policy Committee

Over the course of the year, Education Policy Committee Chair Conan MacDougall reported on the following items:

In October, the Faculty Council was informed that the committee has started the process of planning for the development of the new curriculum. An email was sent to the faculty from the Dean outlining the potential changes to the curriculum.

In January, it was reported that group, named DRIVE, has been formed and is working with the other schools to develop a curriculum that would not only prepare students for practicing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, but would also integrate with the overall UCSF curriculum. Using the School of Medicine's Bridges Curriculum has a reference point; the group has worked to identify key areas for collaboration and innovation. To go into greater detail, several groups have been formed to work on parts of the new curriculum. These include:

- Core science and practice of therapeutics
- Frontiers in Science and Practice Therapeutics
- Experiential Science and Practice
- Partners

In regards to timeline, the curriculum group hopes to develop a new curriculum and implement it by 2017. When approval votes are required, faculty will be notified. To ensure good communication with stakeholders the following tools will be used:

- Project website
- Monthly email
- News articles
- Social Media

In April, EPC Chair Conan MacDougall reported on the outcomes of the curriculum retreat that was held in March. He informed the Council that all stakeholders, from students to faculty, attended and participated in the event. While a lot of issues were discussed, the main focus was on the structure of the curriculum. Given all of the feedback received at the retreat, EPC started to move forward with the development of a curriculum blue print. Chair MacDougall believes that if all goes as planned, the new curriculum could be rolled out in the Fall of 2016.

#### Student Status and Honors

Associate Dean Kishi provided the Council will updates throughout the year on the status of students.

### Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions that the Council will continue into 2015-2016:

- Chancellors Fund
- Curriculum Reform
- IT Security
- Strategic Planning
- Student Conduct Policies
- UCSF and School of Pharmacy Space Policy

### Appendix

- [Appendix 1:](#) Guidelines for Accepting Equity
- [Appendix 2:](#) IT Presentation
- [Appendix 3:](#) Graduate Division Response for Faculty Concerns with Student Genetic Testing Policy
- [Appendix 4:](#) 2015 Admissions Report



Senate Staff:  
Artemio Cardenas, Senate Analyst  
[Artemio.Cardenas@ucsf.edu](mailto:Artemio.Cardenas@ucsf.edu), 415-476-4245