

School of Medicine Faculty Council
Timothy Kelly, MD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT
2015-2016

Primary Focus Points for the Year:

- 2016 UC Retirement Tier
- Bridges Curriculum
- Bylaw Revisions
- Education Funds Flow
- Faculty Council Support
- IT Security
- School of Medicine Climate Survey
- School of Medicine Faculty Development Fund
- Standing Committee Reports
 - Academic Standards/Screening and Promotions
 - Admissions
 - Committee on Curriculum and Education Policy

Issues for Next Year (2016-2017)

- Bridges Curriculum
- Campus Development Campaign
- Communication with Faculty
- Education Funds Flow Model Implementation
- Faculty Salary Equity
- School of Medicine Faculty Development Fund
- School of Medicine Governance

2015-2016 Members

Tim Kelly, Chair

Lydia Zablotska, Vice Chair

Marcelle Cedars (Past-Chair)
Thomas Chi
Susannah Cornes
Cynthia Curry
Matthew Haight
Jialing Liu
Dana Rohde
Hope Rugo (Clinical Affairs
Liaison)
M. Reza Vagefi
Lydia Zablotska

Ex-Officio Members

Bobby Baron, Associate Dean, Graduate Medical Education
Renee Binder, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs
Talmadge King, Dean
Catherine Lucey, Vice Dean, Education
Robert Hiatt, Chair, Committee on Curriculum and Educational
Policy

Number of Meetings: 7

Senate Analyst: Artemio Cardenas

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

2016 UC Retirement Tier

In December, Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources David Odatto attended to report on the status of the UC Retirement Plan. He informed the Council that in May of 2015, UC President Napolitano and Governor Brown agreed to a budget deal that would provide UC with additional state funding in turn for an undergraduate tuition freeze and several university policy reforms. One of the components of the deal was a requirement from Governor Brown and the state legislature that UC align its pension plan with the state's pension program. This included a cap on UCRP covered compensation at \$117,000. To implement the UC Retirement Plan changes, President Napolitano requested that a Task Force be formed. In the December report, AVC Odatto, informed the Council that he was the UCSF representative on the Retirement Options Task Force and that if faculty had any feedback, they should provide it to him. On January 15, 2016, the Task Force released their report. Faculty Council reviewed the recommendations and members expressed concern that, with a cap on covered compensation, a new tier would make recruitment and retention of new faculty more difficult. In March, the President released her 2016 Retirement Tier Plan and the Regents approved. The new tier went into effect on July 1, 2016.

IT Presentation

In November, Chief Information Officer Joe Bengfort, Deputy Director of Data Center Infrastructure Mark Day, and Director of Solutions Engineering Donald Francis attended the Faculty Council meeting to report on UCSF's plans to move the hosting of UCSF applications and data from San Francisco to Quincy, Washington and UC San Diego. Deputy Director Mark Day informed the Council that the UCSF IT group had come to realize that the current infrastructure of data resources at UCSF would soon be inadequate. To address the issue, the campus did an assessment on how much it would cost to upgrade the current data resources in San Francisco, and compared that number to the cost of moving our data to an off-site provider. After analysis, the IT department and university leadership decided that it would be much more cost effective to move the data off campus. The site location is designated to be in Quincy, Washington. Along with UCSF, UC Davis Health and other UC units will be moving their data to the same location. APEX information will be the first source of data that will be moved.

Faculty Council members asked what impact the data migration will have on clinical and research work. CIO Bengfort informed the group that the hope is that the migration will not have any impact on work processes. In the short term, the changes will only have an effect on faculty if they are application managers. In the long term, there will be an evaluation of performance of their applications and faculty will most likely be involved in this process. The IT department believes that the vast majority of applications will not experience any difference. However, it is anticipated that in some rare cases there will be issues with application performance and speed. In these cases, the campus will bring the housing of the applications back to campus in the data centers at the Mission Bay Hospital and Minnesota Street. Finally, CIO Bengfort informed the group that if faculty want to continue to be involved in the process, they can attend town halls that will be held over the next few months.

In March, IT Security Director Pat Phelan attended to provide the Faculty Council with a review of recent information technology security initiatives:

- Background
 - Due to several information breach incidents, the UC system is taking new steps to increase security systemwide
 - Each UC campus has assigned responsibility to cyber-security contacts
 - The President requested that each campus design a 120-day accelerated action plan. This was developed to identify quick solutions
 - Advisory Board was developed which included internal and external experts
 - Framework has been established for assessing and documenting risks
- Strengthen and Modernizing our Security Environment

- UC accelerating plans in place
- Investigating new funding options for security applications
- UC Systemwide Privacy Concerns
 - UC Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) Response
 - The UCACC will be closely consulted on all security efforts going forward
- UCSF to Contract External Vendor
 - UCSF will be contracting with a network security platform
 - This platform will provide real-time protection against many threats and most cyber attack strategies
- Immediate Efforts
 - The UCSF Information Technology department is working on the follow efforts in the near-term
 - BigFix
 - Network Patching
 - Dual-factor authentication
 - Increasing password standards
- Upcoming Initiatives
 - The Information Technology department will be working on password reset systems in preparation for increasing password security
 - Once plans are complete a new password standard will be set and implemented. To ensure the new policy will not be too much of a burden, UCSF will offer premium keychain services such as LastPass.

School of Medicine Business

This year, the Faculty Council took up the following issues related to the School of Medicine:

Bridges Curriculum Updates

Throughout the year, the SOM Faculty Council received updates on the implementation of the Bridges Curriculum. In November, Director Education in the Department of Medicine Patricia Cornett attended the Council meeting to provide a review of the Foundation 2 and Career Launch components of the new Bridges Curriculum. Dr. Cornett's presentation covered the following topics:

- Bridges Curriculum Structure
 - Phases
 - Foundations – 1 and 2 and Career Launch
 - Elements
 - 21st Century Foundational Sciences
 - 21st Century Clinical Skills
 - Inquiry, Innovation and Discovery
- The Belief
 - The purpose of medical education is to improve health of communities and reduce the burden of suffering from diseases and illness
 - Patients and providers should recognize UCSF graduates from the way they tackle problems, work in teams, embrace measurement and improvement, and champion inquiry.
- Foundation 2 – Design Principles
 - External
 - 48 Weeks
 - Intersessions
 - Incorporation of foundations into the second year.
 - Allow for deeper exploration
 - Internal
 - Longitudinal relationship with site
 - Longitudinal relationship with patients
 - Meaningful integration foundational science into clerkships
 - Integration of other curricular content as appropriate

- Meaningful integration into clinical teams for true workplace learning
 - Vision
 - The vision for Foundation 2 is a combination of clinical, small group module-focused learning of which students:
 - Integrate within the clinical team for true workspace learning
 - Develop longitudinal relationships with site and patients
 - Experience meaningful integration of foundational sciences
 - Pursue areas of interest related to career choice
 - Explore and gain competency in the UCSF 49
- Selective Clinical Experience Overview
 - Two to Four week non-core clinical rotations
 - Students will have the opportunity to experience surgical subspecialties
 - Students will be able to revisit areas of interest
 - The plan is to release pilots of the program in April of 2017
 - Bridges Foundation 2 will begin in January 2018
- The UCSF 49
 - There is an expectation that all future graduates of UCSF will have an understanding and an ability to prevent, diagnose and treat a common set of 49 clinical syndromes and diseases.
- Longitudinal Integrated Clerkships (LIC)
 - The school believes the new clerkships will work and work well
 - The details on clerkships will be worked out with the individual locations
 - There will be opportunities for the clerkships to grow
- Career Launch
 - Design Principles
 - External
 - Preparation to practice clinically in the 21st Century
 - 24 clinical weeks
 - Intersessions and Coda
 - Internal
 - Final opportunity to learn clinical medicine
 - Professional Identity formation
 - Design Components
 - Tier 1: Core Advanced EPAs
 - Tier 2: Care of Vulnerable Populations
 - Tier 3: Professional Identity Exploration
 - Ambulatory Capstone Experience
 - Intersessions and Coda
- Major Changes Summary
 - Foundations 2
 - Students
 - More clinically savvy due to CMS time in Foundation 1 entering clerkships
 - Students tuned into foundational science content/high value care when doing clinical work
 - Able to explore other specialty/subspecialties early
 - Clinical Experiences
 - Clerkships One Less a Week
 - There will be an opportunity to incorporate some foundational science material
 - Career Launch
 - Student
 - Focus on professional identification and residency preparation
 - Clinical Experiences
 - Defined in terms of principles
 - Tiers and Ambulatory Capstone Experience

In January, Bridges Curriculum Planning Committee member Gordon Strewler provided the Council with the following report on the Inquiry component of the new Bridges Curriculum:

- Goals of the Inquiry Curriculum
 - Create an inquiring habit of mind
 - Integrate diverse perspectives and expertise
 - Foster exceptional skills in critical reading and evidence-based medicine
 - Provide formal training in methods of discovery
 - Give each student the opportunity for discovery
 - Unite each student and a faculty member in the discovery process, building close relationships
- Creating a Habit of Mind
 - Curious, logical, skeptical
 - Comfortable with ambiguity
 - Integrates information and applies new problems
 - Recognizes limits of existing knowledge
- We will be focusing on Six Domains for Inquiry
 - Clinical Sciences
 - Biomedical Sciences
 - Educational Sciences
 - Systems Science
 - Social and Behavioral Sciences
 - Epidemiology and Population Science
- Overall Inquiry
 - What?
 - Develop Inquiring habit of mind
 - Develop tools for discovery
 - Create new knowledge
 - Where?
 - Core Inquiry Curriculum
 - Inquiry Immersion
 - Deep Explore
 - How?
 - Problem-based Learning and Journal Club
 - Designing Clinical Research course, Mini-courses
 - Research or Scholarship
- Core Inquiry Curriculum Components
 - Inquiry Skill Builders (ISB): Didactic or Interactive
 - Inquiry Cases (IQ Cases): PBL
 - Frontiers in Medicine (FIM): Cutting edge
 - Evidence-Based Inquiry Question (EBIQ): Journal Club
- Deep Explore
 - Opportunity for a mentored experience in original scholarship
 - Diversity of fields of inquiry
 - Advanced curriculum as appropriate
 - Required of all students.
 - Transition from Pathways (underway)
- Challenges
 - Required faculty participation is substantial
 - Must engage students by interlacing with clinical learning
 - Must emphasize diversity of opportunity and match each student to a desired project
 - Must adequately support Inquiry leadership

Bylaw Revisions

In April, Associate Dean of Susan Masters and Associate Dean of Student Maxine Papadakis attended the Council meeting to present a series of proposed changes to the Academic Senate Division and Faculty Council bylaws. Two sets of bylaw changes are proposed.

Division Regulation SFR 785: Grades – Candidates for the M.D Degree (Attachment 1)

Division Regulation 785 revisions were proposed to accomplish the following goals:

- Update the bylaws to today's practices. The last update occurred in 1992.
- Align the rules with the local School of Medicine regulation on grading. The School of Medicine Faculty Council Regulation on grading is not consistent with SFR 785.
- Promote clarity by grouping all possible grades into two categories and describe each grade in more detail. In particular, the honors policy is clarified.

Appendix IV: Bylaws, Regulations and Procedures of the School of Medicine (Attachment 2)

Appendix IV revisions were proposed to accomplish the following goals:

- Update the bylaws to today's practices.
- Clarify and streamline language.
- Align with the new Bridges Curriculum that will be implemented soon.
- Update Standing Committee membership and practices.
- Updating of regulations on admissions; classification of courses; grades and credit, student progress; and temporary or permanent separation of students from the school.

Council members reviewed the proposed changes. After discussion, Council members voted to approve of all revisions. The proposed set of bylaws will continued through the Academic Senate legislative approval process and were approved.

Education Funds Flow

In June of 2015, Vice Dean of Education Catherine Lucey informed the Faculty Council that the School would be investigating new centralized funding models to further support the educational mission. To follow up on the work to date, Vice Dean Lucey attended the January 2016 Council meeting to provide a report on the proposals that have been developed.

To provide background on the issue, Vice Dean Lucey explained that several decades ago, each department was responsible for courses that directly related to their subject scope. Then, to allow for efficiencies, departments formed agreements with each other to integrate courses that were pedagogically similar. While the system of agreements had functioned well for years, it eventually ran into problems as department leadership turned over. New department chairs have begun to ask why they are paying for courses they feel another department should have responsibility over. In addition to department issues, the new clinical funds flow model has put more pressure on the entire system as faculty and departments have focused more of their efforts on revenue generation through maximizing RVUs.

The proposal is to develop a new centralized education funds flow model that is similar to the clinical and research funds flow models current in use in the school. Vice Dean Lucey explained that undergraduate medical education will be part of Phase 1; Graduate Medical Education will be part of Phase 2; and Graduate Education will be Phase 3. Undergraduate medical education was selected to be part of the first phase because the issues with the system is most acute the system and it requires that most amount of intensive teaching. Distribute the costs of teaching across all departments, not just the departments providing the education.

The hope is to find a way to help compensate faculty who perform "high-intensity" teaching. All teaching that takes a faculty member out of the clinic for more than 10% of the year is considered to be high-intensity. Also, if the teaching load takes away from a faculty member's paycheck, it is considered high-intensity. Normal-intensity teaching is considered to be ad hoc teaching, occasional level, mentoring, or having the student in clinic while a faculty member is generating RVUs. A decision was made not to target normal-intensity teaching as it is too cumbersome to pay for every minute of teaching and it naturally the responsibility of academic faculty to provide some level of teaching and instruction. Vice Dean Lucey said that the school looked at how much it costs to provide instruction. When factoring in faculty and staff

costs, it is estimated that the school will need approximately \$4.5 million to compensate faculty for high-intensity teaching.

Along with the teaching proposal, school leadership is reviewing ideas for how to finance a new education funds flow model. To date, three financing models have been discussed. The first is to have a new wealth tax on departments. With the rebound in the stock market and years of savings, many of the Schools departments have significant resources. The concern with using this model is that department finances are complicated and difficult to properly account for taxation. The second funding model idea is to create a per capita assessment on the number of faculty in each department. Based on the current numbers, there would be an assessment of \$2100 per faculty member. The issue with this model is that it would: 1) be hard to determine as the number of faculty in a department is constantly changing 2) discourage departments from hiring new faculty 3) be burdensome for departments with high numbers of faculty, but relatively lower RVU payments. The third funding model is to use the existing Dean's Tax as the funding mechanism. If this option is selected, the Dean could decide to use the existing revenue to help pay for the educational support, or he could choose to increase the tax.

In April, Vice Dean Lucey informed the Council that after considering several different options, the School of Medicine Chairs and Directors group decided to support the new educational financing model by increasing the tax that the Dean's Office levies on each department.

Faculty Council Support

In October, Chair Kelly informed the Council that in order to ensure that all faculty constituencies are represented on the Council, it is imperative that the group has all of the necessary technology to facilitate high-quality phone and video-conferencing. Currently, the Academic Senate Office has to compete with other campus organizations and departments for the limited number of classrooms. Some of these classrooms do not have the necessary phone or videoconference hardware to conduct a meeting.

Chair Kelly believes that SOM Faculty Council and the Academic Senate should be provided with the best available resources to ensure that the Senate can effectively conduct its work. As a result, Chair Kelly and the Faculty Council would like request that the campus administration provide the Academic Senate with access and rights to a conference room on campus that has all of the adequate video conferencing and presentation equipment. This would reduce the Senate's reliance upon classroom services and make the Academic Senate's business much more efficient. Chair Kelly proposed that the SOM Faculty draft a communication requesting better support for the academic senate. Council members agreed (Attachment 3).

School of Medicine Climate Survey Presentation

In January, Director of Research for the Office of Diversity and Outreach, Elizabeth Ozer, provided the following report to the Council on the UC Climate Survey results:

- **Background:** The UC Climate Survey was initiated by the UC Office of the President and sent to all campuses. All UC community members received the survey in 2013 and the results were released in early 2014.
- **Climate Definition:** "The current attitudes, behaviors and standards of faculty, staff, administrators, and students concerning the level of respect for individual needs, abilities and potential."
- **UCSF Campus-wide Results:**
 - Strengths:
 - Most respondents believe UCSF is respectful of all groups
 - Most respondents believe UCSF values diversity
 - Most respondents believe that UCSF is supportive of taking leave and utilizing flexible work schedules
 - Most graduate students, postdocs and residents feel positive about academic experience and intellectual environment at UCSF.
 - Opportunities for Improvement
 - Female respondents felt less comfortable than their male counterparts
 - Underrepresented minorities felt less comfortable with overall climate

- Individuals with disabilities felt less comfortable with climate
- SOM school-specific results were shared with the Council. Statistics retained by the Office of Diversity and Outreach
- Action Plan: UCSF will be working to make the campus more inclusive. Leadership plans to expand diversity education and training programs and increase awareness. New initiatives include:
 - Chancellor's equity and Inclusion Priority
 - Data transparency, education and training
 - Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Certification
 - Equity Advisors Program
 - Eye Opening Conversation Series
 - SOM Differences Matter Initiative
- Additional Actions
 - UCSF must ensure equity among faculty in hiring, salary and promotion.
 - Establish equity advisor program for faculty
 - Establish ongoing assessment of faculty
 - Annual reporting of faculty leadership
 - Report on faculty exit interviews
 - Ensure transparency of salary equity analysis findings

School of Medicine Faculty Development Fund

In the 2014, the Chancellor announced that he would be awarding the Academic Senate with an annually re-occurring fund of \$500,000. The aim of the fund would be to benefit faculty life. After receiving the funds in the spring of 2015, the Senate decided to break up the Senate committees into five clusters and divide the funding equally. After further discussion amongst the Senate, a decision was made to allocate \$22,901 of the Chancellor's fund to the School of Medicine for Faculty Development activities. The total fund was doubled to \$45,802 when Interim Dean Bruce Wintroub agreed to match the funds. The call for proposals went out in April and by the deadline in June, the Council had received almost 33 applications requesting over \$120,000.

In October of 2015, the Council members agreed that the Faculty Development program should continue, but there should be some changes to the call for proposals. Members agreed to keep the same funding statement from the previous year, "The funds are intended to 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 will be given to applications that benefit other faculty and/or the school."

Members discussed and decided to add the following additional eligibility guidelines for the 2016 round of the Faculty Development Fund:

1. UCSF faculty appointment must be at 50% or greater
2. UCSF faculty appointment must be within five years or less
3. Awards are limited to \$5000
4. Applicants may only receive one full or partial grant every 3 years.
5. Applicants must provide a detailed description of how the activity will benefit their career. Proposals should not surpass 2 single-spaced pages. Supporting documentation does not count towards the page limit.
6. Applicants must prove that funding does not currently exist for the opportunity

The SOM Development Fund (Attachment 4) was announced school-wide on February 1 and the call for proposals closed on March 15. In April, Council members reviewed applications and made the final selections.

Academic Standards and Screening Committees Report

In May, Associate Dean of Assessment Karen Hauer reported on the following items:

- New Associate Dean's Office: In 2015, the School of Medicine decided to create a new Associate Dean position for Assessment. Previously, all assessment responsibilities were under the purview of the Associate Dean of Students.
- Shift in the Role of the Screening and Promotions Committees: Currently, the role of the Screening and Promotions committees is to review students' progress and provide students with needed support. With the implementation of the new Bridges curriculum, the role of the committee will change. The body will become an academic progress committee rather than a screening committee.
- Role of Academic Standards Committee: When a significant academic issue arises, the Academic Standards committee is convened to review the case and make a ruling. This group was not required to meet this academic year.

Admissions Committee Report

In May, Associate Dean of Admissions David Wofsy reported on the following items:

- Summary of 2016 Admissions Cycle: In the most recent admissions period, there were 8,200 applications for 149 seats. After the initial review, 500 applicants were selected to interview. Acceptance letters were sent out to 280 students. A total of 77% of admits are California residents and 36% are from underrepresented minority populations.
- Influence of New Curriculum: Council members asked if prospective students were made aware of the upcoming curriculum changes. Associate Dean Wofsy informed the Council that the school made a concerted effort to inform students about the new curriculum and that it did not have a significant impact on the 2016 class.
- PRIME and MSTP Admissions: Council members asked how the PRIME and MSTP applicants are considered in the admissions process. Associate Dean Wofsy informed the group that specific program applicants go through two reviews. The first is for the program and second is for the school. There is no preferential treatment for applicants who were admitted to the specialty programs.

CCEP Report

In March, Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy Chair Robert Hiatt provided the following report:

- Key Committee Actions of 2015-2016
 - Approved the removal of a threshold requirement, beyond a passing score, for Core Clerkship honors grades;
 - Approved the Oversight Policy for Evaluation & Assessment, clarifying that the central administration is responsible for overseeing evaluations & assessment;
 - Affirmed that CCEP will be a primary discussion group to review the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition proposal in the Fall
 - Approved the motion to make all 4th year two-week elective grades pass/fail only (vs. honors/pass/fail)
 - Approved the concept of a shift in the lens through which CCEP & its subordinate committees view policies, changing some requirements to guidelines when the change provides more individualization of student experience without significantly negatively impacting other students, faculty or staff.
 - Approved Religious Observance & Accommodations policy
 - Approved changes to Bylaws, Section SFR-785 & Appendix IV
- Curriculum Design and the Bridges Curriculum
 - Blended Learning Strategies now in Bridges
 - The committee reviewed students and faculty reports. Results showed high levels of satisfaction with the new modes of curriculum delivery.

- Student performance data has been unaffected by the transition of some curriculum content to digital video format.
 - Class of 2015 Graduation Questionnaire
 - Results of the survey showed low rates of support for selection of 4th year electives.
 - Career advising emerged as key area where students expressed need for more support. Dean Papadakis recruited new career advisors. The Bridges Curriculum will have coaches, who will be trained in career advising.
 - Clinical Core Operations Committee (CCOC) Overlap
 - In 2018-2019, there will be overlap of core clerkship experiences in the current curriculum and the Bridges Curriculum; running both in parallel will require significant resources;
 - We have one year to pilot and test innovative models;
 - The pilot will happen take p during the LCME self-study.
 - Fourth Year Two-week Electives – Honors
 - The Integrated Curriculum Steering Committee (ICSC) requested that CCEP approve revision of policy that makes all 2-week electives pass/fail instead of honors/pass/fail.
- Policy and Administration
 - Admissions: Update Prerequisites
 - A new prerequisite statement leaves out specifics of courses required & instead emphasizes broad preparation in given disciplines including biological, natural, & social sciences as well as humanistic disciplines.
 - Search for Associate Dean for Student Life
 - CCEP provided input for the desired characteristics of the new Associate Dean for Student Life, which were incorporated into the search process;
 - Search continues, has expanded from an internal to a national search.
 - Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition
 - For '16-'17, UC SOM Deans in Fall '15 agreed on a 3% PDST increase;
 - In response to student feedback, UCSF will apply the entire increase in PDST to student aid;
 - In the future, CCEP seeks to review the PDST proposal early in the process.
 - Policy Review
 - Following feedback from students regarding rigid school requirements, proposal was brought to committee to change certain requirements & policies into guidelines.
 - Religious Observance and Accommodations Policy
 - Student requested for accommodation of religious observance prompted School of Medicine to draft policy based on existing UC, Irvine policy. Policy has been designed to allow students to meet their religious obligations while minimizing disruption to the delivery of patient care.

Appendices

- [Appendix 1:](#) San Francisco Division Regulation 785 Revisions
- [Appendix 2:](#) Appendix IV Bylaw Revisions
- [Appendix 3:](#) Faculty Council Support Communication
- [Appendix 4:](#) SOM Faculty Development Fund RFP