

Executive Council Report

June, 2017



The May meeting of the Academic Council was fairly meaty including:

BOARS Chair, UCSF colleague, Henry Sanchez, did wonderful work on a contentious issue regarding undergraduate admissions. UCB proposed adding letters of recommendation to augment review of some applicants. This proposal contrasts with augmented review methods used by other campuses, including UCLA, which, utilizing other methods of obtaining information to resolve any gaps in the applicant's materials, substantially increased the diversity of their undergraduate admissions. Academic Council endorsed the BOARS recommendation to support augmented review methods used by most campuses, and which did not include letters of recommendation, which are seen as having limited value, and potentially biasing to more resourced applicants.

The proposed policy on export controls was discussed; many campuses requested clarification and had concerns about this policy, which is intended to align UC with Federal regulations concerning the transfer and export of information, items, technology and software when important to US national security, foreign policy and economic interests. UCSF R&J and COR noted another pending policy on Research Openness might have bearing on the export controls issue. It turns out that UCOP is not further pursuing the Research Openness item for the present time. We anticipate receiving responses to committee questions and comments prior to advancement of the policy.

The sexual harassment and sexual violence policy continues to undergo adjustments.

The Senate is currently reviewing the revised Systemwide Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security "IS-3". The revised policy sets minimum standards, and establishes nomenclature that characterizes the sensitivity (and need for privacy) of data, ranging from P1 (public access) to P4 (most sensitive). The policy is responsive to Federal requirements for data security controls.

The general 1.5% salary augmentation will be continued (augmented X prime) with another 1.5% funding available for targeted use. The Senate had recommended that 3% be applied generally.



The Chancellor's advisory group, the Budget and Investment Committee is considering UCSF

Senate recommendation regarding the 95% rule, and will make a final decision about this before the Fall Division meeting.



The extended survey on priorities for the Diller endowment funds will be complete soon, and we are working with Joan Hilton to analyze the data. We expect to submit our recommendations to the Chancellor, including an executive summary, reports from the task force and committees, and survey results over the summer.



On Thursday we will discuss the issue of senate voting rights for selected without salary faculty. Paul Garcia will make the proposal which is intended to encourage senate engagement of faculty based on long-term UCSF teaching, research or research, teaching and clinical affiliates such as some VA faculty and investigators based at the Gladstone and perhaps the Blood Systems Research Institute. The challenge may be constructing a bylaw change so that voting rights are extended to individuals who engage in the full gamut of UCSF missions, differentiating from WOS faculty whose link to UCSF is much narrower.



We also will query the group to see what ideas and comments you might have for the incoming Senate chair, David Teitel.