

School of Nursing Faculty Council
Abbey Alkon, RN, PhD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT
2016-2017

Primary Focus Points for the Year:

- 2017 Faculty Development Fund
- Bylaw Revisions
- Core Curriculum Mapping Project
- Doctorate in Nursing Practice (DNP) Degree
- Education Committee
- Faculty Teaching Award Process
- Fiscal Health Workgroup
- Great People Great Places
- Helen Diller Foundation Gift
- Open Access 2020
- Personalized Mentoring Advancement and Promotion Educational Module (PMAP)
- Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Policy Review and Communication
- Salary Equity Report
- Shared Education Data Plan
- SON Salary Equity Report
- SON Climate Survey
- Strategic Plan
- UC Health Strategic Plan
- Website Refresh

Issues for Next Year (2017-2018)

- Climate Survey
- Dean Welcome
- Faculty Teaching Award Process
- Implementation of the DNP
- Strategic Planning Process

2016-2017 Members

Abbey Alkon, 2017 Chair

Audrey Lyndon, 2016 Chair

Melinda Cuthbert, Vice Chair
Catherine Bliss
Annette Carley
Carol Dawson-Rose
Jason Flatt (2017)
Xiao Hu
Jenny Liu (2016)
Michele Pelter

Ex-Officio Member

Sandra Weiss (Interim Dean)

Permanent Guests/Representatives

Lynda Jacobsen (Associate Dean of Administration
Finance)
Matthew Sachs (Student Representative)

Number of Meetings: 13 (10 Faculty Council meetings and 3 Full Faculty meetings)

Senate Analyst: Artemio Cardenas

Systemwide Business

The School of Nursing Faculty Council took up the following Systemwide issues this year:

Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Policy Review and Communication

In October, the Office of the President initiated a policy review of the revised policy that would incorporate Regents Policy 3104: Principles Underlying the Determination of Fees for Students of Professional Degree Program - <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/3104.html> into a revision of Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition - <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/3103.html>. The proposed revision was prepared by the PDST workgroup, which the university formed in early summer 2016 to consider issues related to PDST, including the policy governing PDST and the process through which campuses establish and adjust PDST charges - <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/underreview/documents/pdst-policy-2016.pdf>.

In November, Chair Lyndon informed the Council that in response to the systemwide policy review, UCSF Division Chair Ruth Greenblatt has asked that all Faculty Councils review the use of the PDST funds in their respective school and draft a letter detailing how PDST is collected and what activities the revenue is used to fund. In early December, Chair Lyndon and Council member Michele Pelter drafted a communication on behalf of the Council. The PDST response communication was based on a financial summary report provided by the Dean's Office and comments Council members made at the November meeting. After reviewing, members suggested that more detail be added on specific program requirements that are needed for accreditation. For example, students in the PDST programs are required to be supervised anywhere from 500-1100 hours. Along with a few other minor edits, the Council approved of the communication. The final communication ([Appendix 1](#)) was sent on to the Division Chair Ruth Greenblatt for consideration in the campus-wide response.

Divisional Business

The School of Nursing Faculty Council took up the following Divisional issues this year:

Great People and Great Places

In May, Executive Director Leanne Jensen provided a report on UCSF's Great People, Great Places (GPGP) Initiative to the Full Faculty.

- GPGP Goals
 - We want to be one of the best employers to work for in the U.S
 - We want people to have the experience
 - We are stronger together. Seen as UCSF.
- Campus-wide Survey - Collective Themes
 - Individuals need to feel that the organization values their contribution to the mission and cares about them and wants them to thrive
 - There are burdens associated with living in the Bay Area
 - There are current efforts to improve in various areas of UCSF
- Committee
 - Developed a 3-5 year plan to accomplish GPGP goals
- Culture
 - Values Adoption
 - The campus adopted the values that had been used in the Medical Center for years.
 - PRIDE Values
 - Professionalism
 - Respect
 - Integrity
 - Diversity
 - Excellence

- Internal Communication
 - Efforts were made to communicate about the goals of the GPGP program
 - Changes to Business Systems
- Programs and Resources
 - Recognition
 - Community Engagement
 - Survey Data
 - Family Life Support
 - New Employee Orientation
- Foundation – the focus for Year 1
 - Values
 - Adoption and Promotion of the PRIDE values
- Year One Goal
 - Phase 1
 - Senior Leaders reinforce the share PRIDE values through various communications
 - Phase 2
 - PRIDE appears on website, job descriptions, interview questions, merit letters and recognizable criteria, as well as new hire materials.
 - Phase 3
 - PRIDE Materials made available to campus community. Tool kit available online for staff and faculty to access.

After the presentation, faculty members praised Director Jensen for her work and offered support the initiative.

Hellen Diller Foundation Gift

In January, UCSF received a generous \$500 million gift from the Helen Diller Foundation. The majority of the new commitment, \$400 million, will establish endowments to support UCSF faculty and students. The remaining \$100 million will create an Innovation Fund, which can be used at the discretion of the Chancellor. In February, the Council learned that a portion of the fund would go to the support students and faculty in the School of Nursing. In March, Member Carol Dawson-Rose informed the Council that the Academic Senate had formed a task force to develop recommended guidelines for how to distribute faculty funding. In April, the task force released their report ([Appendix 2](#)). Council members reviewed and commented that the fund guidelines should divide funding equally across the schools. If not equally, then there should be a minimum amount of funding for the schools of dentistry, nursing and pharmacy. Without a guide, it might be very challenging to ensure that all schools receive funding.

Open Access 2020 Presentation

In February, Chair of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Rich Schneider presented on the Open Access 2020 Initiative (OA2020). OA2020 aims to accelerate the transition to open access by transforming the existing corpus of scientific journals from their current subscription system to open access. In making this presentation, COLASC Chair Schneider is asking the Faculty Council to support UCSF becoming a signatory to the Expression of Interest.

Chair Schneider reviewed the well-known model of scholarly journal publishing, in which academics typically provide labor (e.g., research, drafting articles, and peer review) that scientific journals in turn charge readers, academic institutions, and researchers to access. Internationally, \$8-10B is spent annually for journal subscriptions, with 1.5-2M papers being published worldwide. Subscriptions costs continue to rise (60% over the past decade vs. CPI of 16%). 50% of all papers are from the top five publishers (Reed-Elsevier, Wiley-Blackwell, Springer, Taylor & Francis, etc.) who extract over \$2B in profits annually with margins of 30-40%. He also reminded Council members that UCSF was a leading institutions in open access, as it was the first UC campus to adopt an open access policy in May 2012. This was followed by the systemwide Senate's Open Access Policy in July 2013, which became a UC Presidential Policy in October 2015. Despite the nearly 800 OA mandates and policies worldwide, OA publishing has grown only about 1% per year.

The goal of OA 2020 is to convert journals from subscription to open access by re-directing the existing funds spent on journal subscriptions into open access funds, in order to finance the essential services that publishers provide for scholarly communication (e.g., the administration of peer review, editing, and open access article dissemination). OA2020 would enable an orderly transformation of the current publishing system, since the disruptions would affect only the underlying cash flows, rather than the publishing process itself, or the roles of journals and publishers. COLASC Chair Schneider remarked that the money is already in the system to facilitate this transition (\$8-\$10B spent in journal subscriptions). This translates to approximately \$4,000 - \$5,200 paid per research article. The benefits of implementing this transition would include: 1) Existing journals and their systems (e.g., editorial boards, peer reviews, prestige, impact, etc.) can remain intact; 2) authors, funders, and institutions would have a direct market influence on keeping prices (e.g., APCs) down; and 3) publishers would have to compete for authors' "business" by providing services and products. Subscription money can then be reallocated to support new academic publishing models and platforms. COLASC Chair Schneider commented that such a model would only impact 1-2% of research budgets worldwide (likely < 1% for UCSF), but new workflows for payment would be needed (e.g., combinations of library, university, and grant funding). That said, there may be higher costs for research-intensive institutions with high output (like UCSF), but potentially lower overall payments to publishers worldwide. A relative loss in the current negotiation leverage and control by UC libraries with some journals may also ensue. However, "contracts" would be between authors and publishers, instead of libraries and publishers.

Members expressed appreciation for COLASC Chair Schneider's presentation. All members then voted to approve the submission of a letter of support ([Appendix 3](#)).

Personalized Mentoring Advancement and Promotion Educational Module (PMAP) Presentation

In January, former Committee on Academic Personnel member Art Miller and Associate Director of the Academic Senate Office Alison Cleaver attended the Faculty Council meeting to provide a report on the new PMAP educational module. Designed by former Committee on Academic Personnel members for current faculty, the module provides a map through the promotion and advancement process. The system includes details on:

- Requirements for Promotion and Advancement
- Accelerations and decelerations
- Series Changes
- Creative Activities
- Professional Competence
- Advancement/Promotion Packet
- Frequently Asked Questions

The following sample sites were reviewed:

Assistant Professor

<https://senateserviceportal.ucsf.edu/pmap/Adjunct-Assistant-1-6>

Associate Professor

<https://senateserviceportal.ucsf.edu/pmap/Adjunct-Associate-1-5>

Full Professor

<https://senateserviceportal.ucsf.edu/pmap/InResidence-FullProfessor-1-9>

After the presentation, Council members praised the new PMAP system and noted that it will be very helpful for faculty. Chair Alkon asked members to go back to their departments and provide the links to the example pages. The same presentation was provided to the Full Faculty.

UC Health Strategic Plan

In September, Council members were asked to review and comment on the draft UC Health Strategic Plan and supporting documents. Before and during the Council meeting, members provided the following comments:

- **Emphasize Education and Research:** Council members believe that the Strategic Plan must include additional details on the relationship between UC Health and the UC campuses in regard to the education and research missions of the university. For example, on page 2 of the plan, a statement reads, “First, this is a strategic plan for only the clinical enterprise. It is not a strategic plan that provides direction for the research and educational programs associated with UC Health. This is not to ignore the fact that the clinical, educational and research programs are inextricably linked.” Members believe that these sentences conflict each other and should be revised. Rather than note a division between the UC Health Strategic Plan and the mission of the university, leadership should emphasize the connection and mutual benefit that education and research provide to clinical care, and visa-versa. The need for such integration is demonstrated throughout the remainder of the document as a number of values, goals, and tactics explicitly discuss the inherent relationships between excellence in clinical, educational, and research programs.
- **Ensuring the Quality of Care:** Council members agree that the UC Health Strategic plan must have an additional section which states that UC Health will provide a full range of high quality and comprehensive health care services for all patients. With the rapid expansion of the UC Health system, new affiliations are being made with providers that may or may not deliver the same quality of care to that patients would receive at a UC medical center. While we recognize the need to optimize service locations based on quality, we also seek to ensure the level of quality meets UC expectations and that populations are not disenfranchised from services (e.g. reproductive health services or high level specialty care) by geographic location or health system affiliation. To help guide all future UC Health leaders in the consideration of new provider relationships, it is important that the strategic plan include a statement that the services provided at UC must also be available to all patients elsewhere. These services may include end of life care and the full range of reproductive health services. This new section, possibly titled “Quality of Care” could be included under the Strategic Goals, or the Clinical Excellence section.
- **Emphasize Using All Types of Clinical Providers to Their Full Scope of Practice:** One opportunity to improve innovation, value, and clinical excellence within UC Health that is not explicitly addressed in the strategic plan is utilization of all types of clinical providers to their full scope of practice. Empirical data support the idea that reduction of barriers to full scope of practice for non-physician clinical providers would enhance quality, value, innovation, and teamwork within UC Health.

After all comments were collected. A communication was drafted ([Appendix 4](#)) and sent to Division Chair Ruth Greenblatt for consideration.

School Business

The School of Nursing Faculty Council took up the following school issues this year:

2017 Faculty Development Fund

In the spring of 2016, council members voted to grant the 2017 Faculty Learning and Development oversight and administration to Associate Dean Shari Dworkin. In November, Associate Dean Dworkin recommended the following fund criteria. Council members approved.

Description:

The Faculty Learning and Development Fund is intended to provide all School of Nursing faculty members with the 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; conferences; and external professional development consultation.

Guidelines:

- 1 Applications that clearly bolster the professional development of faculty members will be prioritized.
- 2 There is no limit to proposal amount. Group proposals are encouraged. Preference will be given to proposals that benefit as many faculty members as possible.
- 3 Faculty who received a full or partial Faculty Development Fund award last year are welcome to apply. However, preference will be given to faculty members who have not already received funding from this resource.
- 4 Applicants must provide a detailed description of how the activity will benefit their career. Proposals should not surpass 1 single-spaced page. Supporting documentation does not count towards the page limit.
- 5 Applicants must prove that funding does not currently exist for the opportunity
- 6 All awardees of the funds will be required to provide a summary of their experience and notes on the usefulness of the conference, course, or activity they participated in using the funds.

Application Process:

Using the Senate Service Portal, applicants should submit a PDF with their request including what the request is for, the amount requested, a brief paragraph explanation about how funding of this request will enhance that faculty member's knowledge and skills, and supporting documentation. The SON Associate Dean of Academic Affairs Shari Dworkin will evaluate all proposals.

In May, Analyst Cardenas provided the following report on the final selections:

- Funding Available:
 - \$50,000 (\$25,000 awarded by the Academic Senate and \$25,000 awarded by the SON Dean's Office)
- Funding Awarded:
 - \$46,550 (Council members voted to send out a second call for proposals for the remaining funding. For the second round, the Council would select which proposals will be awarded.
- Number of Applications Received
 - A total of 9 applications were received
- Number of Applications Awarded
 - A total of 7 applications were awarded
- Proposals Awarded and Topics
 - Kit Chesla – Invitation to external leadership expert, Gene Crumley, to come to UCSF campus for a full day to work with junior faculty in the K-scholar program.
 - Amanda Peacock – Attendance of Interprofessional Education Conference, titled Collaborating Across Borders (CAB) VI.
 - Judy Martin-Holland – All day faculty development day focused on teaching-learning strategies and curriculum development topics.
 - Jyu-Lin Chen – One-day workshop on “Supporting excellence in research and clinical programs: Exploring private philanthropy and foundations grants”
 - Kara Birch – Attendance of a trauma therapy externship program.
 - Soo-Jeong Lee – Participation in personal coaching sessions.

In June, Faculty Council members reviewed the second round of applications. A second round was held to distribute a windfall of \$3450.

- Number of Applications Received
 - A total of 6 applications were received
- Number of Applications Awarded
 - A total of 3 applications were awarded
- Proposals Awarded and Topics
 - Sara Ackerman – Support to attend the annual Graphic Medicine Conference. Graphic medicine is the use of graphic stories for patient care and education.

- Rosalind De Lisser – Support for the effort to become a Relationship-Centered Communication Facilitator and Fellow of the American Academy of Communication in Healthcare (AACH).
- Pi-Ju Liu – Attendance of the annual National Adult Protective Services Association Conference for professional and leadership development.

Bylaw Revisions

In 2017, the Council approved the following bylaw revisions

- Global Health Standing Committee Bylaws ([Appendix 5](#))
 - In March, the Global Health Standing Committee presented a set of proposed bylaw revisions. Council approved of revisions, with changes. In particular, members want to remove references to Center for Global Health since, at this time, long-term funding for the center has not been secured. Once requested revisions were made, the second version was sent to the Global Health Nursing committee for further review. Committee members responded that they were not comfortable with the removal of the Center for Global Health references in the bylaws and would like the Council to re-consider adding the center back into the draft. Council members considered the feedback and after discussion, members voted to approve of the bylaws without the inclusion of the Center. The reasoning for the decision was based on precedent that centers are not named elsewhere in the bylaws and that the dean can still appoint a center representative to the committee each year.
- Standing Committee Bylaws ([Appendix 6](#))
 - In March, the Council requested that changes be made to the standing committee bylaws that would update the guidelines to current practices. Two of the major changes included revisions to the course approval process and removal of the reference to Graduate Council. Chair Alkon informed the Council that she met with the Graduate Council to discuss the changes. After review members of the Graduate Council requested and their reference remain in the bylaws. In addition, the Graduate Council would like the language to be revised to state that the Graduate Council will perform periodic reviews of the School of Nursing programs. Nursing Council members discussed and voted to approve the bylaw revisions with no changes to the current Graduate Council reference.

In May, all bylaw revisions approved by the Faculty Council were approved by the Full Faculty. Bylaws will go in to effect on September 1, 2017.

Core Curriculum Mapping Pilot

In April, Master's Program Council Chair Kim Dau provided the following report on the Curriculum Mapping Pilot ([Appendix 7](#)):

- What is curriculum mapping?
 - A process indexing or diagraming a curriculum to understand the overall content and then identify and address academic gaps, redundancies, and misalignments for purposes of improving the overall coherence of a course of study.
- Pilot Overview
 - Why it is important?
 - Allows faculty to focus on balance between the content across curricula.
 - No online curriculum mapping tool is currently available in SON.
 - Formalized and systematized review of curriculum to support student success is manual, cumbersome and therefore, done infrequently.
 - Background
 - Upcoming accreditations (BRN, CCNE, ACME)
 - Due for review of our MS core courses (MPC)
 - Fiscal Health committee, curriculum streamlining
 - Objectives
 - Learn the benefits, costs and level of efforts needed to implement online curriculum mapping for a specialty (pilot group).

- Make documented assessment and recommendation of system solutions.
- Scope
 - Use existing online system options (Ilios, E-Value) for one specialty to perform comparisons.
 - Document the assessment process, tasks and system recommendation.
- Expected Outputs
 - Understanding Resource Time & Efforts Needed (Faculty & Staff), both upfront and maintenance
 - Sample Reports & Value Received
 - Documented Technology Options & Comparisons

Council members thanked MPC member Dau for her presentation and they offered support for a curriculum mapping initiative. Council members also supported a request to present at the Full Faculty meeting.

Doctorate in Nursing Practice (DNP) Degree

In December, council member Annette Carley informed the group that with the development of the DNP degree program at UCSF, there will be a need to establish a standing committee of the Faculty Council that is devoted to the DNP degree. A proposed new DNP Program Council will work in concert with the Graduate Council and the other program councils (i.e. MEPN Program Council, MS Program Council and Doctoral Program Council) to support similar functions.

Faculty Council members discussed and approved establishment of an Ad-Hoc DNP Program Council. The Council membership will include one representative from each of the four departments (FHCN, Physio, CHS and SBS); SBS will decide if they wish representation. There will be one student representative at large as well. Associate Dean Judy Martin-Holland will serve as ex officio, as will the DNP Program Director and Associate Program Director once those positions are filled. Associate Dean Martin-Holland will also be asked to provide staff assistance to this ad hoc council.

Based on the six charges put forward by AS for program councils, the Ad-Hoc DNP Program Council will plan to meet regularly and:

1. Review and approve courses for the consent calendar submitted to faculty for approval
2. Advise with decision making, recruitment efforts
3. Assist with ongoing communication to departments and governance
4. Solicit input from departments and faculty.

In January, the DNP degree proposal was approved by the system Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs. In March, the President and Provost approved of the degree proposal. In May, the Full Faculty approved of a new DNP Council. Through the end of the 2016-2017 academic year, the degree proposal underwent the WASC accreditation process. Once all approvals are acquired, the school can begin hiring faculty.

Ad Hoc SON Education Committee

In September, Chair Lyndon informed the Council that some faculty members have proposed the idea of reinstating an Education Policy Committee. The goal would be to help promote communication and make it easier for the program councils to work together on common issues, such as the evaluation system implementation. The School of Nursing is the only school that does not have an Education Policy Committee. To discuss the feasibility of the idea, Chair Lyndon invited the three program council chairs and Associate Dean Judy Martin-Holland. When asked how the previous education committee functioned, Interim Dean Weiss explained that the education committee was independent from the program councils in that the work assigned. For example, if a school-wide policy were being considered for revision, the education policy committee would be responsible for the review and approval. Associate Dean Martin-Holland informed the Council that having an education committee would be helpful. From her perspective, an education committee could help coordinate policy reviews and serve as a resource. Member Annette Carley noted that the group could also help the education hub. After discussion, the Faculty Council

members and the Program Council chairs all agreed to address this concern by convening a regular meeting of the Program Council Chairs to discuss cross-council issues as indicated in Program Council charge under current bylaws directing cross-council collaboration on educational policy matters. Dean Martin-Holland agreed to provide administrative coordination for these meetings, which she would also attend ex officio. All agreed to convene regular meetings for one academic year and then have an evaluation at the end of the period to determine if this process meets the needs identified in the original request for a new committee.

In February, Associate Dean Judy Martin-Holland attended the Council meeting to report on the progress of the ad hoc Education Committee. She informed the Faculty Council that the group had their first meeting in December. The agenda included a review of how the program councils function; the course review system and process; and a discussion on how to develop on shared guidelines for the program councils. The next meeting will be held in the spring. The ad hoc committee will develop a report and bylaws that can be presented to the Faculty Council for review next academic year. The NFC will review the bylaws and if they are accepted the full faculty will vote on the bylaws to establish a SON Education Policy Committee Spring 2018.

Faculty Teaching Award Process

In April, Teaching Award Committee Chair Xiao Hu reported on the 2017 selection process and award winners. He informed the Council that, while the selection worked well this year, he believes the process can be improved to encourage more faculty to be nominated. After discussing a variety of potential solutions, members agreed to take up the issue next academic year.

Fiscal Health Working Group

In September, Interim Dean Weiss informed the Council that she had met with Chancellor Sam Hawgood and EVCP Dan Lowenstein to discuss the state of the school and the vision for future. Throughout their discussions, there is a common belief that the school must address two critical areas before a new dean is hired:

- **Fiscal Health:** The immediate concern for all is the financial health and future of the school. All believe that it would be wise to have a plan in place for when the new dean is hired. The purpose of developing a plan now is to position the school for future fiscal health and the potential to attract the best possible candidates for the Dean position. There are two goals of the plan: The first is to identify major areas of focus in the school that should be priorities for budget support. The second goal is to recommend a potential strategy for realigning the budget to assure adequate funding for the identified priorities.
- **Relationship with the UCSF Health System:** Along with the need to address the fiscal health of the school, Interim Dean Weiss explained that the school has the opportunity to develop a plan for effective integration and participation of School of Nursing faculty and students in the UCSF Health System. There are three goals that are part of this plan: The first is to design a model for participation of SON faculty and students that is advantageous and feasible for both the SON and the Health System. The second goal is to identify barriers and supports for implementing the model. Finally, the third goal is to outline specific methods to address barriers and to use existing supports, along with a timeline for implementing the model.

In October, the Fiscal Health and UCSF Health working groups were formed. In November, Chair Lyndon provided the following report on the Fiscal Health group:

- **Purpose of the Workgroup:** To position the School for future fiscal health and the potential to attract the best possible candidates for dean.
 - **Goal 1:** Identify major areas of focus in the School that should be priorities for budget support
 - **Goal 2:** Recommend potential strategies for realigning the budget to assure adequate funding for the identified priorities.
- **Project Governance:** To ensure that all stakeholders are included in the process the following project governance structure was established:
 - ***School of Nursing Dean:*** The Dean will assign teams and decide and adopt final recommendations

- *Workgroup:* The workgroup is co-chaired by Council Chair Lyndon and Associate Dean of Administration and Finance Lynda Jacobsen. Team members include:
 - Abbey Alkon, Family Health Care Nursing
 - Barbara Burgel, Community Health Systems
 - Janine Cataldo, Physiological Nursing
 - Kit Chesla, Family Health Care Nursing
 - Gerri Collins-Bride, Community Health Systems
 - Kim Dau, Family Health Care Nursing
 - Shari Dworkin, Dean's Office and Social Behavioral Sciences
 - Julene Johnson, Institute for health and Aging
 - Elena Flowers, Physiological Nursing
 - Judy Martin-Holland, Dean's Office
 - Janet Shim, Social and Behavioral Sciences
 - Cecilia Chang, Ex Officio member and member of the Dean's Office

The workgroup is responsible to research and understand issues; formulate recommendations; set priorities based on criteria; provide information for consultation process; maintain collaborative environment; and offer subject matter expertise, as needed
- *Consultation:* The members of the workgroup are also expected to consult with the relevant constituencies on the progress of the workgroup. These include the departments, program councils and committees.
- What is Shared Governance:
 - Faculty has decision-making authority over curricula and provides consultation on administrative/financial issues
 - The workgroup in consultation with faculty makes recommendations to put forward
 - The Dean has final decision on financial priorities
- Planned Approach
 - November 1st
 - Kick off project – understand charge
 - Clarify roles and responsibilities
 - Establish governance and decision making structure
 - Set guidelines for developing recommendations
 - Identify data needed
 - November 18
 - Understand current state of ongoing and one-time
 - Programs and initiatives
 - Infrastructure projects
 - December 1 Retreat
 - Develop priorities and recommendations
 - Develop material for consultation
 - December 1 – December 13
 - Focus on consultation with departments and committees
 - December 14
 - Finalize recommendations with clear rationale
 - Confirm plan for work on Goal 2
 - January – March
 - Clearly describe recommendations and cost out
 - Access funding sources and options
 - Reprioritize recommendations based upon criteria and cost

In February, Chair Alkon provided the following report:

- Purpose of the Workgroup: To position the School for future fiscal health and the potential to attract the best possible candidates for dean.
 - Goal 1: Identify major areas of focus in the School that should be priorities for budget support
 - Approach to Complete Goal 1

- Information Sharing
 - SON Departments, Budget Office, Dean's Office
- Consultation with Faculty
 - Faculty Retreat
- Day Long Retreat
- Goal 1 Recommendation for Focus Areas
 - Faculty, Student and Staff Welfare
 - Restructure faculty workload to support faculty focus and improve faculty wellbeing
 - Evaluate compensation model to better incentivize, recognize and reward faculty in alignment with available resources
 - Expand efforts to attract and maintain a diverse faculty
 - Sustainability
 - Increase promotion of faculty experts, innovations, and research findings to journalists representing community and new media
 - Diversify, optimize and expand funding sources
 - Use financial metrics that align with strategic priorities and goals to maximize financial accountability
 - Research, Education and Clinical Experience
 - Streamline & improve operational infrastructure, technology, and staffing strategies to provide both faculty & student support
 - Enhance research structures to better support faculty productivity and enable timely & responsive engagement with local, national, and international initiatives and changes
 - Partnership and Collaboration
 - Maintain and more fully engage community partners
 - Incentivize internal collaboration leading to synergies among existing researchers and when developing new grant opportunities
 - Partner with UCSF Health to expand clinical programs and training opportunities
 - Prioritize and enhance investments to expand expertise in new research areas
 - Climate
 - Continue building a climate where all faculty, students and staff feel respected, supported, and valued
 - Expand investments in diversity training
 - Pipeline
 - Increase investments in programs supporting
 - recruitment & retention of diverse faculty and staff
 - recruitment & retention of underrepresented students
- Criteria for Prioritization
 - Advances population health for Californians
 - Increases faculty welfare
 - Promotes equity in educational programs
 - Advances innovation
 - Accomplishes financial sustainability
- Goal 2: Recommend potential strategies for realigning the budget to assure adequate funding for the identified priorities.
 - Collaboration with the University of Washington, School of Nursing: To learn more about how a peer public institution addressed their budget, leaders at the University of Washington were interviewed.
 - What were the problems that UW SON was trying to solve?
 - How did you approach defining the problems/issues?
 - Who was involved in addressing the problems? Did you have the resources to address the issues?

- Does UW have a shared governance model? If yes, how were the issues worked through the shared governance structure? How were the faculty engaged?
- What are the metrics that are used to track and follow the problem long term?
- Looking back, what lessons did you learn? Were there unintended consequences? What would you do differently?
- UW Review
 - Reviewed 2-year process
 - Support from UW Office of the President, Budget Office
 - Developed criteria for identifying strong and vulnerable programs
 - Reviewed the structure of the SON
 - Held monthly meetings to increase communication
 - Identified the cost of educating students in their Masters, DNP, and PhD programs
- Next Steps
 - Develop budgets for revenue generating ideas
 - Align ideas with Focus Areas (Goal 1)
 - Recommend efficiencies and revenue generating ideas
 - Write summary for Dean Weiss

Salary Equity Report

In March, Associate Dean Shari Dworkin attending the faculty council meeting to present on the findings of the Salary Equity report ([Appendix 8](#)):

- All 4 UCSF Schools have completed their analyses that examine faculty salary equity for 2015-2016 data
- The goal of the report is to assess whether there are any imbalances in a) X+Y salary b) presence or amount of Z payments c) accelerated actions between women and men and between whites and under-represented minorities after controlling for a number of relevant covariates (rank, step, degree).
- All Schools have drafted a full written report that includes both results and a school-level action plan. The draft reports were sent to the Vice Provost's office in early December.
- Our report was commented on by a faculty salary equity taskforce, and this year, that was 1 Vice Chair from each of the Departments
- AD Dworkin then produced a power point slide set of our results and action plan and presented this in early February to the UCSF Faculty Salary Equity Committee. Representatives from across many entities from UCSF were present.
- Our findings and our action plans were fully accepted by the committee. No additional analyses were requested
- Our findings include: no statistically significant differences by gender or race in a) X+Y salary b) presence of a Z payment c) presence of a merit acceleration.
- However, we did find trends in X+Y salary whereby women make 4% less than men (with all controls) and under-represented minorities make 4% less X+Y than Caucasians (after covariates were controlled for).
- Thus, to understand whether these imbalances were inequities or not, SON carried out an additional matched pair analyses to delve into the reasons for pay imbalances. We also carried out a residual analysis. We found that in all cases except for 1 faculty member—the differences in salary were due to reasonable organizational practices (a faculty member bringing in more grant money made more X+Y salary)
- In the 1 case where the imbalance was deemed an inequity, we have retroactively paid the person for 2015-2016 and increased the 2016-2017 and forthcoming salaries. We also found the root cause for the issue (this was not gender or race based) and have discussed this with the Department Chair; the issue won't arise again.
- Thanks to Steve Paul for running the statistics and leading the analysis and to the Vice Chairs who provided feedback and also contributed to the report and the action plans

- Because the report is lengthy and because it is critical to make this information transparent to the public, I will be making this report available on the Faculty Council website soon.
- Because it is important to engage faculty on these issues and to offer some time and space to ask questions, AD Dworkin will present the findings and answer questions at the March Faculty Council meeting.

SON Climate Survey

In October, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs Shari Dworkin and School of Nursing Climate Survey PI Teresa Scherzer attended the Council meeting to provide an update on the proposed climate survey and to determine how best to proceed.

In 2012, the UC Office of the President administered a systemwide survey to collect data on campus climate. This survey was sent out to all UC students, staff and faculty. In 2013, the survey results were sent out to all campuses for review. At UCSF, the Office of Diversity and Outreach was assigned to provide reports and develop a campus-wide Climate Action Plan. In thinking of how to develop a School of Nursing Climate Action Plan, Associate Dean Dworkin requested to view and analyze the raw data for the school. However, the Office of Diversity and Outreach (ODO) informed her that the raw data was not accessible. To best develop an action plan for the School of Nursing, Associate Dean Dworkin recommended to the Council that the school develop and conduct its own climate survey. A new survey would provide current data and would be focused on questions that align better with the school's priorities and goals of increasing diversity and creating a more inclusive environment. At the time, Council members discussed and agreed that it would be a good idea to have a survey that was personalized to the School of Nursing. In January of 2016, a decision was made by the Faculty Council to grant the responsibility over the climate survey to another group that would include students and staff.

Since the last report, a decision was made to allow students and staff to pursue alternative options for gauging campus climate and developing an action plan. Now focusing on faculty, Council members were informed that the major question is whether or not the school or campus has the resources to follow up on the results of a survey? For example, will there be resources to fund trainings or workshops to address key areas? Associate Dean Dworkin informed the Council that she recently contacted ODO Vice Chancellor Renee Navarro to ask if there are any resources available in her office. The response was that there is a \$15,000 fund that is available, potentially on a competitive basis. Council members acknowledged that this funding resource could be used for necessary trainings.

After further discussion, Council member requested to see the raw data from the 2012 UC systemwide survey. Associate Dean Dworkin and PI Scherzer noted that it could be possible to request the data, but it would have to go through a formal approval process with IRB review. There is no additional funding for analysis from the office of diversity, so faculty would have to run the data. Chair Lyndon suggested that the data request should target specific questions in the 2012 survey, rather than to just ask for the entire survey.

Shared Education Data Solution

In February, Associate Dean of Administration and Finance Lynda Jacobsen deferred to member Annette Carley to report on the Shared Education Data Solution (SEDS) system.

Currently, the Schools of Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy manage student data through multiple systems and manual processes, which leads to inefficiency, inaccuracy and limitations with both monitoring and reporting. Schools are in need of better ways to manage student data in order to meet the demands of new degrees programs, curriculum redesign, student progression tracking, programmatic assessment, accreditation mandates and reporting requirements. Working together, the schools have proposed the development of a Shared Education Data Solution that will build upon the system the School of Medicine has been using since 2007. The main benefits of leveraging the School of Medicine system are based on using a shared software platform to address our immediate needs. Anticipated benefits of implementing new student education data solution include:

- Promoting a culture evidence through easily accessible access to education data

- Fostering data driven decision-making and informed planning
- Increased communication across the Schools
- Improved user experience in tracking and monitoring student academic progression
- A shared platform to foster technological standardization for all schools
- Centralized tool to enable program monitoring and reporting
- Access to reliable, consistent and secure data
- Improve data integration and consistency

Member Carley encouraged Council members to review the project on the UCSF Open Proposal site - <https://open-proposals.ucsf.edu/itgov/ed-ops-2017/proposal/14067>.

Strategic Plan

In February, Interim Dean Weiss informed the Council that it might be of benefit to the school to consider the development of a strategic plan. If the school starts to develop a plan now, faculty can set the desired direction of school. Potential dean candidates will then have the opportunity to review the proposed plan and comment. This situation would be similar to what has happened at other institutions. Furthermore, the school can take advantage of potential development opportunities, as a plan can be shared with prospective donors. On the other end of the spectrum, there are benefits to not developing a plan at the moment. Generally, when a new dean is hired, that individual is afforded the ability to implement their vision for the school. If a plan is already in place, top prospective candidates may shy away from an opportunity that only provides limited degrees of freedom. Interim Dean Weiss asked the Council for their thoughts on how the school should proceed. Members discussed and determined that it would be good to at least have an outline of a plan in place while the school continues the search for a new dean. Members feel the outcomes from the Fiscal Health and UCSF Health working groups should help to inform potential dean candidates and potential donors. The NFC recommended to the Interim Dean to establish a Summer Strategic Planning Workgroup to develop a plan for the SON to develop a strategic plan in the academic year 2017-2018. The workgroup included faculty from every department and faculty in the clinical and tenure track series. Howard Pinderhughes has experience developing the last strategic plan for the SON. Abbey will be the chair of the summer workgroup and Howard will be the co-chair.

Website Refresh

In May, Communications Manager Courtney Andersen informed the faculty that she is working on soft-refresh of the school's website. A web governance committee has been created to assist in the process. This group consists of faculty, staff and students. The new site should be launched September. Manager Andersen believes that the school should have a beta version to review and comment on in August. In addition to the new website, work is being done to build a preceptor portal. The portal will provide preceptors with a new way to communicate quickly and effectively with faculty.

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions that the School of Nursing Faculty Council will continue into 2017-2018:

- Climate Survey
- Dean Welcome
- Faculty Teaching Award Process
- Implementation of the DNP
- Strategic Planning Process
- Convene a task force to address the Fiscal Workgroup Strategy #4 on a MS curriculum review.

Appendices

This Annual Report is posted on the [School of Nursing Faculty Council Web page](#) on the [Academic Senate Web site](#). Appendices are embedded into this PDF document.

[Appendix 1](#): Faculty Council Communication on the PDST Policy

- [Appendix 2:](#) Helen Diller Task Force Report
- [Appendix 3:](#) Open Access 2020 Support Communication
- [Appendix 4:](#) UC Health Strategic Plan
- [Appendix 5:](#) Global Health Standing Committee Bylaws
- [Appendix 6:](#) Standing Committee Bylaws
- [Appendix 7:](#) Core Curriculum Mapping Presentation
- [Appendix 8:](#) Salary Equity Report
- [Appendix 9:](#) MS Program Council Annual Report
- [Appendix 10:](#) MEPN Program Council Annual Report
- [Appendix 11:](#) Doctoral Program Council Annual Report
- [Appendix 12:](#) Research Committee Annual Report
- Appendix 13: Recruitment and Retention Committee Annual Report
- Appendix 14: Faculty Practice Committee Annual Report
- [Appendix 15:](#) Global Health Nursing Committee Annual Report

Senate Staff:
Artemio Cardenas, Senate Analyst
Artemio.Cardenas@ucsf.edu; 415/476-4245