

School of Medicine Faculty Council
Nisha Parikh, MD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT
2017-2018

Primary Focus Points for the Year:

- Effect of AB 1887 on Junior Faculty
- Changes to Clinical Trials Administration at UCSF
- UCSF Campus Climate Survey
- Space Planning at Parnassus Campus
- SOM Strategic Planning Goals
- Research Management Services
- Faculty Learning and Development Fund
- SOM Bylaw Revisions

Issues for Next Year (2018-2019)

- Maternity Leave
- Recruitment Strategies targeting Junior Faculty
- Parking
- Expanding MOP Loan Program

2017-2018 Members

Nisha Parikh, Chair

Thomas Chi, Vice Chair

Lydia Zablotska (Past-Chair)
Cynthia Curry
Rena Fox
Seema Gandhi
James Harrison
Jialing Liu
Marta Margeta
Gabriel Sarah
M. Reza Vagefi

Ex-Officio Members

Robert Baron, Associate Dean, Graduate Medical Education
Renee Binder, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs
Talmadge King, Dean
Catherine Lucey, Vice Dean, Education
Lowell Tong, Executive Vice Chair, Department of Psychiatry

Number of Meetings: 10

Senate Analyst: Artemio Cardenas/Kirstin McRae

Divisional Business

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

Effect of AB 1887 on Junior Faculty

In March, Emma Webb, MD, Professor of Clinical Radiology, raised the issue of Assembly Bill (AB) 1887 and its impact on junior faculty. AB 1887 (Prohibition on State-Funded and State-Sponsored Travel to States with Discriminatory Laws) prevents travel to those states which have enacted laws discriminating against LGBT people. This travel prohibition applies to state agencies, departments, boards, authorities, and commissions, including those operating under the University of California, the Board of Regents of the University of California, and the California State University. (Gov. Code, § 11139.8, subd. (b).)

Guest Webb advised the Council that the bill has particularly affected the Radiology department, where numerous faculty have forgone attending national and primary society conferences due to AB 1887. Ex officio member Binder advised that faculty can already list on their CV the reason for declining to attend an invited speaker slot at a conference.

Council members communicated their position to the Committee on Academic Personnel.

Changes to Clinical Trials Administration at UCSF

In April, Jennifer Grandis, Associate Vice Chancellor of Clinical & Translational Research and Eunice Stephens, Executive Director of the Office of Clinical Research presented an overview on clinical trials at UCSF to the Faculty Council ([Appendix 1](#)).

Historically, motivation to invest in clinical trials at UCSF was often related to audits, or billing, rather than by research; for example, accidentally sending bills to insurance companies rather than sponsors. However, the impetus remains to correct issues before they become problems. Therefore, moving forward every clinical trial will have a coverage analysis rather than only some of them. Council members cautioned that the School of Medicine may not want so much space being used for clinical trials because it risks losing money. However, the guests noted that UCSF receives funds when it participates in such trials. Guest Stephens further advised that the Medical Center won't actually see the coverage analysis because it is for back-end billing scrubbers, rather than for the medical center. Additionally, this policy will be coordinated and linked with APEX. Finally, all the offices that touch on clinical/translational research will speak to one another monthly. This is necessary because protocols differ across locations—e.g., the west coast of US is governed by a different Center for Medicare Services than the east coast.

Council members asked for clarification on how the OnCore system will be used; the guests explained that historically UCSF was considered a compliance risk because many different people were making clinical trial decisions. Moving forward, OnCore will be used for Subject Enrollment and Subject Visit Tracking (effective May 7, 2018). Over the past 15 months the system has been linking to Apex slowly and eventually, all systems must link with Apex in order to move forward with clinical trials. If faculty are new to OnCore, guest Grandis encouraged them to reach out to UCSF Cancer researchers — who have been using this product for a decade so have a lot of experience.

UCSF Campus Climate Survey

In May, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Brian Alldredge provided an overview of the 2017 UCSF Climate Survey results, which the Faculty Life Task Force will use in the future to propose recommendations ([Appendix 2](#)). Such surveys have typically been conducted every decade (2001 and 2011), however it was decided to push the next survey up, considering the vast and quick changes occurring on campus, rather than wait until 2021. Key statistics of interest included:

- Gender distribution of UCSF faculty has changed rapidly since 2001 (ex: 36% to 48% women)
- Although UCSF isn't at risk right now of losing more female faculty than in the past, the percentage of female faculty leaving UCSF has remained consistent and could increase in the future.
- Mentoring has improved from 37% to 60% (2/3 of faculty report having mentor; associated positively with most every need/issue queried; women/URM/adjunct series appear to benefit most from having mentor)
- Male and female perspectives on climate and gender-based advantages differ more in 2017 than in past years
- Although ¾ of faculty state UCSF promotes climate free of racial/ethnic discrimination, 40% of URM faculty report experiencing discrimination at any time (>2x as many as in 2011)

School of Medicine Business

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

Space Planning at Parnassus Campus

In October, Dean King recommended that the Faculty Council get involved in space planning efforts focused around the Parnassus campus renovation. Chair Parikh and Vice Chair Chi held a phone conference with John Fahy, a faculty member leading the Parnassus Renewal effort, in November about his efforts to encourage investment in clinical research at Parnassus. Council members supported the work, but noted that revitalization efforts should not just focus on one area; instead, all mission areas of teaching, research and clinical care should be considered. Council members suggested putting someone from the Senate Space Committee on the committee for this project, plus another faculty member from the clinical side. Ex-Officio member Tong added that he sits on a couple of space planning committees at UCSF and offered to report on the work of the committees and/or provide Council feedback to the groups.

In March, Jon Giacomi, Assistant VC, Facilities Services, gave a presentation at the Dean's meeting on several small Parnassus improvement projects that are intended to boost campus morale while the larger Parnassus revitalization plan is in development; Facilities Services have \$2.5 million this year to work on such projects. Additionally, the Helen Diller \$500 million pledge will start the Parnassus hospital rebuild. The projected estimate is \$2B.

SOM Strategic Planning Goals

In November, School of Medicine Chief of Staff Olivia Herbert presented on the school's efforts to develop a new strategic plan that aims to engage a diverse group of stakeholders across multiple geographies who, through their work together, will set a bold vision for the coming years ([Appendix 3](#)).

- **Planning Hierarchy**
 - Tactics/Actions - What initiatives will be undertaken, and how will resources be allocated?
 - Strategy - What are we going to concentrate on?
 - Vision - Where are we going, and what do we aspire to be?
 - Mission – Who are we and what do we believe in?
- **Planning Timeline**
 - The Strategic Plan for UCSF SOM should build upon the organization's mission and vision and provide areas of focus for the organization over the next five years.
 - Strategy Creation will happen between September 2017 and January 2018
 - Strategy Execution will happen in January 2018 and be ongoing
- **Strategic Themes**
 - Organizational and Operational Characteristics:
 - Consistent culture and values permeate all units within SOM
 - The SOM is nimble, responsive, and coordinated to rapidly pursue opportunities; decision-making authorities and responsibilities are clearly defined and well

- understood by stakeholders; the independence of individuals, units, and departments is appropriately balanced against the SOM's ability to pursue its goals.
 - Communication is believable, efficient, timely, and meaningful.
 - Unnecessary bureaucracy that does not add value is eliminated.
 - UCSF People
 - Ensure consistency of experience, equitable treatment, and opportunities; eliminate disparities within the SOM.
 - Create and sustain an environment that attracts and supports bold thinkers and promotes and ensures personal and professional well-being for all within the UCSF community.
 - Strengthen the recruiting pipeline and professional development, through mentorship and sponsorship, to develop a deep, diverse bench of talent and promote distributed leadership throughout the organization.
 - Develop creative solutions to mitigate local/regional economic pressures that negatively affect the SOM and its people (faculty, staff, and learners).
 - Partnering and Relationships
 - Integrate research, education, and clinical programs to optimize a learning health system and foster an innovative and dynamic culture of continuous learning for all within the UCSF community.
 - Break down barriers and enhance and expand collaboration within the SOM and throughout UCSF—across geographies; among departments, units, teams, and individuals; and across all mission areas.
 - Expand the breadth and depth of external partnerships to unlock synergies: create new opportunities with public and private partners; promote stronger UC system-wide collaboration across all segments; and empower our patients as partners in every aspect of our work.
 - Economics and Resources
 - Diversify funding streams and pursue opportunities to secure more “hard dollar” support through the development of endowments and other vehicles for faculty work across all mission areas.
 - Support the clinical enterprise and preserve/enhance access to funds for reinvestment in the academic, clinical, and scientific enterprises.
 - Deploy resources at the SOM and department/unit level to promote the pursuit of strategic goals across all mission areas through stewardship of existing programs, infrastructure, and resources as well as through new program development.
 - Position UCSF for ongoing success in securing extramural federal research funding, given the national trend toward larger center-based and cooperative awards and training grants versus individual investigator awards.
- **Questions for the Faculty Council**
 - What would it take for UCSF to be the best place to work in all mission areas?
 - What structural support do people need to feel valued?
 - What would it take to create an environment that has no barriers to success for women and URM in medicine, science and leadership in the School of Medicine?
 - How can UCSF best foster a collectivist purpose while supporting individualistic strategies?
- **Council Feedback**
 - Council members focused on their feedback on a desire for more mentorship and sponsorship programs, as well as more mentorship opportunities. Often there are instances when early-career faculty have been assigned a mentor, but that mentor is not always very helpful. There needs to be a connection or good relationship between the mentor and mentee. CS Herbert asked for more information on specific programs that have been successful; Council members commented that future programs do not have to be so formal.

Perhaps SOM could work to develop a culture that encourages faculty to organically form mentor relationships.

In March, Vice Chair Thomas Chi provided an overview of the SOM Leadership Retreat he attended in February 2018, where stakeholders were challenged to think boldly about the future to generate new ideas. In an effort to engage new perspectives, retreat organizers deliberately sought to invite people other than the usual attendees to be at this year's retreat.

School leaders focused on accelerating UCSF forward through the creation of a new ten-year strategic plan. The current vision is for up to three years, after which school leaders will discuss future goals and decide how to measure success/metrics. The overall goal is to push the boundaries of technology, its human interface, and data-driven methodologies leading innovation and discovery. Included in this strategy are efforts to unify the campus, making IT work such that people can attend campus-wide meetings without having to be there in-person, and build up UCSF's presence in the community to attract people to the campus, rather than relying on reputation alone.

Ex Officio member Binder noted that development of a strategic plan is required as part of the accreditation process.

Research Management Services

In December, Council members expressed their concern with the quality of the research management services provided by UCSF. To address the issue, Vice Dean David Morgan was invited to the January meeting to discuss the following Council concerns with pre-award services:

- Inconsistent Quality of Services
 - The quality of the services provided seems to vary between the departments. There needs to be more consistency.
- Workload
 - Some departments seem to have more analysts available to assist with grants.
- Loss of grants or grant funding
 - Council members cited several instances where they, or their colleagues, have lost grant funding because of pre-award analyst mistakes.
- Turnover
 - There is a belief that many of the pre-award analysts are turning over. It takes time for analysts to develop a knowledge set about certain grants and funding agency requirements. If there is high turn-over, then it is difficult for analyst to get up to speed and provide quality service.
- Better Services Provided by Partner Universities
 - Faculty who have worked with pre-award analysts at other universities have experienced better quality services. Two examples that were given included the University of Washington and the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

Vice Dean Morgan acknowledged the concerns and thanked Council members for bringing the above issues to his attention. He promised to learn more about the Research Management Services Office and investigate what can be done to make improvements. He further requested that complaints be submitted to him so that he can also pass them along to the Vice Chancellor of Research, Lindsey Criswell.

Faculty Learning and Development Fund

At the beginning of the year, the Council discussed whether they would like to continue the School of Medicine Faculty Learning and Development Fund for the 2018 fiscal year. Council members commented that they enjoyed the experience of reviewing applications and providing needed funding to faculty. The Council unanimously voted to move forward with the Faculty Development in 2018 and also voted to request additional funding from the dean.

In November, Council members reviewed the 2017 Faculty Learning and Development Fund criteria. Members agreed on the following: [2018 RFP, timeline, and request amount](#).

In December, the Council was informed that the Executive Council had received \$570,000 in requests for the \$500,000 available in the 2018 Chancellor's Fund. After negotiation, the Council voted to reduce the School of Medicine's request of \$35,000 to \$30,000 for the Faculty Development Fund.

In April, Council members reviewed the independently scored L&D applications and determined the cut-off for funding. Those applications with a disparity between the two reviewer's scores were reviewed by the committee as a whole, and scores were adjusted when relevant. Ultimately, the committee funded 13 grants this year, down from 18 last year. This is because many of the top scoring applications were requesting – and awarded – the full \$5000 amount. 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.

SOM Bylaw Revisions

In March, Council members proposed changing SOM FC bylaws to reflect accurate current representation and remove mention of the Council representing only "teaching faculty". In June, a draft of the proposed bylaw revisions were sent to Council members via email for review and feedback.

School of Medicine Standing Committee Reports

Committee on Curriculum and Education Policy Presentation

Former Committee on Curriculum and Education Policy (CCEP) Chair Robert Hiatt provided the 2016-2017 annual report on the work of his committee ([Appendix 4](#)). Key actions included:

- As part of the new governance structure, CCEP will only meet quarterly beginning in the 2016-2017 Academic Year
- Approved changes to the Core Clerkship Grading beginning in the 2016-2017 Academic year, including:
 - Increase cap on honors from up to 25% to up to 45%
 - Institute grading committee in each core clerkship, and have or develop plans for including URM faculty in committee, or someone identified in dept. as representing awareness of diversity issues
 - Develop criteria for honors; clerkship directors should work with colleagues and Medical Education to develop criteria
 - Standardize contribution of shelf exam to clerkship grade—approve by CCEP in 2015/2016
- CCEP approved modifications to Appendix IV of Bylaws which included:
 - Elimination of Student Welfare Committee
 - Modified membership of CCEP to not include chairs of UME Curriculum Governance subcommittees as it was determined the Associate dean for Curriculum, who chairs the Executive Committee was sufficient representation
 - Amplified the description of the membership and procedures for the Committee on Admissions
 - Went into effect on September 1, 2017
- Developed a new policy template that includes the person who is accountable for enacting the policy and continual review, as well as indicating date of next review
 - Policies affecting work of standing committees within Appendix IV Bylaws to be considered by the CCEP whereas other policies considered by governance committees charged by CCEP.

Appendices

[Appendix 1](#): Changes to Clinical Trials Administration

[Appendix 2](#): UCSF Campus Climate Survey Findings

[Appendix 3](#): UCSF School of Medicine Strategic Planning Overview

[Appendix 4](#): Committee on Curriculum and Education Policy 2016-2017 Annual Report

Senate Staff:

Kirstin McRae, Senate Analyst

Kirstin.Mcrae@ucsf.edu; (415) 514-0315