

School of Dentistry Faculty Council
Elizabeth Mertz, PhD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT 2019-2020

Focus Points for the Year:

- Admissions Committee Updates
 - Revision of Admissions Committee Bylaws (for 2019-2020 academic year)
- Approval of the 2019 Graduating Class
- Bylaw and Regulation Changes
 - Academic Grading Appeal
 - Student Progress & Remediation
 - Student Professionalism and Honor Code Practices
- Dental Center
- Divisional Business
 - Chancellor's Fund
 - Elsevier Publishers
 - Issue of Vacation Pay for Part-time Faculty
 - Sustainability: Red Meat Resolution & Fossil Fuels Memorial
- Retreat Report and Planning
- School Strategic Planning and School-specific Committee Reports
- Student Concerns

2018-2019 Members

Jennifer Perkins, DDS, MD, Chair

Elizabeth Mertz, PhD, Vice Chair

Nejleh Abed, DDS

Katja Brueckner, PhD

Fred Chang, MD, PhD

Gwen Essex, RDH, MS, EdD

James Giblin, DDS

Snehlata Oberoi, BDS, DDS, MDS

Yvonne Kapila, DDS, PhD

Ex-Officio Members

Michael Reddy, Dean

Permanent Guest(s)

Sapna Saini (2018-2019) and

Steven Gigli (2019-2020)

ADS Student Representatives

Number of Meetings: 11 (9 meetings; 1 Full Faculty Fall Retreat; 1 Full Faculty Spring Meeting)

Senate Analyst: Alison Cleaver

Divisional Business

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

Chancellor's Fund

In June of 2014, the Chancellor announced that he would be awarding the Academic Senate with a reoccurring annual \$500,000 fund for faculty life. The fund administration would be at the Senate's discretion. After discussion, each of the four Schools were given a similar amount. The School of Dentistry was awarded \$25,000 in 2019-2020.

Five applications have been received with two more being forthcoming. Once the system closes mid-April, applications will send out to everyone for review. Historically Council members review 2 applications each, using the developed rubric. We may have enough funds to cover all applications. Good to have a meeting if needed to discuss — perhaps 15 minutes — this time in 2 weeks perhaps at 8:30am. April 30. Applications that involve a travel component especially to a conference will be rejected at this time, due to COVID-19.

IRB Briefing and Update

Brian Smith, Interim Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer & Associate Vice Chancellors, Research Infrastructure and Operations provided an overview on the campus status and initiatives related to the HRPP Institutional Review Board., as well as changes to the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects: the "Common Rule".

- Noting the increase in IRB submissions and the increased complexity of research efforts, guest Smith advised that these directly result in an increase in the time to approval, especially of expedited reviews.
- Current initiatives include hiring, staff review, consistent business process review, work flow adjustments (LEAN analysis), and enhance the service aspect to the research community.
- The "Common Rule" only applies to new federally funded or conducted research approved on or after January 1, 2019. The intent of the changes is to better protect human subjects involved in research, while facilitating valuable research and reducing burden, delay and ambiguity for investigators. UCSF has already implemented some of the changes as 'best practices' in recent years; overall, the changes are anticipated to be minor for UCSF investigators.

Guest Smith also advised that some of the funds flow will change from charging schools to charging departments. It is expected that the SOM and the Medical Center will bear the brunt of the financial burden.

Springer Publishing Agreement

The Council heard a presentation from Rich Schneider, Chair, UCOLASC, about the upcoming negotiations between UC and Elsevier Publishing. The Senate's COLASC Committee kept council members and all UCSF faculty updated on the status of negotiations as they preceded. COLASC members advised that this would only pertain to publications published in 2019 and beyond.

Wildfire Smoke Response Protocol Taskforce Recommendations

UCSF Associate Chancellor Theresa O'Brien presented on the UCSF-response focusing on action steps if the Air Quality Index (AQI) is at a certain level due to wildfires. This included protocols for classes, students, faculty, and staff and the campus overall. These will be re-examined annually and kept current.

School Business

Approval of the 2020 Graduating Class

In June 2020, Jennifer Perkins, Director, Clinical Education and SOD FC Member, presenting on behalf of Associate Dean Sara Hughes. She provided the Council with a roster of proposed 2020 graduates for approval. All candidates who had met the requirements to graduate by the Spring Ceremony were approved.

COVID-19: Changes to Grading Options for Admissions

SOD FC member Perkins presented on this topic. Director Hwang of the Student Learner Center has requested Faculty Council approval for changing SOD admissions guidelines for incoming fall 2020 class and future quarters or semesters impacted by COVID-19. The changes would related to admissions requirements for the DDS program.

At present, UCSF SOD requires all coursework has a letter grade. Given that due to the COVID-19 evolving situation, most universities and colleges are changing their grading for spring 2020 and beyond to P/NP grading and accepting online coursework, the proposal is that SOD DDS program do the same. This is supported by the systemwide Academic Senate document "Divisional Flexibility for Grading Options in 2020" (Attachment 2). This is not a loosening of actual standards.

ACTION: Faculty Council members voted to approve this change. It requires no change to bylaws or regulations, but language will be added to the SOD DDS Program Admissions Requirements page. Director Hwang will have such language up on the website shortly.

Education Report

Sara Hughes, Associate Dean, provided an overview on next steps in the current environment to administer secure remote examinations, as required by CODA. A temporary amendment to current examination procedures has been created and needs approval by the SOD FC Members.

All proposed technologies have artificial intelligence (AI) built in, for various reasons, to insure no cheating. Examsoft is the preferred software as UC has a pre-existing contract with them, and SOD in particular has used them previously to deliver exams. The difference now is that the software will be used to proctor the exams too; SOD used to rent rooms and have faculty on site to monitor exam testing period. Fiscally, using Examsoft to both deliver and proctor will produce significant cost savings. SOD is adding two components to its pre-existing contract. This has gone through IT security to insure that the encryption is approved by UC, and it's been reviewed/approved by privacy, risk, and legal.

Once tests have been taken, they are electronically delivered to Associate Dean Hughes who reviews them for any red flags that might indicate cheating took place. If there are any issues related to cheating/plagiarism, the standard UCSF SOD procedures for review will commence and recordings are secured until the internal process is complete. At that point, recordings are deleted.

This has been approved by the SOD Executive Committee and EPC this week. Approved UCSF temporary process/guidelines will be delivered to CODA for review and approval shortly. Associate Dean Hughes fielded Council member questions:

Q: Does this take into account any use of other devices, i.e. phone, iPads. One of the primary indicators of cheating is returning to a question already answered and changing the answer. Is there any way to verify someone isn't using their phone to text/chat to ask others.

A: Questions are timed, so test takers cannot go back and answer open questions. Plus the AI tracks eye movement, and using a phone/chat will produce a red flag. Council members support the tests all being given at the same time, to further insure cheating doesn't occur.

Q: Has this changed the grading? Or does P/NP remain in place?

A: P/NP grading remains in place. Examsoft has always been used, but used in-person proctoring. In-person proctoring won't be used temporarily due to guidelines on social

ACTION: Vote to approve a temporary amendment to written examination procedures. APPROVED

School Regulation Changes

Council members discussed the process for revising the proposed changes, which are focused on addressing issues of compatibility with the Registrar's Office involving post-graduate work. School education leaders will be working with a variety of groups to insure that the proposed revisions work seamlessly across the school system.

Student Affairs & Policy Changes

Director Armstrong provided an overview on a variety of school-specific student policies which have recently been updated or newly developed. These are going into a manual and focus largely on how the school is governed.

- a. Engagement Policy (updated): The current posted policy included many of the procedures. These have been taken out of the Engagement Policy and incorporated in the new Absence Procedures (to be reviewed). Additionally, the policy now includes definitions of the types of absences for more clarity which included what can be considered for an excused absence. A request was made to include "Summer Research Fellow mandatory activity" as an option for an excused absence.
- b. Absence Procedures (updated): The current procedures did not include a mechanism for students to ask for an excused absence (as defined in the Engagement Policy). The Absence Tracker Form has been updated to include this and has more logic built in so the students have less confusion when requesting time off. As a reminder, there are separate procedures when a student is missing clinic so these procedures relate to missing courses.
 - a. If a student's request for an excused absence is not approved and they choose to take off anyway, the student will be notified that they will be added to the excused absence report. If they miss an exam or mandatory activity, there are additional consequences.
 - b. For excused absences or discretionary absences, the school has asked for two weeks notice from students.
 - c. The school is reviewing whether taking attendance for didactic courses is necessary. It may be too cumbersome. The school may need to review unexcused absences farther.
 - d. Student Discretionary Absence Policy: SOD gives up to three annually with reason (for didactic courses, not clinics); SOM students get upwards of five (during didactic courses) and don't have to explain why. Why different for the different schools? A reminder that this does not relate to clinic absence. In addition to the 6 week scheduled breaks for all students (18 weeks for first year students), the unlimited excused absences for professional, exams, bereavement (see policy) students are allowed 3 discretionary absences. This does not include when they are sick or have an emergency which simply requires notification on the absence tracker and does not have a max. However, patterns of extreme absences will be reviewed by the SSC.
 - e. There is a request to remove the requirement to provide medical note if sick more than 3 days since SHC will not provide a note.
- c. Conference Attendance Policy (new): This new policy addresses excused absences and student conference attendance (who's attending, when and why they are attending, and how to get that approved). This policy states that students can take one excused absence to attend a conference. They can also take another discretionary absence to attend a conference but will not be excused from exams or mandatory activities (i.e., it must follow the discretionary absence guidelines). For students in a leadership role, or have been asked to present on their work, then in these two separate capacities students can request two separate excused absences. The School is requesting 3 months advance notice. Committee requested a definition be added as to what a leadership role is.
- d. Examination Policy (updated) and Examination Procedures (new): Privacy screens will be required. It'll be up to the course director if the student arrives without a privacy screen. Students must keep belongings at the front of the room, no smart phones and/or watches. This means that you can send students away without passing them. Council members have advised that if that

had been done last semester, there might have been a riot. So proctors need to have exam training.

New Policies

Health and safety policies/procedures: a point system has been assigned for infractions. There are multiple warnings sent out - and if trainings aren't completed, then a point is assigned. These aren't bad infractions; they include minor things like forgetting to put your mask back up after talking to someone. It becomes vitally important that faculty also follow these, if students are being asked to do so; it becomes a mirror image issue and faculty could ultimately result in faculty losing privileges. The policy is aimed at changing the culture.

Council members asked: Where do the points go, who's going to track them? The faculty member, Dr. Rai, who has created this system will track it all. The policy states what the threshold level and what the result will be.

ACTION: Council members voted to approve the presented policies as authored. Director Armstrong advised that the 'megacourse' policies will still need to be developed further as there's information not known at this time.

WASC Accreditation and Career Outcomes Project

Vice Chancellor Elizabeth Watkins, Student Academic Affairs provided two overview presentations on the upcoming ten-year WASC re-accreditation process, which includes an institutional self-study review, undertaking a campus-wide project, and a site visit. The campus-wide project will focus on the schools' processes for collecting and categorizing, publicly reporting, and annually updating career outcomes for all UCSF graduates. Sharon Youmans, Vice Dean, SOP attended as a school representative of the WASC Steering Committee.

The last WASC site visit was in October 2010. UCSF was reaccredited in February 2011 for ten years with a three-year interim report. After that interim report was submitted and approved, UCSF was notified in August 2017 that it was eligible to apply for the Thematic Pathway for Review (TPR), which meant that we could propose a multi-year project in lieu of a more traditional institutional review. In August 2018 the reaccreditation steering committee was formed and in June 2018, UCSF's proposal for TPR was approved by WASC.

The institutional report for TPR was due August 19, 2020. The UCSF site visit will be October 28-20, 2020. The TPR doesn't have to be completed by the site visit, but it needs to be in progress with a clear and thorough plan. UCSF's Project is the "Tracking and Reporting Career Outcomes by Degree Program"

The program's rationale is to provide data that can be used by:

- campus leadership and program faculty in assessing educational effectiveness and improving curricular and co-curricular programming
- faculty in offering better-informed mentorship
- campus administration in developing university, state, federal, and professional accreditation reporting
- prospective students and trainees in making better decisions about program fit
- current students, trainees, and alumni in learning more about the full range of professional opportunities available to them

To date the institutional report has been drafted and posted on the Graduate Division website for comments and review.

Career Outcomes Project:

A group met last fall through to early part of 2020. What was learned was that each professional school and the medical school tracks something differently. It's very important for each school to be very specific about what should be collected and why, and who were their stakeholders. The group collaborated on

efficiencies in re the technicalities of collecting data.

Chair Mertz advised that the American Dental Association has a large master file of data on dentists which was accessible for UCSF in this project. Key things will include: where do people go at graduation (including ADEA surveys which are anonymous but show intention), then who goes into residencies, plus where were they located, etc. This will be the launching point and develop a new survey on key things that are important to SOD. But this is the plan to execute beyond what WASC has requested. This is meant to be a work-in-progress and not a static report.

Dean's Reports

Throughout the academic year, Dean Reddy provided an overview on the below topics, among others:

- **Accreditation/CODA Reports:** The School sent CODA Reports throughout the year
- **EPIC:** The School is moving to EPIC in December 2020. A timeline for trainings has been set, and there is both a tentative roll-out and true implementation dates.
- **Executive Council:** This was launched in fall 2019 and includes school leadership, including Associate Deans, Chairs of school-specific committees. It will meet throughout the year and minutes and slides will be routed.
- **Health Sciences Compensation Board:** this committee has been recreated and is meeting regularly. The School is examining the possibility of implementing a unified HSCP across all departments. Of concern is transparency, equity, and feasibility. Revising the HSCP requires many administrative hurdles.
- **Mock Boards:** The School has seen a 100% pass rate for those taking the mock exam. For those taking the actual board exams, there has also been a 100% pass rate. In future academic years, there will be a course linked to the mock board. The School has also seen Elizabeth Joyce, PhD (Associate Adjunct Professor, Department of Microbiology & Immunology) appointed as a writer on the national mock boards.
- **School Executive Committee:** An Executive Committee is being developed — which is slightly different from the current Chairs/Deans (C-D) Meeting. There is a concern that the C-D Meeting is not disseminating Information back to the departments. Moving forward, Division Chairs, Vice Chairs, and FC will be invited to attend these meeting. If an outcomes assessment is developed, it will then drive the next steps. Initial meeting will be in July 2019.
- **Fall Retreat 2020:** The Dean advised that the September 2020 Retreat has been cancelled due to the pandemic. The December 2020 Retreat is still planned via Zoom.

Fall Faculty Retreat 2019

Held in November 2019 at the Academy of Sciences (Golden Gate Park), the primary topics focused on aligning the School's priorities with the True North pillars.

Fourth Floor Poster

A poster detailing the members of all school-specific committees including Research & Clinical Excellence Day was created by FC members and put up on the fourth floor of the D building. (Appendix 1)

School-specific Committees:

Academic Planning & Budget (APB)

APB Chair Sharma provided an update on the committee's actions to date for this academic year, At their most recent January 2020 meeting, Dean Reddy attended the meeting to discuss the new budget model being developed for faculty salaries, as well as having a consistent budget model within the school so that

all four departments are using the same methodology. The Dean discussed the budget shortfall and asked for AP&B to work on identifying areas of cost savings related to Supplies and Services for non-sponsored activities (primarily clinical services). The Dean's Office will provide a budget analysis of these areas for the committee to identify where savings could be made. The next AP&B meeting on March 31 will discuss the above in more depth.

Admissions

Chair Abed provided an update on the committee's actions to date for this academic year and on the DDS 2020 applicant status,

In reviewing the statistics, across the board, SOD saw a drop in number of applications, and subsequently number of applications reviewed (ranging from -2% to -4%). However there was an increase of 2% in the number of interviews held and GPA/DAT Averages remained flat when compared to 2018-2019. The same statistics were true of the IDP 2020 applicant pool.

In comparing the DDS Class Profile as of April 2020 to that of last year's, it was noted that the biggest change is in the URM student profile, in particular the Latinx and Filipino students which showed a large decline. There is a large increase in the number of NRA (mixed ethnicity) students from 2.3% (2019-2020) to 12.0% (2019-2020).

In reviewing the IDP Class Profile, the breakdown remains similar to 2018-2019, with 28 enrolled and of that nearly 78% coming from India. To date, seven aren't in the country and can't get in due to visa and COVID-19 restrictions. Plus, there isn't housing for married students (or married with children). Don't know if the school is moving forward with IDP for this upcoming year due to austerity measures (is it fiscally sound to operate two separate clinical sites with full staff?). In addition to that, SOD was planning on bringing IDP students on sooner and now must bring them on later. If that is the situation, how will we proceed?

Admission Recap – 2019-2020

Goals

- The School intends to continue inviting candidates to interview as early as possible, post June 1 application live date, so as to be competitive with other schools.
- Admit more than 90 slots by the December 1 notification date. This will enable the school to admit more qualified candidates, and not wait for Round 2. The School's yield rate is around 60-65% so there's no risk of over-enrolling.

Review of the Process

- Interviews started in September with nine interview days pre-December and three interviews in January.
- Admitted over 90 candidates in the December Round 1.

Results

- Admitted 112 on December 1
- Deposit numbers: 70 (62.5% — up from 48% last year)

Challenges

- Faculty recruitment and show-rate during interview days are hugely problematic We had the lowest faculty sign-ups and an increased number of faculty not showing up on the day of the interview.
- URM numbers are very low for interview invite and admissions especially for the December 1 notification. This was not due to lower application number, we in fact had a small increase in number of AA students applying but fewer being invited to interview and admitted. Analysis is ongoing as to why this was the case, with the intention that it not be repeated in future years. FC members proposed having someone, perhaps Admissions Director Julia Hwang, keep track of all

URM applications during the process to monitor what's occurring.

Recommendations for 2020-2021

- Keep application review cycle the same. However the cycle may be pushed back due to COVID-19 issues.
- Move DDS/PhD review process separately so that one committee can review all candidates (vs. each candidate be reviewed separately by DDS and PhD committees). Like IDP, this Committee will bring candidates for admission to the main Admissions Committee for final approval.
- For IDP, move all of the process online to be parallel with the DDS process
- Keep 3 dedicated readers. A new reader – Justin Griest – has been proposed and needs FC approval.
- Keep faculty members at 10 and student members to 2. FC members recommended keeping the Admissions Committee members at 12, as this will be an unusual year with COVID-19 and it's highly feasible that some faculty members may drop off of the committee due to other commitments.
- Perhaps also develop a set of guidelines to help those reviewing remember they're not necessarily looking for the best GPA but for many other things. Members thought having more than 1 reviewer per application could eliminate some implicit bias issues.

Educational Policy Committee (EPC) Priorities

EPC Chair White provided an update on the committee's actions for this academic year, and sought feedback from Council members. No vote was taken on proposed changes to bylaws. Chair Mertz will request members of the School's Curriculum Committee attend an upcoming meeting to discuss how that group interfaces with EPC. Following that presentation, Council members will vote on the proposed bylaw changes, with the intention of having them be on the Consent Calendar for the May Full Faculty meeting.

a. EPC Charge

This committee reports to the Faculty Council. In addition to giving students' commendation letters, it receives course evaluations from students. If the combined average of course evaluations is below a 4.0, then a quality improvement process is initiated. That form is discussed later on.

1. Course/Program Evaluation Report Form

- a. Chair White presented the revised report form for discussion. The form requests feedback from students on the course/program, as well as suggestions for course/program development, and separately, course/program development opportunities. On page 2 of the report form is mention that comments received can be "used to support faculty in applying for membership to the Haile T. Debas Academy of Medical Educators at UCSF.

Q: FC members asked if there were any course issues that faculty have challenged?

A: Chair White advised that in some instances, faculty have declined to accept the overall course evaluation citing guest lecturers as being those receiving the score, not the faculty of record. EPC has declined to accept that justification and has required the faculty of record to take ownership of the course rating, and work with EPC on executing the QI plan. If a course receives a 4.5 or higher, EPC reaches out to the faculty of record to discover what they did well, so it can be replicated. EPC Chair White also advised that the committee looks back at prior evaluations once a quarter or as data becomes available.

EPC acknowledges that there remains an issue with number of course evaluations received. They're working to increase the number these. EPC members recognize that there is an unfairness to determining a course valuation off of a handful of evaluations, especially if the course had over 100 students.

Chair White advised the course evaluations and faculty evaluations are different. But right now they must fix course evaluations, especially the number received, in order to then change faculty evaluations. Student Representative Gigli advised that in some classes, students are given a set protected in-class time to fill out these evaluations. That could be an approach moving forward.

b. Quality Improvement Process

Chair White went over this process, including EPC's ongoing analysis. To date the process is as follows:

1. Course Director with LSC Assistance:
 - i. Completes QUE framework, submits to Curriculum Committee for review/approval (1-2 weeks).
2. Curriculum Committee once approved, submits to COCOI:
 - i. Committee reviews proposed changes, makes recommendations or approves for submission in Course Review system for COCOI review/approval (2-4 weeks).
3. EPC Chair/Committee Dept and EPC Chair approve in the Course Review system:
 - i. Course listed in EPC Chair queue, Chair approves and forwards to COCOI in Course Review system or requests EPC Committee review (1-4 weeks)
4. COCOI/Academic Senate approve in Course Review system; published.
 - i. Academic Senate committee member reviews and either approves or send back for changes. Published in subsequent UCSF Course Catalog (4-6 weeks)
5. The ongoing analysis focuses on two questions:
 - i. What is the timeline for implementation and plan for ongoing review/analyzing success?
 - ii. Could the improvement be standardized to other courses or across the curriculum?

c. Proposed EPC Bylaw Revisions for Review

1. Bylaws are being revised to formalize pre-existing practices, including the addition of three students as members, and to clarify its charge.
2. FC members discussed speaking with the Curriculum Committee—which is a school-specific committee which doesn't answer to the Faculty Council—
3. Chair White advised that EPC used to be predoctoral, but Associate Dean of Curriculum, Sara Hughes, posed the question that no one has collective oversight on graduate courses. While program directors manage the individual programs, broadly speaking there's no one looking at the overall graduate programs.
4. Post discussion at the next Council meeting with members of the Curriculum Committee, FC will vote on approval of these revisions.

Student Status Committee

No report was provided during 2019-2020. Council members voted on new Chairs for the D2 Class (Ana Casal) and the ID3 Class (William Hsin).

Student Concerns

During 2019-2020 academic year, student representative Steven Gigli provided an overview of issues students were raising as concerns. SOD FC also welcomed new student representative Laura Hubacek in late spring 2020. These student issues included the following:

- Clinic Schedule Changes: Released in February 2020, as scheduled, they impact mission trips that take approximately 50-80 students over spring break. FC members suggested that students pursuing mission trips should be given first choice for changing schedules. Student

agree with the idea, but limit their expectation that it will work out in that manner.

- COVID-19 & Distance Learning: Students appreciated leadership efforts around the pandemic. The School is making contingency plans through to fall 2020. For courses that are partly didactic and clinical, the didactic will be held first. When clinical does open up, students will move directly to clinic.
- Mock Boards: While students didn't initially receive these well—as many failed them—however by the end, they were greatly appreciated. Of particular concern by students was that the test preparation (Kaplan) was very different from the actual test.
- Student Concern Center: Housed in the Learner Success Center, this will launch in March 2020.

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the School of Dentistry Faculty Council will continue into 2020-2021:

- COVID-19 Impact to Education
- School Strategic Planning & Alignment with True North

Appendices

Appendix 1: Fourth Floor Poster

Senate Staff:
Alison Cleaver, Associate Director; Alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu; 415.476.3808