School of Medicine Faculty Council
Lydia Zablotska, MD, PhD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT
2016-2017

Primary Focus Points for the Year:
• Allowable Effort (95% Rule) Policy
• Education Funds Flow Model
• Faculty Learning and Development Fund
• Faculty Workspace Planning
• Improving Communication with Faculty
• Mission Hall Survey Results
• Open Access 2020
• Personalized Mentoring Advancement and Promotion Educational Module (PMAP)
• Review of Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Policy
• SOM Bylaw Revisions
• Training in Clinical Research Degree
• UCSF Fresno Report

Issues for Next Year (2017-2018)
• Bridges Curriculum
• Improving Communication with Faculty
• School of Medicine Faculty Development Fund
• School of Medicine Governance

2016-2017 Members

Lydia Zablotska, Chair
Nisha Parikh, Vice Chair
Tim Kelly (Past-Chair)
Thomas Chi
Cynthia Curry
Rena Fox
Matthew Haight
Jialing Liu
Marta Margeta
Hope Rugo
Gabriel Sarah
M. Reza Vagefi

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

Number of Meetings: 9
Senate Analyst: Artemio Cardenas

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

Allowable Effort (95% Rule) Policy
In the spring of 2016, the federal government recommended that UCSF should modify its current 95% maximum effort policy on federally funded projects and move to a 100% sponsor funded faculty policy. To determine whether or not UCSF needs to revise their effort policies, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Dan Lowenstein asked the Academic Senate to review the issue and provide a recommendation. In the Fall of 2016, the Senate convened a task force. In December, the task force completed their report and presented it to the Executive Council in January. The recommendation from the group was to maintain the 95% maximum effort policy. If faculty want an exemption to the policy, they must provide a justification. In April and May, council members received comments from SOM faculty who were concerned with the 5% gap. Faculty noted that they often have to find funding to fill the gap. In response, Council members and the Academic Senate asked for more information on how many faculty at UCSF the 95% rule impacts. After numerous requests, the information was not provided.

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), which is being led by the Max Planck Institute in Germany. 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 was 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, but voiced concerns over the implementation. Council members asked to continue to monitor developments (Appendix 1).

Personalized Mentoring Advancement and Promotion Educational Module (PMAP) Presentation
In February, former Committee on Academic Personnel member Lynn Pulliam 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

In May, the PMAP system went live. All faculty are now able to view their own profile via the Senate Service Portal.

Review of Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Policy
In the fall of 2016, the Office of the President initiated a systemwide 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 summary on PDST charges can be found here - http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/underreview/documents/pdst-policy-2016.pdf. In November, Chair Zablotska informed the Council that UCSF Division Chair Ruth Greenblatt has asked that all schools to review the use of the PDST funds and provide a report on what activities the revenue is used to support. In December, Vice Dean for Education Catherine Lucey and the SOM Budget Office provided a document which provided an overview of how PDST revenue is allocated. Overall, the Council agreed to support the proposed PDST policy revisions and the idea of increasing the predictability of PDST levels in the future. Based on the financial reports provided by the School of Medicine (SOM) Medical Education Office, the PDST revenue supports essential educational activities such as financial aid, student services, educational support in the form of faculty and staff salaries, and the accreditation process (Appendix 2).

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

Educational Funds Flow Model Update
In January, Vice Dean Catherine Lucey provided a report on the school's effort to implement a new Educational Funds Flow Model. To provide background on the issue, Vice Dean Lucey summarized the work on the Educational Funds Flow Model over the past couple of years. Starting in June of 2015, the School of Medicine began to consider the development of a new centralized funding model that would further support the educational mission. Several decades ago, each department was responsible for courses that directly related to their subject scope. Then, to allow for efficiencies, departments formed agreements with each other to integrate courses that were pedagogically similar. While the system of agreements had functioned well for years, it eventually ran into problems as department leadership turned over. New department chairs have asked why they are paying for courses they feel another department should have responsibility over. In addition to department issues, the new clinical funds flow model has put more pressure on the entire system as faculty and departments have focused more of their efforts on revenue generation through maximizing RVUs.

To address the issue, leadership began to work to develop a new centralized education funds flow model that is similar to the clinical and research funds flow models current in use in the school. Vice Dean Lucey explained that undergraduate medical education will be part of Phase 1; Graduate Medical Education will be part of Phase 2; and Graduate Education will be Phase 3. Undergraduate medical education was selected to be part of the first phase because the issues with the system is most acute the system and it requires that most amount of intensive teaching.

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

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

In April of 2016, the School of Medicine Chairs and Directors group decided to support the new educational financing model by increasing the tax that the Dean's Office levees on each department, from 4% to 4.5%.

Over the course of the fall of 2016, the school began to roll out the new model. Under the plan, each faculty member participating in "high-intensity" teaching is paid a percentage of their release time. Currently, the funds devoted to the new model are being used for those teaching in the Bridges curriculum. For the faculty teaching in the prior curriculum, their additional support is being paid out of reserves.

At the end of the presentation, Council members thanked Vice Dean Lucey and all those involved in the project. Member also encouraged the school administration to do more to promote the goals, implementation and details of the model. The development of a website was proposed. Vice Dean Lucey agreed and stated that she would look into doing more communication.

Faculty Development Fund

In October n 2014, the Chancellor announced that he would be awarding the Academic Senate with an annually re-occurring fund of $500,000. The aim of the fund would be to benefit faculty life. After receiving the funds in the spring of 2015, the Senate decided to break up the Senate committees into five clusters and divide the funding equally. After further discussion amongst the Senate, a decision was made to allocate $22,901 of the Chancellor's fund to the School of Medicine for Faculty Development activities. The total fund was doubled to $45,802 when the Dean agreed to match the funds. In the spring of 2015, the Council received almost 33 applications requesting over $120,000. In the fall of 2015, Council members decided to focus the development funds on early-career faculty. In the spring of 2016, the Council received 10 applications requesting over $40,000.

In October, the Faculty Council discussed what to do with the funding for the 2016-2017 academic year. Council members agreed that the Faculty Development program should continue, but there should be improvements made to the promotion of the opportunity. Members agreed to keep the same funding statement from the previous year, "The funds are intended to give all faculty members an opportunity to participate in a broad range of development activities. These include, but are not limited to, formal training courses to improve teaching or to develop new professional skills; leadership development programs; academic and training courses; leadership programs; and external professional development consultation. Preference will be given to applications that benefit other faculty and/or the school."

Members discussed the following additional eligibility guidelines:

1. UCSF faculty appointment must be at 100%
2. UCSF faculty appointment must be within ten years or less. Preference will be given to faculty with five years or less.
3. Awards are limited to $5000
4. Applicants may only receive one full or partial grant every 3 years.
5. Applicants must provide a detailed description of how the activity will benefit their career. Proposals should not surpass 2 single-spaced pages. Supporting documentation does not count towards the page limit.
6. Applicants must prove that funding does not currently exist for the opportunity

To encourage more faculty to apply, Council members would like the fund to be promoted in January. Email notification should be clear and appealing. The call for applications will go out in February and the deadline will be in March. Council members agreed upon the following guidelines and dates:

Posting Date: February 1, 2017
Proposal Due Date: March 15, 2017
Applicants Notified of Decision: April 15, 2017

In March, the Council has received 27 applications with total requests of approx. $84,000. To review the applications, Chair Zablotska proposed using a review process similar to the NIH. The council broke out the applications into sets and each set will be assigned two reviewers. Scores were gathered and proposals ranked. The final decisions were made at the April 13 meeting. Award notifications were sent on April 15.

Faculty Workspace Planning

In November, Vice Dean Bruce Wintroub attended the council meeting to present on space governance and planning at UCSF. He provided the following report:
- Overview of UCSF Space Governance
  - UCSF Space Committee

- Previously called the Space Development Committee
- Co-Chairs EVCP Dan Lowenstein and Senior Vice Chancellor of Budget Paul Jenny
- This committee oversees all space subcommittees
  - UCSF Space Management Subcommittee
    - Previously known as the Space Committee
    - This subcommittee is focused on the management of existing space
    - Committees that report to the Space Management Subcommittee include:
      - School Space Committees
      - Open Plan Building Governance Committees
      - Space Management Working Group
  - UCSF New Space Development Subcommittee
    - New Committee
    - This committee is devoted to the planning of new work and research space on campus
    - Committees that report to the New Space Development Subcommittee include:
      - Building Programming Committees
        - These are ad hoc groups that meet as a new building is programmed
        - Chairs vary per building
      - Building Working Groups
        - These are ad hoc groups that meet as needed
- Mission Hall Space Governance
  - Vice Dean Wintroub informed the Council that Mission Hall Space Governance is managed by the UCSF Space Management Sub-committee. Several blocks report and provide recommendations to the Building Governance committee in the following format:
    - Building Governance Committee
      - Space Administration Block A
      - Space Administration Block B
      - Space Administration Block C
      - There are also sub-blocks are under each of the blocks
- Mission Hall Capital Improvements
  - $4.3 Million has been approved and funded.
    - Council members noted that very little communication has gone out regarding the approved funding and plans to make improvements to Mission Hall. Vice Dean Wintroub noted that the space.ucsf.edu could include more information.
  - Timeline for capital improvements is 8-10 months
  - 65% of focus rooms on all floors will be converted to private offices
  - Vacated work stations will be returned to the Block and held for Chancellor mandated assignment to Precision Cancer Medicine Building (Phase 1B) occupants
  - Space held for PCMB occupants may be request from the Campus for short term needs.
- UCSF Space Field Observation, 2016
  - For an overview of how efficiently space is currently used. Campus Planning is leading walk-throughs at Mission Bay, Mt. Zion and Parnassus
  - In September, 45 floors were walked by three teams in three days
  - Preliminary Data (35-40% of research space)
  - Results:
    - Mission Bay – 30% was found vacant
    - Mt. Zion – 32% was found vacant
    - Parnassus – 47% was found vacant
  - Leadership would like to develop a roadmap for the revitalization of Parnassus to ensure the efficient use of space
- Questions
  - See space.ucsf.edu for more information on major construction and renovation projects

In March, Dean Talmadge King provided an additional update on space planning:

- o UCSF leadership has been working on the development of space policies that will best utilize new and existing space. In regards to existing space, the campus performed an audit of wet and dry lab space across campus. The result of the survey showed that there is a considerable amount of space, especially on the Parnassus campus, that is not used. To address this issue, the Dean's Office recently released a note to department chairs stating that beginning on January 1, 2017, when a faculty member (or faculty fellow) vacates 1000 assignable square feet or more, the following policies apply:
  - Notification to the Space Committee
    - The department or ORU must notify the SOM Space Committee in writing 30 days before, or as soon as it is known that a faculty member (or faculty fellow) will vacate space.
    - It is the department's or ORU's responsibility to request continued use of the vacated space; if not request, the space returns to control of the Dean's Office.
    - If the department fails to notify the SOM Space Committee, the school may seize the space.
  - Following the Notification, the Department Chair/Director must:
    - Within 90 days of notifying the SOM Space Committee, present to the Space committee a detailed proposal for continued use. The proposal must describe committed financial resources and a timeline for execution.
    - The SOM Space Committee must approve the proposal and will submit its recommendation to the SOM Dean.
    - If approved by the SOM Dean, the department will be allowed up to a maximum of 2 years to execute the proposed plan
    - For approved proposals, the department will be required to provide an update to the committee 6 months before the specified time ends.
    - If the committee does not approve the proposal, the space returns to the dean.

Dean King informed the Council that if they wanted more information on the space policies and governance they should visit UCSF's space website - http://space.ucsf.edu/school-space-committees-and-policies.

Council members then asked whether the school has plans to renovate existing space? Dean King noted that university leadership realizes that a lot of resources have gone to Mission Bay and that Parnassus facilities have been neglected. To address this issue, the Chancellor's Cabinet is looking at plans to comprehensively renovate the Health Science West and East buildings. These renovations will go beyond the small changes to HSW and HSE that have been going over the course of the past year. The estimated cost of the renovation is around $1 billion. While half of the project could be financed through the university, we need to make efforts to find donors for the other half of the expenses.

Improving Communications with Faculty

In October, the council agreed to make communication with faculty a priority. In December, Communications Director Sarah Paris was invited to attend the council meeting to discuss potential solutions for how the group can improve communication with faculty across the school. Chair Zablotska informed Director Paris that the Council is designed to represent the broad interests of the School of Medicine faculty. The point is to ensure that all faculty are equally represented and their voices are heard. To ensure effective communication with each respective constituency, council members were interested in learning about strategies and resources available in the School of Medicine.

Director Paris provided the following ideas for the council:
- Custom Listserv: The Council should develop email listservs for particular faculty groups. Once developed, the Council can use the following strategies to ensure that the communications have the greatest impact:
  - o Timing and location
  - o Audience

- o   Use attention grabbing subject lines that help to triage the email
- o   Create news digests
- o   Send physical postcards for events
- o   Utilize digital signage
- Faculty Profiles: Each faculty member at UCSF has a profile website. If used effectively, the service can be a very powerful tool in connecting faculty. Council members should consider adding information on the Faculty Council to their profile.
- School of Medicine Intranet: The School has discussed the idea of developing an intranet that would include all SOM information and news on one site. It is yet to be seen whether this resource will be developed.
- Consultant Review: The School of Medicine has hired a consultant firm to do a review of all of the communications resources. The report will provide recommendations for how communication can be improved in the school. The Council should review the report once complete.

In May, School of Medicine Chief of Staff Olivia Herbert and Communications Manager Shelley Wong attended the council meeting to discuss additional solutions to improve communication with faculty. Chief of Staff Herbert started the conversation by noting that she had reviewed the proposed letters from the faculty council members to respective constituents. She stated that she like the drafts, but requested that the council include some type of call to action. Members agreed that there should be something added that request faculty to act. Chief of Staff Herbert then reviewed the following communication strategies that could assist the Council:
- Email Analytics: The School of Medicine now has a new program that can monitor email to determine the impact of a message. For example, if the council sends out an email communication to faculty, the school can monitor how many faculty opened the email and how long they read the message. The newly available software application will allow the council to understand the impact of a particular message.
- Smart Mail: Communications Manager Wong added that the School has been working on a best practice guide for email. The council can use the techniques included in the guide to help increase the effectiveness of future email communications. Coupled with the email monitoring software, the council can work smarter in communicating with faculty.
- SOM Chairs and Directors: Chief of Staff Herbert noted that the SOM Chairs and Directors meetings are great ways to communicate with the school as a whole. Council members can email issues or work through the council chair to have items important to the faculty council added to the chairs and directors meeting agenda.

In May, each council member sent out an email to their respective constituents to report on the work of the council and ask for feedback from members. Council members received some feedback regarding space the 95% rule policy. Council members believed that the outreach did work and they would like to do more in the future.

Mission Hall Survey Results
In April of 2016, a consultant firm hired by UCSF conducted a survey of all Mission Hall occupants. The purpose of the survey is to study how well faculty and staff are working in an activity-based workspace. In June of 2016, the results of the survey were released to all Academic Senate for review and comment. To increase transparency, Chair Zablotska requested that council obtain the necessary permission to post the survey results online for all faculty to view. In April of 2017, the Office of Capital Programs released the consultants review of the Mission Hall workspace (Appendix 3). The study included an analysis of the Mission Hall survey results (Appendix 4). In May, the Capital Programs office approved the council's request to post the raw survey results online for all faculty to view. After obtaining permission, a notification from the faculty council was sent out to all faculty in the school to inform them of the Mission Hall report and the raw results.

SOM Bylaw Revisions
In May, Associate Dean Susan Masters informed the Council that last year, the UCSF SOM education deans, in partnership with the Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy (CCEP), proposed major revisions to the UCSF Appendix IV Bylaws, Regulations, and Procedures of the SOM, which were

approved by the Academic Senate. Since last year, further review of Appendix IV by the SOM educational leadership has resulted in additional proposed revisions for the purpose of clarification, correcting omissions, and aligning the bylaws with the new SOM Bridges Curriculum. Recommendations are detailed below. The page numbers referenced correspond to the PDF version of Appendix 4 (Attachment 5).

- **CCEP Membership**
  - o In Section II.2.A.2.d regarding permanent guests on the CCEP (p. 4), we recommend deleting:
    "iii. Chairs of the UME curriculum subcommittees." In the new Bridges governance system, the education subcommittee structure has changed dramatically so there is now one Executive Committee chaired by the Associate Dean for Curriculum and 11 subcommittees that report to the Executive committee. It would be unwieldy and would have a negative impact on discussion (due to such a large group) to invite the 11 subcommittee chairs to CCEP meetings. We believe it is sufficient for the Associate Dean for Curriculum to represent the Executive Committee and its subcommittees at CCEP.
- **Committee on Admissions**
  - o In Section II.2.B regarding the Committee on Admissions (pp. 5-6), we have amplified the description of Membership and Procedures to provide more details about the committee's practices.
  - o *Section II.2.B.2.c, p.5*: We have provided an explicit description of the individual components of the Admissions Committee (Interviewers, an Executive Committee, and an Alternate List Subcommittee).
  - o *Section II.2.B.3.a, p.5*: We have been explicit that the Associate Dean for Admissions is a non- voting participant in the selection process.
  - o *Section II.2.B.3.b, p.5*: We have moved the description of the Associate Dean's role in orienting members of the committee from Section 3a to 3b.
  - o *Section II.2.B.3.c, p.6*: We have added an explicit description of the quorum and the majority required for a final decision on admission.
  - o *Section II.2.B.3.d and e, p.6*: We have added an explicit description of the terms of appointment to the Admissions Committee.
- **Committee on Academic Standards Membership Term Renewability**
  - o In Section II.2.D.2 regarding membership on the Committee on Academic Standards (pp. 6-7), we recommend adding the option for one renewal for members and changing the number of renewals for the Chair from one to two. The actual change in language would be Section II.2.D.2.a.ii, p. 6: "Members will serve an eight-year term, renewable once, contingent on satisfactory annual performance as judged by the Committee Chair.
  - o Section II.2.D.2.b, pp. 6-7: The Chair will serve in the role for a term of three years, renewable twice. The reason for proposing an extension of potential terms for members and the chair has to do with the unique nature of this committee. The committee meets on an ad hoc basis to complete an in-depth review of a student's entire academic record. This is a high-stakes review that may lead to a mandated leave of absence, repetition of a curriculum segment, or dismissal. It is important to have members and a chair with experience in these types of review. Because the committee meets infrequently, sometimes with a year or more between meetings, membership stability over a long period of time is extremely helpful. We decided to propose increases in renewability rather than increases in base terms to provide flexibility.
- **Committee on Student Welfare**
  - o Section II.2.E (p. 7) defines the functions and membership of a Committee on Student Welfare (p.7). We recommend that this section be deleted. This ad hoc committee has not been convened as far as the institutional memory of current SOM educational leadership goes back, meaning at least 20 years. It seems inefficient to appoint yearly a committee of faculty and students who do not ever meet and, in fact, such appointments have not been consistent. There are other established avenues for faculty and student discussions of academic freedom, including the SOM governance committees and the Student Faculty Liaison Committee, a monthly meeting of SOM education deans, faculty and the student Associated Students of the School of Medicine leadership. There are

UCSF offices with expertise and authority to handle potential intersections between academic freedom and protected rights against discrimination, racism, and sexual harassment. The 100.00 Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline regulates student conduct potentially related to issues of freedom speech. Additionally, we believe that the SOM Dean and the Dean's designees have the authority to appoint a committee to educate issues of academic freedom. With all of these alternatives, we do not see the need to include this standing committee in the SOM bylaws.

- **Consistency of Reference to the SOM Faculty Council**
  - We noted that Appendix IV lacks consistency in referring to the SOM Faculty Council, sometimes calling it "Faculty Council" and other times call it the "Council of Faculty." We recommend a decision of the correct title and then the editing of Appendix IV to attain consistency.

Council members review and approved all proposed bylaw revisions. In July, the School of Medicine Full Faculty approved the changes via an online vote.

Training in Clinical Research Degree
In March, Dean Elizabeth Watkins attended the Council meeting to discuss the Training in Clinical Research degree program. Members requested more information on the program and to learn more about whether it could be expanded. Dean Watkins informed the group that it is a very popular program that is well respected. She noted that currently, the program serves UCSF community members. However, there is interest of involving other individuals, external to our community, to enroll. The trouble is that the program is self-sustaining and there are limitations to expansion. If offer widely, a new model would have to be developed to hire more faculty and build up resources. Member Robert Hiatt informed the group that the program is top notch, but the faculty workload is an issue. Council members informed Dean Watkins and member Hiatt that they would like to be consulted if there are ever any plans to expand the program. Dean Watkins agreed.

UCSF Fresno Update
UCSF Fresno representative Cynthia Curry attend the Council meeting to provide a update on the work of the Fresno campus. The following items were covered:
- New Construction
  - New Ambulatory Care Center
  - New Clovis Cancer Center
- Faculty and Staff
  - 264 Core Faculty
  - 408 Non-Core Faculty
  - 126 Staff
- Residents, Students and Fellows
  - 260 Residents
    - 9 specialties
  - 50 Fellows
    - 17 subspecialties
  - 300 3rd and 4th year Medical Students
  - All Residencies Filled For 6th Year
  - 50% of Trainees Remain in the Central Valley
- New Dean
  - UCSF Fresno has a new Dean, Dr. Michael Peterson
  - Faculty are excited about the new leadership and have great respect for Dr. Peterson
- New Endowed Chair of Emergency Medicine
  - Dr. Gene Kallsen
- Improving Health Care in the Central Valley
  - UCSF Benioff Children's Hospitals and Community Medical Centers Joined to Expand Children's Specialty Medical Care in the Valley
- Communication with Dean Talmadge King

- o On November 17th, 2016, Dr. King held a town hall with the faculty. This event was much appreciated and well received.
- Research
    - o 59 current grants and contracts, totaling over $7 million dollars
    - o 21 clinical trials are ongoing
    - o 14 grants for public service or instruction
    - o All Pediatrics residents participate in research
    - o Several UCSF Fresno faculty participating in UCSF Main Campus studies.

At the end of the presentation, Council members asked if UCSF Fresno faculty have any concerns that the SOM Council should be aware of at the moment. Member Curry noted that under the new leadership, faculty have a very positive outlook for the future of the campus and UCSF. If anything comes up, member Curry will let the Council know.

<div style="background-color:navy;color:white;text-align:center;font-weight:bold">School of Medicine Standing Committee Reports</div>

Admissions Committee Report

In June, Associate Dean of Admissions David Wofsy reported on the following items:
- Review of the Admissions Process
    - o Review and Screening
    - o Interviews
    - o Committee Reviews and Decisions
- Admission Committee Membership
    - o At the beginning of the academic year, faculty council members noted a concern that the admissions committee roster was heavily represented by faculty who were at the full professor rank. In response to the concern, Associate Dean Wofsy acknowledged the council's concern and responded that the admissions committee requires a significant amount of faculty time and effort. Generally junior faculty do not have the time to commit. Furthermore, Associate Dean Wofsy has observed that admission committee benefits from member experience. Late to mid-career faculty tend to be able to provide long-term service.
- o Faculty Council Assistance
    - o Council members asked what they could do to assist the Admissions Committee. Associate Dean Wofsy informed the Council that he would appreciate assistance in the recruitment of new committee members.
    - o

<div style="background-color:navy;color:white;text-align:center;font-weight:bold">Appendices</div>

Appendix 1:   Letter of Support for Open Access 2020

Appendix 2:   SOM Communication on PDST Policy Review

Appendix 3:   Mission Hall Report

Appendix 4:   Mission Hall Survey Results

Appendix 5:   SOM Bylaw Revisions

Appendix 6:   UCSF Fresno Report