
2017-2018 ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The UC Board of Regents has long delegated to the faculty the authority and responsibility for key components of the University enterprise. Through the agency of the Academic Senate, [Regents Bylaw 40.2](#) (formerly Standing Order 105.2) delegates the responsibility for determining for condition of admission for degree and certificate programs, authorizing and supervising all courses and curricula, and has the right to form committees to advise the Chancellor and/or President on the budget, as well as other issues pertaining to the governance of the University. In practice, this means that the governance of the University is in fact shared between the Academic Senate and the University administration, which acts through authorities specifically delegated to the President of the University and the Chancellors.

The respective Divisional or campus Academic Senates share governance responsibilities with their respective campus leadership and administration(s), and partner with the UC Office of the President (UCOP) on systemwide issues. Academic Senate business is conducted through various standing committees and faculty councils that are focused on key subject matters.

The UC San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate aims to be a partner with both the faculty and the Administration. The office's practices invite an open dialogue between all parties, giving space for concerns, comments, and feedback on proposed policy changes on its committees and faculty councils. The Senate is focused on consensus-building but strongly supports inclusion of minority reports where appropriate. At UCSF this structure allows faculty to participate in the planning stages of initiatives with campus leadership.

The pace and complexity of issues coming to the Senate for analysis and creative solutions has continued to increase in the past year, and has altered how the Senate responds to issues. This year saw the elimination of one of two annual Division Meetings replaced instead by topic-specific Town Halls which focused on issues faculty identified as of a primary importance. Senate staff have also advised that faculty more readily approach them on campus to initiate issue-specific conversations than in years' past.

As a professional services group, the Academic Senate Office is composed of career professionals with backgrounds in local and state government, law, and academic governance. We bring these backgrounds to bear in a measured, but proactive, approach in addressing faculty concerns, and the issues facing UCSF and the UC system at this time.

The following 2017-2018 report provides a broad overview on the Senate's major projects for this academic year, plus activities by key standing committees, and changes in the office.

OFFICE CHANGES & COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

During 2017-2018 academic year, the Academic Senate Office launched a quarterly newsletter, and hired a Faculty Engagement Analyst who's focused on outreach and coordination with faculty and other UCSF offices. It also saw the Senate launch a new version of the Senate Service Portal (SSP), through which all standing committees and councils are managed administratively (e.g., meetings, agendas, minutes, etc.), along with Divisional votes and surveys concerning legislative actions.

Senate Newsletter & Communications

Called "[Slice of Pie](#)" (SP), and intending as a complement to EVCP Lowenstein's "[Espresso](#)", the Senate newsletter provided overview articles on substantial Senate business important to faculty including space, research, and marketing efforts aimed at encouraging faculty to serve on Senate standing committees and councils. With the growth of UC Health, the Senate has seen a decrease in the volume of clinicians participating regularly or volunteering to serve on Senate Committees. Links to past issues of SP can be found [here](#).

The Senate will also be providing articles upcoming for the Research monthly newsletter coming out of VC Criswell's Office.

In 2017-18, the Senate has continued to author faculty profiles and independent articles on changes to space throughout UCSF and how faculty might be impacted by their moves into these buildings. To read a full summary of last year's Communications' efforts, please see [Appendix 1](#).

Faculty Engagement Analyst

These past few years have seen the Senate's need to focus on detailed analytical work result in administrative matters being addressed in a less than timely manner. After conducting a prior unsuccessful employee search for a Faculty Engagement Analyst and Events Planner, this year the Senate Office was able to hire an Analyst II, Amber Cobbett, into this role.

Joining UCSF from the Academy of Art, Amber Cobbett is an experienced administrator who is also the office's event planner, and is responsible for bolstering faculty participation and implementing a grassroots communications strategy encouraging faculty dialogue with Senate Office analysts and leadership. She is also a junior committee analyst who will be assuming staffing the Senate's Committee on Courses of Instruction in 2018-2019. Quickly establishing herself as a networker, Amber has already had seasoned UCSF staff outside of the Senate volunteer to serve as her mentor as she grows into this role and beyond it.

Making the Senate Service Portal More Faculty-Friendly

In September 2017, the Academic Senate Office launched a project to revamp the existing Senate Service Portal site (found through MyAccess). The goal of the site change was to make it more user-friendly and accessible to faculty, to have the website be better integrated with other UCSF websites and to improve functionality of the site for the Academic Senate Staff Members. There were also other Senate Office activities which have historically been managed via email, but with the increased pace of business, the Senate needed a new non-email solution.

SELECTED COMMITTEE EFFORTS 2017-2018

In 2017-2018, the Senate found that standing committee and council discussions were more robust and required more analyst due diligence. This year also marked the first year in many where faculty actively approached Senate analysts on campus to discuss issues outside of committee meetings. This is a level of active engagement not previously seen:

Standing Committees

Clinical Affairs Committee

Clinically Integrated Network

Clinical Affairs (CAC) spent considerable time discussing ways to support UCSF's affiliated physicians experiencing organizational and clinical programming implications that often surface following the completion of formal affiliation. Members expressed their interest in developing closer, strategic relationships with affiliated physicians and working with UCSF Health to draft guidelines that support clinical programming. Proposed guidelines would formally come from the Senate to UCSF Health with the intention of improving engagement between UCSF faculty and affiliated physicians where appropriate.

UCSF Health affiliations

During the 2017-2018 year, UC Health engaged all medical center campuses with the intention of focusing on best practices concerning quality and brand due diligence. The result of this effort identified the need for each affiliate's medical director to develop a scorecard similar to UCSF's True North Goals. A key component of UCSF Health's affiliations will include adding to five-year affiliation agreements co-branding provisions. They will also allow new affiliates to correct issues within a sixty-day period. In addition, large affiliations will require consultation with Adrienne Green, the chief medical officer of UCSF Medical Center.

The UCSF Health Leadership Council is expected to publish a list of affiliations, a leadership guide to UCSF Health and establish a health governance committee in 2018-2019. In May, Chief Strategy Officer Shelby Decosta sought CAC's feedback on the Council's Partnership Guidelines, which were a recommendation of the Joint Academic Senate-Administration Review Committee on Campus Affiliation Policy 100-10.

Systemwide Clinical Affairs Advisory Group

CAC Chair Steve Hetts and Vice Chair Steve Hays served on the Clinical Affairs Advisory Group, a systemwide ad-hoc clinical faculty advisory group whose members represent faculty at their respective UC medical center campuses (UCSF, UCD, UCLA, UCI, UCSD). The group was formed in 2017 by Professor Emeritus Joel Dimsdale, MD, who served on the Regents Health Services Committee as the faculty representative. On July 1, the Academic Council appointed CAC Chair Steven Hetts as the Faculty Representative on the Regents Health Services Committee. Dr. Hetts will serve a 1-year term with an option for renewal. Dr. Hetts' appointment marks an important milestone for faculty in the San Francisco Division and health sciences faculty across the University of California, who currently lack a formal conduit to the Academic Senate and UC Health.

Committee on Courses of Instruction

COCOI approved four new subjects during the 2017-2018 Academic Year. From the School of Pharmacy COCOI approved the new subject Pharmacy Integrated Sciences. From the School of Nursing, COCOI approved the new subjects Implementation Science and Nursing Skills Lab. From the Graduate Division, COCOI approved the new subject Graduate Studies.

Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication

Academic freedom and publishing practices

During the spring quarter, Professor Ruth Malone requested COLASC's response to actions taken by publisher Taylor and Francis that ran counter to the guidelines of the Committee on Publishing Ethics (COPE). In a communication from Drexel University Professor Arthur Frank, MD to the National Library of Medicine (NLOM), Professor Frank requested the NLOM to remove the International Journal of Environmental and Occupational Health (IJEHO) from Medline on the following grounds: 1) The publisher's lack of consultation with the Journal's editorial board on matters within the board's scope; 2) The dismissal of the Journal's editor and the subsequent retraction of his publication that raised questions about industry science; and 3) threats from the publisher to rescind the former editor's publication decisions.

While the UCSF Library does not hold a subscription to the IJEHO, COLASC felt it was important to broaden this discussion across the campus and to the systemwide Senate. To plan the Committee's response, COLASC Chair Diana Laird, UL Shaffer, and Professor Stanton Glantz, the Committee on Committee's liaison to COLASC, began to develop a cross-campus strategy with the goal of implementation next term.

Committee on Space

In the 2017-2018 academic year, the Committee on Space, in partnership with the Committee on Committees, created two task forces: Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force and the Education Space Policy Task Force. Each task force met monthly during the spring and summer of 2018 and developed recommendations for principles and policies pertaining to space. The Committee on Space successfully advocated for the appointment of four Senate representatives on the University's Research and Administrative Space Policy (RASP) Work Group: Vineeta Singh, Tom Lang, Xaio Hu, and Fran Aweeka. Sri Nagarajan also served on the RASP Work Group as the alternate to Xaio Hu. The Committee also appointed Xaio Hu to represent the Senate on the Parnassus Master Plan Steering Committee.

In addition, the Committee requested Senate representation on the four working groups of the Parnassus Master Plan Steering Committee, and promptly recruited Kathy Yang, Carol Dawson-Rose, Sara Hughes, and Sri Nagarajan to serve on each working group. The Committee on Space and the working groups met with numerous campus leaders during the academic year. The committee also organized a space town hall with a panel that included Bruce Wintroub, Lori Yamauchi, Vineeta Singh, Arianne Teherani, and Louise Walter.

The Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force met at least monthly between March and June 2018. It consulted directly with campus leadership including EVCP Dan Lowenstein, Associate Vice Chancellor of Campus Planning Lori Yamauchi, University Librarian Chris Shaffer,

Academic Senate Chair David Teitel, and Senate Space Committee member Singh. The task force developed and recommended principles underpinning the allocation of space for non-direct patient care activities or clinicians and their staff. It also considered policies the administration would use for space assignment during space planning, oversight, and governance during space utilization/management of assigned space. The Senate espouses the following in allocating administrative space to clinicians: transparency, fairness, consistency, economic sustainability, strategic prioritization to align with all UCSF missions, and enabling faculty and staff success. The task force recommended that every UCSF faculty member have one private assigned office at UCSF for non-direct patient care activities with temporary “hotel space” at other locations if a clinician works at multiple locations. A private office should not be construed as a single room dedicated to only one person for their exclusive use.

The Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force convened five meetings between April and June 2018. The task force report incorporates feedback from the Space Town Hall and discussions with key stakeholders including University Librarian Chris Shaffer, Director of the Kanbar Center, Sandrijn Van Schaik, and Academic Senate Chair David Teitel. The task force recommended that UCSF educators be included in the membership of all UCSF space design, assignment, oversight, and utilization/management committees. The Senate also proposed developing and instituting a unified, seamless, and transparent education space reservation system that crosses the campus and UCSF Health.

The Senate also endorsed many of the recommendations from the RASP Work Group, especially its recommendation for the use of a dashboard for econometric evaluation of research productivity. The Senate advocated for the use of both quantitative econometric indices and qualitative academic impact metrics in a holistic assessment of research space utilization. The Senate submitted to the EVCP recommendations to operationalize a dashboard.

Committee on Research

In the 2017-2018 academic year, the Committee on Research (COR) awarded 23 RAP grants totaling \$963,761. The Committee also awarded travel grants to 20 members of the faculty, distributing \$8,833 for travel grants. COR planned, communicated, and facilitated a Town Hall with a panel of senior administrators: David Odato, Associate Vice Chancellor, Human Resources (HR); Jenny Schreiber, Assistant Vice Chancellor, HR; Winona Ward, Director, Office of Sponsored Research; Gretchen Kiser, Executive Director, Research Development Office; Laurie Herraiz, Director, Human Research Protection Program (HRPP); and Elizabeth Sinclair, Director, Research Resource Program.

In addition, the committee met with eight faculty nominators for the 2018-2019 Faculty Research Lecture awards.

- COR participated in the systemwide review of various policy issues during the year including the Presidential Policy on Export Controls, the Presidential Policy on Disclosure of Financial Interests and Management of COI in Private Sponsors of Research, and Revised APM-028.
- Regarding export controls, COR recognized that UC was out of compliance with federal laws and regulations and therefore supported the establishment of an Export Control Policy. However, COR noted that PIs are responsible for compliance with export control laws and are thus exposed to liability for potential violations. Implementation of an export control program at UCSF will be a significant undertaking that will require commitment of resources.

- COR supported the systemwide policy changes concerning conflicts of interest. However, in consultation with UCSF administrators, COR found significant confusion about how UCSF administered the former policy and how the new policy would impact UCSF.
- COR also addressed UCSF COI policy "Rule 11" during the year. Previously, in 2004, the Academic Senate recommended the elimination of Rule 11 from UCSF COI Guidelines. At that time, the administration declined to eliminate Rule 11. During the 2017-2018 year, COR asked the administration to revisit Rule 11. In particular, COR found the policy to be too broad and raised concerns that Rule 11 discouraged faculty from accepting offers to travel for or provide consultation to privately sponsored clinical research. The Office of Conflict of Interest agreed to reexamine Rule 11 during the 2018-2019 academic year.
- COR also successfully advocated for increased funding for the Office of Sponsored Research - Research Management Services in order to support additional FTEs to implement improvements to the subaward process. In doing so, COR highlighted the relationship between sufficient staffing and timely processing of subaward agreements.

Equal Opportunity

Following the systemwide implementation of diversity statements for faculty recruitment, EQOP drafted guidelines on the evaluation of diversity statements for faculty advancement and promotion with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). While VPAA Office determined it could not recommend implementing diversity statements as criteria for faculty advancement, CAP pledged to continue working with EQOP to disseminate these guidelines to faculty.

Faculty Welfare Committee

This past academic year saw this committee handle many topics related to faculty. We highlight here two primary topics: part-time academic series faculty and retiree health benefits.

Part-Time Academic Series Faculty

CFW investigated whether Academic Senate series faculty (Clinical X, Ladder Rank, and In Residence) could seek appointments at less than 100% time. The review was prompted by numerous faculty complaints, which noted that their School, Division, or Department would not allow a change in series to a Senate Series, despite otherwise meeting the specified criteria, because their appointment was less than 100%. The affected faculty were primarily women with childrearing responsibilities. The commonly cited policy for these decisions was Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Policy 220. However, a careful reading of APM 220-16, APM 220 Appendix B, and APM 760-29 made it clear that the University recognizes that faculty may hold less than full-time appointments in Senate series, either temporarily or permanently, in order to accommodate family caregiving responsibilities. The APM states that, in general, part-time appointments must be the faculty member's sole professional responsibility, and that each request, either for appointment or for change to part-time, must have the approval of the Chancellor. CFW consulted with VPAA Alldredge, who informed committee members that the Chancellor has delegated the approval authority cited in APM 220 to his office, and that he would be willing to approve requests on a case-by-case basis. CFW and the Executive Council subsequently sent a November 2017 letter to the School Deans advocating for part-time Senate appointments, which resulting in a local policy change for such part-time appointments.

Retiree Health Benefits

CFW followed the progress of the Retiree Health Working Group, which submitted their interim [report](#) in July 2018. The history of this issue goes back to June 2017 when UCFW opposing a proposed Regents item scheduled for discussion to remove the 70% floor for aggregate expenditures on retiree health, and allow a cap on the rate of growth of the maximum UC employer contribution to an individual retiree's health coverage at 3%. President Napolitano subsequently established the Retiree Health Working Group, which has been working over the past year to address concerns over retiree health. While the Working Group has not completed its work, UC President Napolitano announced in July 2018:

- There will be no significant changes to the retiree health program for 2019.
- The UC contribution for eligible retirees aged 65 and older who are not coordinated with Medicare will be gradually reduced to adjust to levels comparable to Medicare-coordinated retirees.

UCOP will continue to work with members of the Working Group through 2019. For further information on this, please see page 12 "Systemwide Reviews" of this report.

Graduate Council

Graduate Division Course Proposal

In November 2017, Dean Watkins presented the Graduate Division's proposal to offer courses in professional development and research ethics. As of now, the Research Ethics course is offered under the Biomedical Science Division. The professional development courses are offered, not for credit, by the Office of Career and Professional Development. For Research Ethics, currently, PhD programs other than Biomedical Sciences that are supported by NIH T32 grants (e.g., PSPG, CCB, etc.) have to explain why their students enroll in a course under the Biomedical Sciences Division. This change would alleviate that explanation. For the professional development courses, this would allow students to list said courses on their transcripts. On many other UC Campuses, the Graduate Division offers courses, giving this proposal precedent. Graduate Council approved this proposal. In the following months, this proposal was subsequently approved by the Committee on Education Policy, the Committee on Courses of Instruction and the Executive Council. In April, the proposal was approved by Full Faculty.

MS Genetic Counseling Proposal

Graduate Council received a proposal to create a new Master's Program in Genetic Counseling in April. Graduate Council reviewed the proposal at the May meeting and responded via letter to the proposed program directors, asking questions about the program and making suggestions and improvements. The program directors resubmitted the proposal in June, incorporating Graduate Council feedback.

Post Master's Certificate Program in Nursing

Graduate Council received a proposal to codify the existing Post Master's Program as an SR 735 Certificate program. Graduate Council reviewed the proposal at the June meeting and responded via letter to the proposed program directors, asking questions about the program and making suggestions and improvements. Graduate Council has not yet received a resubmitted proposal.

Rules & Jurisdiction

In 2017-18, Rules & Jurisdiction (RJC) had another busy year, concluding the following UCSF Divisional business. Please see the RJC [Annual Report](#) for the actual communications.

- RJC Communication to UCSF Senate Chair Teitel on proposed revisions to UCSF Regulation 775 (H);
- RJC Communication to COCOI Chair Shin in re Interpretation of UC Systemwide Regulation 750A-B and SF Senate Divisional Variance to Regulation 750A-B;
- Committee on Educational Policy Request for Review of Proposed Bylaw Revisions;
- SOP Faculty Council Proposed Regulation Modifications;
- RJC Communication to UCSF Senate Chair Teitel on proposed new SF Divisional Regulation 781. Grades – Candidates for the PharmD Degree;
- RJC Communication to UCSF Senate Chair Teitel on Use of Chancellor’s Senate Funds for Development of a Community Service & Volunteering Fund

School of Dentistry Faculty Council

Accreditation

The 2017-2018 academic year included several presentations on the status and progress of readying the school for its March 2019 Accreditation Site Visit. Self-review will be completed within 2018 so that all syllabi and course objectives are in line with curriculum changes.

Admissions Process Changes

SOD Associate Dean Sara Hughes, MA, EdM, along with Admissions Director Julia Hwang presented on how the prior year’s admissions process worked. They proposed minor revisions to the composition of the Admissions Committee, while retaining the team of dedicated reviewers. Because of these changes, all offers to potential students were made by December 1, which is expected to remain true for all upcoming years.

Dental Center Concept Update

Sunil Kapila, CEO & Chief Dental Officer, provided an overview on the Dental Center concept as relates to the financial health of and partnership with the dental clinics. This concept links the DC to the 2015-2020 Strategic Objectives and is still in development. Broadly speaking, guest Kapila spoke on:

- Budget Assumptions
- Additional Expenses
- Long-term Goals
- Next Steps

New Dean Joins UCSF

This academic year saw the retirement of Dean John Featherstone on December 31, 2017, and come June 1, 2018, the arrival of Michael Reddy as the new Dean.

School of Medicine Faculty Council

During the 2017-2018 term, the School of Medicine Faculty Council proactively engaged in a variety of campus initiatives to improve faculty life at UCSF.

The Council began the year with an inquiry into space planning efforts at Parnassus campus, specifically related to how future development plans may affect research, education, and clinical space at UCSF. In the fall, the Council provided comments and recommendations on the SOM Strategic Planning Goals and advocated for a greater focus on improving mentorship opportunities and sponsorship programs for faculty. The Council also sought to address problems with the quality of research management services provided by UCSF, including inconsistent quality of services across depts., high turnover among pre-award analysts, and loss of funding resulting from pre-award mistakes. The Council partnered with the Vice Dean of Research for the SOM in communicating these concerns to the Office of Research and emphasizing the need for improvements.

Lastly, the Council awarded over a dozen grants to SOM faculty members through its 2019 Faculty Learning and Development Fund, which provides financial grants for faculty to participate in a broad range of professional development activities with funding from the Chancellor's Fund and SOM Dean's Office.

School of Nursing Faculty Council

During the 2017-2018 Academic Year, the Nursing Faculty Council worked on three main issues: Admissions, Master's Curriculum Taskforce, and Student Concerns.

Admissions

In response to concerns from Council members on inconsistencies communicated to prospective students about the specialty programs' admissions policies, a memo was drafted summarizing findings related to the alignment of admission policies and practices. The findings included inconsistent policies across MS specialties, varying staff support for admissions across different departments and no annual review of admissions data with MS specialties, associate deans, and department chairs. The memo was distributed to SON administration and will continue to be discussed next academic year with the new Associate Dean of Academic Programs.

Master's Curriculum Task Force

In the fall, Dean Gilliss convened a Curriculum Taskforce with the goals to realign and consolidate the MS program curriculum, direct limited resources to high priority curriculum areas and reduce faculty teaching loads and required student credit hours whenever possible. The taskforce found an overlap in courses that prepare students for the same competences, graduate and clinical core course don't have to cover the lifespan. Separately, it was discovered the SON needs course mapping software. This task force will continue to discuss these issues once the SON's strategic plan is completed.

Student Concerns

SON students were concerned about the curriculum and climate during this past year. They discussed their efforts to address the microaggressions and insensitivity they experienced in the School's academic programs, and their recommendations to address these problems with Nursing Faculty Council. The Council invited student representatives to meet with a subgroup of the Council to develop a collective approach to address these issues. The students and the SON Faculty Council subgroup will continue to meet in the next academic year.

School of Pharmacy Faculty Council

The 2017-2018 term concluded the School's multi-year planning with the adoption of a new curriculum and a pass/no pass grading system in July. The Senate's review of the pass/no pass grading proposal identified the following benefits under such a grading system: 1) Reduced stress and greater focus on learning; 2) enhanced well-being and a less competitive learning environment; and 3) better collaboration. In addition, assessing Pharmacy students under a pass-no pass grading construct is more reflective of principles of inter-professional learning and practice.

Due to the three-year competency-based PharmD curriculum overlapping with the four-year Pathway curriculum, faculty in the School of Pharmacy will be teaching both curricula through 2021, when students admitted under the Pathway curriculum complete the PharmD degree. Toward that end, faculty in the Department of Clinical Pharmacy continue to build capacity with existing and new ambulatory, inpatient and community placement sites across the state to ensure their students have rewarding experiential education rotations.

While adoption of curricula and assignment of grades are delegated authority from the Regents to the faculty, the Senate office spent considerable effort developing procedures by which to obtain its authority and exercise local implementation. By adopting a pass/no pass grading system, faculty in the School of Pharmacy sought a major departure from the University's letter-grade system. Throughout the 2017-2018 term, the Senate office successfully and simultaneously obtained a variance to the letter-grade system from the Academic Assembly while developing a procedure to achieve this important milestone for the School of Pharmacy and mission of the Academic Senate.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS

Each academic year, the UCSF Academic Senate is requested to opine on a variety of systemwide and local reviews. Below representative the bulk of what was examined by a variety of different committees and councils during the past academic year:

Four-Year Renewal of the Presidential Policy on Supplemental to Military Pay

CFW supported the extension for four years, to June 30, 2022, of the current UC policy of supplementing military pay for eligible UC employees on an active overseas military mobilization campaign if the military pay is less than the employee's University salary. In addition, employees receiving supplements are eligible to receive University contributions for health and welfare benefits, subject to a two-year lifetime limit.

Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128, Conflicts of Interest

This amendment includes a new section, J, which governs conflicts of interests (COI) on Senate committees, subcommittees, and task forces. The proposed bylaw addition outlines a multi-layer process for addressing a COI, and would replace the Academic Senate's reliance on vague language in Sturgis's Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure with standard procedure.

UCSF declined to opine on this proposed amendment.

Proposed New Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 675, Veterinary Medicine Salary Administration

The proposed new policy is responsive to the UC Davis School of Veterinary Medicine (SOVM) request to modify the current Strict Full-time Salary Plan, as approved by the UC Board of Regents in 1968, to allow SOVM faculty to retain income derived from non-clinical outside professional activities up to a threshold amount of \$40K annually per SOVM faculty member.

UCSF's Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) opposes the creation of a new policy as it determined the SOVM faculty can function under the pre-existing APMS. Separately, if this new APM is passed, CAP would support UCSF developing its own APM for non-SOM faculty (SON, SOP, and SOD) that more accurately addresses the nuances of those schools.

Proposed Presidential Policy on Disclosure of Financial Interests and Management of COI in Private Sponsors of Research, and Revised APM – 028

Effective July 22, 2015, the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) revised its regulations regarding review of Statements of Economic Interests for Principal Investigators (also known as the Form 700-U). The revision removed the requirement to perform independent substantive review of Forms 700-U by campus conflict of interest committees. However, subsequent discussion reviewed that this change was inadvertent and the University was still expected to perform substantive reviews of Forms 700-U. This new policy provides the core parameters for continued compliance with the regulations issued by the FPPC, including a continuation of the University's long-standing practice of performing a substantive review of Forms 700-U.

Also enclosed for review are proposed revisions to APM-028. The rationale for the proposed revisions are two-fold: (1) APM-028 hasn't been revised since 1984 and referenced state and federal laws are outdated; (2) the proposed new Presidential Policy applies to all University employees, not just academic appointees.

Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations

This is a new draft policy developed in response to a request from the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC), which advises on academic copyright-related matters, systemwide library policies, and strategies to facilitate the transmissions of scholarly communications in a digital environment. There are currently two other systemwide UC open access policies designed to ensure access to UC-affiliated scholarly research: one for members of the Academic Senate and the other for all non-Academic Senate authors who have written scholarly articles while employed at UC. However there is no such uniform systemwide policy for ensuring open access to UC graduate students' theses and dissertations; this policy provides such systemwide consistency for these works.

UCSF's COLASC committee reviewed the policy and approved as authored.

Proposed Revised APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135, 235 - Second Round

APM Sections focused on Lecturer with Security of Employment Series. This series doesn't exist at UCSF. No committees opined on this request for systemwide review.

Retiree Health Benefits

In July 2017, the UC Board of Regents received a proposal to discuss 1) a removal of the 70% floor for aggregate expenditures on retiree health benefits; and 2) creation of a cap on the growth rate of the maximum UC employer contribution to an individual retiree's health benefits of 3%.

The stated reason for the proposed changes is that retiree health benefits must now be considered a liability, as mandated by a change in the 'GASB 75' accounting rules. This adds a \$21B liability to UC, \$5.9B of which is UCSF's liability. The Systemwide Senate University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) subsequently sent a [communication](#) to President Napolitano outlining the Senate's concerns. In response, the President postponed consideration of the proposed changes, and agreed to assemble a work group in early 2018 to make recommendations on the future of UC's retiree health benefits. The work group will be charged with reviewing strategies and plans for budget management and ways to sustain benefits, peer institution benefits, and implications of different options for UC and retirees, and will make recommendations by June 2018. CFW will continue to monitor this issue.

Systemwide Senate Regulations 424.3 (BOARS Area D in the A-G Requirements) – Proposed Revisions

BOARS is responsible for determining the A-G UC/CSU admission requirements. The main revisions under review include 1) increasing the minimum area "d" requirement from 2 units to 3 units in the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics." And 2) changing the name of the area "d" subject requirement from Laboratory Science to Science. These revisions will align UC's subject area expectations with the new expectations for high school science curricula based on California's adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards for K-12. UCSF Academic Senate didn't opine on these revisions.

Task Force Report on Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP Report) – Review

The NSTP allowed some faculty from the general campuses to generate their income from a variety of external sources (specifically at UCI, UCLA, and UCSD), and was based on UCSF's Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP). Four years into the NSTP, a review taskforce produced a report that concentrated on faculty retention, graduate students, teaching, faculty workload, and administrative costs. The report summarized that the NSTP is not being utilized by a large number of people, and there is no evidence that it has created problems. The NSTP has very little bearing on UCSF, and the Senate will not be submitting comments on this review.

CHANCELLOR'S FUND BACKGROUND & SUMMARY

In summer 2014, Chancellor Hawgood provided \$500K to the UCSF Academic Senate to use toward faculty life, which is generally known as the “Chancellor’s Fund.” These funds were derived from the Campus Core Fund and generated from a portion of assessments on gifts and endowments. They were intended to be renewed annually for the next decade and expended within the fiscal year in which they were awarded. The 2017-2018 Chancellor’s Fund remained divided between funding pre-existing campus units and individual faculty awards.

Of the pre-existing mechanisms, Campus Life Services received emergency childcare backup funding; the Library received funding for Open Science Fund (formerly Open Access); and the Healthforce Center received funding for two cohorts of C-Flex.

There were four Senate pathways this year—Faculty Enrichment, Faculty Learning and Development, Travel Grants, and Volunteering & Community Service. Travel Grants supported Education, and Research-focused travel to conferences and saw a huge uptick in number of applications received. The Faculty Enrichment Fund supported work activities and services that enhance work-life or well-being. Working with the Schools (and receiving matching grants from three of the Schools), the Faculty Learning and Development Fund covered faculty costs for participating in a range of development activities.

ALLOCATING FUNDING / DETERMINING USES

The Academic Senate Leadership and Office advocates the following guiding principles for use of the Chancellor’s Funds:

- Funds should benefit as many faculty members as possible, and in as many different series as possible, including Senate and the so-called “non-Senate faculty” (e.g., Adjunct, Health Sciences Clinical), as well as those faculty in the basic, clinical, social/behavioral, and translational sciences;
- Parity should be maintained;
- Inclusion of all Senate committee input into the decision-making process.

Senate leadership determined that funding should remain split into two models:

- Funding pre-established mechanisms;
- Funding that addressed faculty needs through several application pathways.

Role of the Executive Council

The Executive Council (EC) continued to serve as the subcommittee charged with approving funding decisions across the Senate standing committees and faculty councils. During fall 2017, the committees and faculty councils presented their respective funding priorities. By December 2017, EC members determined a final budget breakdown. ([Appendix 2](#))

Key Ideas

The following ideas (listed in alphabetical order) consistently appeared as the top topics to fund regardless of Senate standing committee or councils bylaws or overall charge:

- Child/Elder Emergency Backup Care
- Diversity Efforts
- Faculty Engagement
- Faculty Needs (varies by faculty)
- Mentoring Efforts
- Open Science Fund (formerly Open Access)
- Supplementing Bridge Funding
- Travel Grants (education and research)

Established Funding Pathways

Four pre-established pathways received lump-sum funds for specific purposes:

- *Child/Elder Backup Emergency Care*: \$20K was allocated to Campus Life Services, to bolster the emergency backup childcare/elder care plan, as it had lost funding;
- *Diversity Efforts*: The Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP) partnered with the Office of Academic Affairs to subsidize participation (\$10K) in support of faculty participation in the online National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD) Faculty Success “Boot Camp.” EQOP also sponsored a half-day faculty workshop (\$6,500), in partnership with the Office of Diversity & Outreach, which was facilitated by NCFDD. While the workshop was particularly designed for under-represented, female, as well as new, faculty, all were invited.
- *Open Science*: \$110K was provided to the University Library to bolster open access funds.

Funding Pathways

The Academic Senate maintained three pathways this year and ran a pilot of a fourth:

- **Faculty Enrichment Fund**: Supported work activities and services that enhance work-life or well-being. Examples include, but are not limited to, training in public speaking and/or participation in a new training program. Funded at \$70K in 2017-18.
- **Faculty Learning and Development Fund**: Covered faculty costs for participating in a broad range of development activities. By combining both Senate and School funds, faculty from each of the four Schools had upwards of \$50K to devote to requested faculty projects.
- **Travel Grant Fund**: Aimed is to defray costs for attending education-, or research-related conferences. This pathway continued to be oversubscribed in both categories. Funded at \$35K in 2017-18
- **Volunteering & Community Service Fund**: Intended to offset faculty personal expenses for community activities outside of UCSF professional job. Funded at \$5K in 2017-18.

Ongoing Non-call Pathways

Mentoring Project (Personalized Mentoring Advancement Promotion)

CAP received \$5K to fund stipends for faculty involved in promoting this online module aimed at educating faculty as to the advancement and promotion expectations for each series. Launched in spring 2017, the PMAP module is found on the MyAccess sign-on page. See the above section on “Major Projects – Faculty Intranet” for more information. Moving forward faculty committee members will continue to speak to departments upon request, but members will no longer receive stipends.

Faculty Leadership EXpress (FLEX) Program

The Clinical Affairs Committee (CAC) received \$60K to work with the Healthforce Center at UCSF to develop a three-day professional development program for clinical faculty. Aimed at faculty with at least a 50% appointment at one of UCSF's four Schools, it allows faculty to learn skills to effectively lead change and improve health. A pilot program was launched in fall 2017, with faculty participants receiving clinic release by Department Chairs and/or Division Chiefs. The program was so successful it was adapted for SOM into a two-day program for clinical faculty. That program is called the Clinical Accelerator and includes different components than FLEX.

CAFÉ Project (Clinical Affairs Faculty Engagement) - Benioff Children's Hospital Oakland

Members of CAC facilitated a successful town hall with faculty at ZSFG, while this year's project supported CAC's February 26 town hall at Benioff Children's Hospital Oakland (BCHO)-*Building Faculty Bridges*. Thirty-five members of BCHO's leadership and medical staff attended the town hall. UCSF Health Chief Integration Officer Pam Hudson and BCHO Chief Medical Officer Stephen Wilson were on hand to provide updates on the integration between UCSF and BCHO, which began in 2014. Town hall attendees raised concerns over UCSF's faculty appointment and advancement process, in addition to the future of Oakland's research enterprise. In response, CAC collaborated with former members of the Committee on Academic Personnel & Chief Integration Officer Hudson to provide technical assistance to BCHO medical and research staff preparing their cv's for a faculty appointment to UCSF.

LAUNCHING THE CALL FOR APPLICATIONS

In January 2018, the Academic Senate launched a single campuswide *Call for Applications* for all pathways. It also worked with the respective Schools' Communications Offices to insure pathway information and deadlines were included in any applicable School-specific newsletter or website.

Faculty Enrichment Fund. The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed and approved funding for 63% of all applications received. They received thirty applications for a combined total request of over \$137K, which surpassed its \$70K budget. After CFW approved the applications, they went into an electronic lottery.

In the end, the Faculty Enrichment Fund funded 19 applications and rejected 11. However, this year also saw a sharp increase in the number of group applications. This year saw six different group applications for \$12K each. Three of those were funded.

Faculty Learning and Development Fund. Funded between \$25 to \$35K per School. Each School also supplemented this pathway with additional School matching funds ranging from \$22,000 to \$25,000. As was the case in prior years, applications for this fund fell into two general categories:

- Leadership Training: Many faculty members are assuming new roles within their Departments, Schools, or the new Mission Bay Hospital, and sought training to develop leadership skills.
- Trainings or Coursework for Teaching or Clinical Skills: Other faculty sought additional education to either remain current, or to expand their knowledge in a specific clinical course, and/or to assist in their teaching efforts.

Each Faculty Council reviewed applications and made funding decisions for its own faculty. A breakdown of funding by School shows the following:

- SOD: 18 applications received and 16 funded for a total of \$49,986. No funds remained.
- SOM: 48 applications received. Fifteen applications were funded for a total of \$54,643. No funds remained.
- SON: 13 applications received. Twelve applications were funded for a total of \$40,075. No funds remained.
- SOP: 9 applications received. Six were funded. No funds remained.

All Senate and School matching funds for this pathway were used this year, which is the first time this has occurred. Built into the award letters for this particular fund was a request that all faculty members share learned information with their colleagues in their respective Divisions and Departments.

Travel Grants. This pathway received more applications in both categories than it could fund. The Senate Office intends to increase the amount offered in it for the 2017-2018 academic year.

- Education Fund: Eleven applications awarded for \$15,000
- Research Fund: Twelve applications awarded for \$20,000

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2018-2019

The Senate saw larger department- or group-focused applications this academic year. Due to the large volume of travel grants however, many of these didn't get funded. For the Senate Office, we appreciate being able to seed new projects which are aligned with the Senate mission or on behalf of faculty within the schools. The Chancellor's Funds were never intended to serve as a source of travel grant funding for faculty-at-large. This trend was troubling for the Senate Office as collectively it took us off-track of our mission and the intended purpose of these funds.

For full breakdown of budget and awarding by School, please see [Appendices 3 - 4](#).

2018-2019 Chancellor's Fund

With the vast influx of travel grant applications, the Senate Office will be examining this category over the summer 2018 and developing recommendations which it'll present at the Leadership Retreat in September for a faculty vote. The Office anticipates pulling funding from Learning & Development (L&D) Funds to bolster travel grants and then offering those upwards of 2-3 times a year.

The Senate Office has also had confirmed that as least one Dean's Office will not match L&D Funds next year as they are largely funding travel grants. The L&D pathway was not developed to serve in such a capacity.

The intended launch of the Chancellor's Awards Call for Applications for 2018-2019 remains January 2019. Although launch of the travel grants might be on a different calendar.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Changes to Chancellor's Funds

As stated on the prior page, the Senate Office will be examining the travel grants specifically over summer 2018 to change what it's offering to faculty in the 2019 Chancellor's Fund call for applications, as well as to allow for changes within the office on processing of said travel grant applications.

Development of New Senate Office Self-study and Strategic Plan

In order to respond to the changing UCFS landscape, the Academic Senate initiated a self-study over the 2018 summer in preparation for development of an office strategic plan that will accommodate the new office expectations for staff, and to better position the office for anticipated forthcoming changes in pace, professionalism, and even physical office location in years to come.