September 22, 2023

To: Faculty Council Committee

From: Meg Wallhagen

Re: Chair’s Report

Given the start of the new academic year, many of the current issues relate to on-going activities which also impact new or evolving issues that will be addressed across the year. All of these issues will involve maintaining open and transparent lines of communication. Issues that I am most aware of to-date, include:

1. Set standing date for committee meetings one time/month
2. Redistribution of the Learning and Development awards applications
3. Continuing to monitor the transition to the DNP and how this is impacting faculty.
4. Addressing issues related to the move to Mission Bay, especially delineating the processes of digitalization - how this will be accomplished and available resources to help faculty.
   1. From Dean’s Council – Justin may be setting up a space committee which may address questions on allocation of space
5. Importance of attending the discussion of finances on the 26th
6. Addressing issues raised by the transition to a new Dean and/or an interim Dean.
7. Reviewing and updating the bylaws as needed to address programmatic transitions.
8. Enhancing open communication between departments and the faculty council so we all stay informed on issues being raised or addressed in and across departments.
9. Working to enhance flow of communication between the SON faculty council and campus wide committees through communications with the representatives to these various committees.
10. Continuing dialogue with chairs of the faculty councils of the other schools to stay informed about issues being addressed in the other schools.
11. Dean’s Council is working on themes that arouse from the feedback at the retreat – each pillar is specifically addressing the feedback and focusing on the ideas provided and concerns raised.
12. There will be discussions of new branding after the announcement about the name change/gift to the SON.

**Report from: Academic Senate Executive Committee Leadership Retreat**

1. UCSF Academic Senate Chair, Steve Hetts, provided an overview of the Campus-Wide and UC Campus Academic Senate with an emphasis on faculty governance.
   1. There is an effort moving forward to include all series as having membership in the Academic Senate
   2. UCSF already incorporates all series in decision making but only votes from the series who qualify for the Campus Wide Senate count in campus wide votes
   3. A group is discussing various options and they are forming a TF to evolve possible bylaws wording - further study
   4. Another TF is focusing on how best to integrate the non-UC clinical faculty on sites being integrated - like all the sites to date plus now new purchases.
2. There was also a discussion of carbon free initiatives with some discussion of the development of policies related to travel and use of attendance at meetings in promotions/merits. E.g., per my understanding, not having non-attendance count against one’s review.
3. Todd Geidt reported from Senate staff.
4. Todd emphasized the importance of providing input when we are asked to provide or review system wide policies and other issues - noted use of staff for background
5. Another focus was on the importance of following parliamentary procedures during Committee meetings. The decision was made to follow Sturgis rules of order (simplified version of Roberts rules from my understanding) –
   1. This included a comment on the policies regarding use of chat feature and motions, etc.
   2. Additionally, it was noted that during zoom meeting the chat feature had to be used with care and not disrupt the meeting. If any motion is “drafted” in the chat is has to be voiced out in the meeting. He also emphasized that if the meeting is recorded the chat is also captured and is subject to public requests, just as the overall recording is. Generally, recordings, if used to improve minutes, are kept for a month.
6. Also briefly discussed was a joint senate-administration workgroup on the future of UC Doctoral Programs, partly as a result of the recent vote regarding post docs and the outcome of the bargaining the occurred.
7. Need to define work vs. research especially in light of the unions; concerns were noted that unions could end up almost defining pedagogy (this was not fully clear to me)
8. They noted there is a need to look at how to evolve a sustainable cost structures and to consider issues of what is a career and career development
9. They acknowledged that there was a difference between social science and basic science. SS have more issues with funding PhD students as BS model is often imposed and does not work.
10. Issue of RO1 or other sources of funding - now issue of covering cost of post docs or pre-docs (especially related to post docs and the requirements for their payment.)
11. Issue of inclusivity in terms of what UC health is; what UC health and UCSF can do in diversity space; and what we can do to improve DEI – this was a panel discussion. At the OP System wide level: really no funding - doesn’t really have a lot of specific powers but can help across system in terms of values and expectations. Powerful voice. UC OP can help leverage. Dr. Navarro noted challenges nationally with reference even to the focus on diversity statements.