**Message from the Chair of the Faculty**

Welcome to the Spring 2011 Faculty Newsletter. As the academic year winds down the Faculty and the School of Medicine (SOM) face significant challenges. But, we are strong and I know that we will persevere and become stronger.

The budget crises in Sacramento and Washington will have significant impact on the SOM and Health System. We know that UC Davis will have at least an $80 million cut from the state. If tax legislation is not passed the cuts will be much more, and the uncertainty of those additional cuts hangs over us like a sword of Damocles. The SOM will be less impacted than the Davis campus, but we will be affected nonetheless.

For over 4 decades we have not faced competition for medical students in inland Northern California—but not anymore. The California Northstate College of Pharmacy has LCME “applicant school” status as the California Northstate College of Medicine. Although it’s a long road going from applicant status to full accreditation, the writing on the wall is clear. Furthermore, Kaiser is apparently looking closely at opening a medical school.

What can we do about these threats? Turn them into opportunities. We are an established, respected medical school with outstanding faculty, in a university and university system known throughout the world. We need to leverage those strengths to attract more of the best students. Thus, we need to increase our class size from the approximate 105 students/year to perhaps 150/year. But doing so won’t be easy. The state will not likely provide more dollars or ladder rank faculty. We will need to teach the additional students with the faculty resources that we currently have. Yes, there will be more work, and we must be creative when deploying our resources. But, if not us, who else? We are best suited to educate the additional students who would come to Northern California for their medical education.

I will soon pass the leadership of the Faculty to a colleague, but I wanted to take this moment to express my thoughts on being a member of the faculty of the University of California. I have lived in California all of my life--I am proud to be a Californian, and I am most proud of being a part of this great University. We must all work hard to not only preserve and protect the University of California, but to make certain that it prospers, even during trying times. The University of California is a treasured heirloom that must be passed untarnished to generations of Californians now living and those yet to come.

Fiat Lux—Let there be light!

With best wishes,

Joseph F. Antognini, M.D., M.B.A.
Professor of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Chair of the Faculty
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Academic Federation and Academic Senate roles in shared governance: Faculty survey results

Richard Tucker, Ph.D., Member, Faculty Executive Committee; Chair, Faculty Personnel Committee

There are real differences between membership in the Academic Senate and the Academic Federation. Faculty in the Senate (e.g., Ladder Rank, Clinical__, Lecturer with security of employment, and in Residence) have historically been expected to play active roles in Shared Governance of the University by being in charge of admissions, curriculum and faculty welfare, and by advising the administration on budget, planning, appointments, merits and promotions. Faculty in the Federation (e.g., Health Sciences Clinical Professors, Adjunct Professors and Unit 18 Lecturers) in turn play critical roles in education and/or clinical duties and/or research, but the Standing Orders of the Regents and the Bylaws of the University limit their role in Shared Governance to advising the members of the Academic Senate. This dual system means that members of the Federation are not able to serve as chairs or vice chairs of the standing committees of the Senate (e.g., Admissions, the Committee on Student Progress, and the Committee on Educational Policy), are not able to alter directly the curriculum of a course, and are not able to have their votes on the appointment and advancement of their Senate colleagues count as more than part of a collective ‘favorable’ or ‘unfavorable’ recommendation. There are other significant differences between the series as well. For example, some members of the Federation (e.g., Unit 18 Lecturers) are represented by unions and their salaries and responsibilities are subject to collective bargaining, but members of the Senate have agreed not to unionize. The appointment of members of the Senate demands arm’s length outside letters and a full-blown nationwide, affirmative-action search; the appointment and promotion of Federation faculty requires letters, but not letters from outside the institution, and the appointment process is streamlined. Some Senate faculty members have genuine tenure and opportunities for sabbatical leave; all can appeal their termination. Opportunities for Federation faculty to do this are limited.

Though there are advantages and disadvantages to membership in either the Academic Senate or Academic Federation, the different roles can lead to members of the Federation feeling like second-class citizens. This issue has been brought before the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) a number of times in recent years, and the FEC has made some progress in giving members of the Federation increased roles and responsibilities on Senate committees. However, options available to the School are limited, and further action may require changes to the Academic Personnel Manual (e.g., did you know that university service is not required for merits and promotions in the HSCP series until promotion to Full Professor?) and the system-wide bylaws. Before the FEC moves forward with this task, it seemed prudent to poll the faculty for their opinions on these matters. For those of you who took the time to respond to our on-line survey last month, thank you very much.

“Though there are advantages and disadvantages to membership in either the Academic Senate or Academic Federation, the different roles can lead to members of the Federation feeling like second-class citizens.”
Ninety-five faculty members responded to the survey (25 Clinical__, 8 Adjunct, 9 In Residence, 20 HSCP, 26 Ladder Rank, and 7 ‘other’ series in the Academic Federation). This is about 15% of our faculty. 73% responded ‘yes’ to the question “Do you think that the system-wide bylaws should be amended to allow qualified Academic Federation faculty to chair or vice-chair standing committees of the School of Medicine’s Academic Senate?” 80% supported making changes to allow Federation faculty develop and alter the curriculum, 70% thought that changes should be made to allow Federation faculty vote directly on the merits and promotions of Senate faculty, 78% want the FEC to pursue system-wide changes to reduce inequities between the Senate and Federation members, and 67% would like to see a new Senate series that requires excellence in teaching, clinical duties and university service (but not research). Additional questions directed to Federation faculty revealed that 70% would take the opportunity to move into a Senate series at their same rank and step, but only 50% would take the opportunity to make this move if the rank and step was determined by the Administration after consultation with the Faculty Personnel Committee. One potential ‘fix’ that might be possible to implement at the School level was also explored: the possibility of Federation faculty being given a 10% appointment in the Senate while serving on Senate committees or when serving as an IOR. 83% of the Federation faculty reported they would take advantage of that solution if offered (the 10% Senate appointment would give them full voting rights and the ability to develop and change the curriculum).

1. To which faculty series do you currently belong? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical X Series</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Series</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Residence Series</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial (Ladder Rank) Series</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Senate Series</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Federation Series</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 95

2. Do you think that the system-wide bylaws should be amended to allow qualified Academic Federation faculty to chair or vice chair standing committees of the School of Medicine’s Academic Senate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 95
Continued: Academic Federation and Academic Senate roles in shared governance: Faculty survey results

3. Do you think that the system-wide bylaws should be amended to allow qualified Academic Federation faculty serving as an IOR to develop or alter the curriculum of the School of Medicine?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 95

4. Do you think that the system-wide bylaws should be amended to allow qualified members of the Academic Federation to vote at the departmental level on merits and promotions of Academic Senate faculty, within the typical limits applied by a departmental policy (e.g., only voting on actions at the same or lower rank, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 95

5. Would you like the School of Medicine’s Faculty Executive Committee to pursue changes in the system-wide bylaws and Academic Personnel Manual that would reduce some or all of the inequities between the Academic Federation and the Academic Senate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 95

6. Would you support the development of a new Academic Senate series that requires excellence in clinical duties, teaching and university/community service for advancement (but not necessarily creative works)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 95
Continued: Academic Federation and Academic Senate roles in shared governance: Faculty survey results

7. Would you take advantage of the opportunity to be ‘appointed by change of series’ into an Academic Senate series (e.g., from HSCP to Clinical X) at a rank and step that are comparable to your current rank and step, knowing that you could be responsible for generating creative works of an appropriate quality and pace to be promoted and to earn merits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 40
skipped question 56

8. Would you take advantage of the opportunity to be ‘appointed by change of series’ into an Academic Senate series (e.g., from HSCP to Clinical X) at a rank and step that would be determined by the Dean of Academic Affairs and the Office of the Provost, after consultation with the Academic Senate’s Faculty Personnel Committee (i.e., the rank and step could be lower or higher than your current rank and step, depending on the contents of your appointment packet), knowing that you could be responsible for generating creative works of an appropriate quality and pace to be promoted and to earn merits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 40
skipped question 56

9. Would you take advantage of the opportunity to keep your current series, rank and step at 90% time, but to be ‘appointed by change of series’ into a part-time (10%) Academic Senate series (e.g., Lecturer with Security of Employment, which is a state FTE-supported series that does not require creative works) while you are serving on Academic Senate committees or serving as an IOR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 40
skipped question 56
Continued: Academic Federation and Academic Senate roles in shared governance: Faculty survey results

Many of you included comments at the end of the survey. Many thanked the Senate for taking this issue on—many of you who did this identified yourself as Adjunct faculty who feel they are “getting a raw deal”. Some offered words of encouragement for creating a new Senate series, but just as many were strongly opposed to this notion. Some respondents inaccurately stated that members of the Senate are in charge because they “teach, do university service and create new knowledge.” While this is a requirement of most Senate series, it is not a requirement of all (e.g., Senate faculty in the State-supported Lecturer with security of employment series are not required to do research). Finally, several faculty pointed out that the problem isn’t having a Federation and a Senate, but the fact that more and more faculty are being appointed into Federation series and are not being adequately informed as to the pros and cons of the Senate and Federation at the time of hiring: “Department chairs are using Federation titles because they can fill these positions more rapidly and terminate them more easily than Senate titles.”

The debate is far over, but the FEC hears the clear voice of a majority of the respondents that something must be done. Please be sure to continue to express your opinions to your chair and your FEC representatives. During the coming months and years you may see some important changes.

http://universityofcalifornia.edu/sites/ucrpfuture/task-force-inf/

“The debate is far from over, but the FEC hears the clear voice of a majority of the respondents that something must be done.”
An Academic Senate Task Force was constituted to examine the issue of Senate membership. In their report, dated April 2010, the essential recommendations were:

- Do not extend the list of titles conferring membership in the Senate.
- Within the divisions and campuses, review the duties and responsibilities of non-Senate academic appointees and reclassify those who should be appointed in Senate into appropriate series, e.g. from "Clinical Professor" to "Professor of Clinical X".
- Retain the historical separation of curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education.
- Revise the list of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.

The following statement was written and submitted on behalf of the Faculty Executive Committee in response to the Task Force report on Senate membership:

Most of the faculty in the School of Medicine are members of the Academic Senate (AS) with full voting rights on Academic Senate committees and at general faculty meetings. Some faculty, including those in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor (HSCP) series and Adjunct faculty, are not part of the Academic Senate. These two groups represent about 30% of the total faculty in the School of Medicine. There are differing proportions of non-AS faculty at other medical schools in the UC system. Of equal concern is the variation across departments in the UC Davis SOM, with at least one department having over 65% of their faculty in a non-AS series. Non-AS members are prevented by system-wide and Davis division bylaws from full participation in shared governance. Many faculty believe that this is fundamentally unfair.

There are limitations to the task force recommendations. Firstly, maintaining the current list of titles that are included in the AS does not address the growing discontent of a large portion of faculty system-wide. Secondly, recommending that non-AS faculty switch to an AS title (e.g., from HSCP to Clin X) is impractical. Many HSCP faculty at higher levels (Clinical Professors) have not done enough scholarly work sufficient to permit transfer into the Clin X series.

Non-AS faculty must enjoy shared governance to the fullest extent, at least within the UC medical schools (and other professional schools). There are several ways that this might come about:

- Changing Regental Standing Order 105 to include HSCP (and other non-AS faculty) as members of the AS
- Altering bylaws at UC medical schools such that non-AS faculty enjoy full rights within the SOM
- Provide Instructor appointments to HSCP faculty so that they would be covered by SO 105.

Whatever the solution, the recommendations of the task force (essentially maintaining the status quo) are exclusionary and inconsistent with fundamental fairness. We disagree with the first two of the four recommendations of the Task Force, as noted above. We do agree with keeping the historical separation of curricula between the professional education and undergraduate education (a position, we believe, that should assuage concerns that non-AS faculty in the SOM will impact decisions regarding undergraduate education). We also agree that some administrative titles do not belong in the AS.
Ralph de Vere White receives 2011 School of Medicine Research Award

Ralph de Vere White, director of the UC Davis Cancer Center, a renowned prostate cancer researcher, professor of urology and associate dean for cancer programs at UC Davis School of Medicine, has been awarded a 2011 School of Medicine Research Award.

Devere White was nominated to receive the award for his "extraordinary contribution to the School of Medicine, including development of the UC Davis Cancer Center and its achievement of National Cancer Institute (NCI) designation, and the development of one of the nation's top-ranking urology research departments."

"Receiving this award is especially gratifying because for years I have talked about the importance of physician scientists and of team science at this institution," said de Vere White. "Without a great team it would never have happened."

The award was announced by Claire Pomeroy, vice chancellor for human health sciences and dean of the School of Medicine, on May 25, at the general faculty meeting. Also honored with a School of Medicine Research Award was Paul Hagerman, professor of biochemistry and molecular medicine and a researcher at UC Davis MIND Institute.

In the early 1990s, de Vere White was the first urologist to receive an NCI program project grant to study prostate cancer and has continued to make major contributions in the area of oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes in prostate and bladder cancer. His work demonstrating that a microRNA shuts off the tumor suppressor gene p53 was a major basic discovery with strong clinical implications for the diagnosis and prognosis of prostate cancer. DeVere White's laboratory also has contributed to the development of prostate cancer therapies, including the application of the soy bean component genestein.

"We owe much to him for shaping the research enterprise and for the tripling of NCI research funding in the past 10 years," said Hsing-Jien Kung, distinguished professor of biochemistry and molecular medicine and director of basic science for the cancer center. "He is a world-class urological surgeon, a great mentor and, above all, an outstanding scientist."

The 2011 School of Medicine Research Award includes a stipend and a $7,500 research fellowship.

"Ralph de Vere White, director of the UC Davis Cancer Center, a renowned prostate cancer researcher, professor of urology and associate dean for cancer programs at UC Davis School of Medicine, has been awarded a 2011 School of Medicine Research Award."
Paul Hagerman receives 2011 School of Medicine Research Award

Paul Hagerman, an internationally respected researcher on treatments and cures for fragile X syndrome and related health conditions, has been honored with a 2011 UC Davis School of Medicine Research Award.

“I’m very flattered and honored by this recognition. Working at UC Davis for the past 10 years has been wonderful, and I believe that part of my thriving here has been because of the phenomenal support I have received from the university and school administration and my colleagues,” said Hagerman, a professor of biochemistry and molecular medicine who is affiliated with the UC Davis MIND Institute.

Hagerman received the award at the May 25 Spring Faculty Meeting. This year he shares it with Ralph deVere White, director of the UC Davis Cancer Center. Each will receive a $175 stipend and a $7,500 fellowship beginning on July 1.

The term fragile X refers to a defect in a gene, called FMR1, on the X chromosome, which gives the chromosome the appearance of a bent or broken letter ‘X.’ Mutations in the FMR1 gene are at the heart of a variety of health conditions, including fragile X syndrome, the leading cause of inherited intellectual disability and the leading single-gene cause of autism.

“In addition to being a superb scientist, Dr. Hagerman is an exceptional mentor, a strong advocate for junior faculty and a leader in team science at UC Davis,” said Robert Hales, chair of the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences in the UC Davis School of Medicine and MIND Institute interim director.

Hagerman is the co-discoverer with his wife, Randi Hagerman, of another disorder rooted in mutations of the FMR1 gene, fragile-X associated tremor/ataxia syndrome, or FXTAS. The condition primarily affects older males. Its symptoms are similar to those of Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s diseases, it provides an excellent model for developing therapies for those conditions as well.

The Hagermans’ research led to the founding of the NeuroTherapeutics Research Institute, established to better understand and treat fragile X-related disorders. The institute is funded by a $21.8 million grant from the National Institutes of Health Roadmap Initiative to address health challenges that have been resistant to traditional research approaches.

With his wife, who is the medical director of the UC Davis MIND Institute, Hagerman has promoted international screening studies and fragile X centers throughout the world, including Indonesia, Thailand, China, Africa, the Persian Gulf states and Latin America.
Susanna Soon-Chun Park receives 2011 Joan Oettinger Memorial Award

Susanna Soon-Chun Park, a professor of ophthalmology in the UC Davis Health System Eye Center, is the recipient of the 2011 Joan Oettinger Memorial Award for her cutting-edge research into the use of radiotherapy as a treatment for ocular melanoma and other eye conditions.

Park was honored for her successful research and implementation of the treatment of patients who have tumors in their eyes with proton beam irradiation — a therapeutic intervention in which a focused radiation beam is delivered into the patient’s eye.

“I am truly honored and humbled by this honor,” Park said. “Our work on proton beam irradiation to treat eye disease represents a collaborative effort among members of the Crocker Nuclear Laboratory at UC Davis, Department of Radiation Oncology at UC San Francisco and the UC Davis Health System Eye Center.”

Park said she shares the honor with numerous colleagues at those institutions.

UC Davis is one of only six institutions nationwide to offer the therapy for ocular melanomas and retinoblastoma. Treatment is delivered at the Crocker Nuclear Laboratory at UC Davis. The laboratory receives regional, national and international referrals. The proton beam treatment also has shown promise as a new adjunct treatment for exudative macular degeneration.

“Dr. Park’s innovative collaborative research in the application of proton beam technology is only one example of her fine work,” said Mark Mannis, chair of the Department of Ophthalmology and director of the eye center. “She is working on what will likely be significant contributions to the application of stem cell technology to diseases of the macula.”
The standing committees of the faculty

**Admissions Committee:** Composed of members of Admissions Subcommittees: Steering, Policy, Screening, Selection, Interview, and Rural-PRIME. Reviews previous cycle, discusses goals, priorities, and deadlines. Chair: Don Hilty, M.D.

- **Admissions Steering Subcommittee:** Oversight of admissions process; reviews progress of Selection Subcommittees; advises Selection Subcommittees; makes final recommendation for admission. Meets as needed.
- **Admissions Policy Subcommittee:** Assesses, reviews, and enhances admissions process; develops policies for primary and secondary screening of applicants. Meets as needed.
- **Admissions Screening Subcommittee:** Conducts primary screening; prioritizes applicants for interviews. Meets 3rd Thursday of each month.
- **Admissions Selection Subcommittee:** Taking into account all available information, ranks applicants for acceptance and submits ranking to the Steering Subcommittee. Typically meets twice each month between November and April.
- **Admissions Interview Subcommittee:** Conducts primary screening; prioritizes applicants for the Selection Subcommittees by following the policies and procedures developed by the Policy Subcommittee.
- **Admissions Rural-PRIME (Program in Medical Education):** Will screen, interview and prioritize applicants for the Selection Subcommittees by following the policies and procedures developed by the Policy Subcommittee. Applicants will need to be accepted for MD and Rural-PRIME criteria sets, with the Selection Subcommittees determining the former and the Rural-PRIME Subcommittees determining the latter.

**Committee on Education Policy:** Defines and implements goals, objectives, and structure of the curriculum; oversees curricula and evaluates course content; establishes and student evaluation guidelines; recommends criteria for evaluation and promotion of students; and consults with Admissions Committee on the academic prerequisites for admission. New volunteers are asked to provide a brief summary of teaching involvement. Chair: Kenneth Beck, Ph.D.

**Committee for Research Affairs:** Reviews applications for research support awarded within the SOM and UCDMC; reviews and selects candidates from medical classes or from the medical faculty for research awards. Co-Chair: John Rutledge, M.D Co-Chair: Sarah Yuan, M.D., Ph.D.

**Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Organization:** Upon request, reviews recommendations of Committees of the Faculty in order to assure consistency with existing rules and regulations of the SOM; assures due process for consideration and adjudication of requests for grade changes; and acts as a committee to evaluate and recommend action on formal appeals of dismissal. Membership limited to Academic Senate faculty. Chair: Michael Syvanen, Ph.D.

**Committee on Student Progress:** Reviews and evaluates student progress; certifies promotion into years two, three, and four. The Committee has the authority to place a student on probation, establish the duration of probation, prescribe steps for remediation of performance deficiencies, remove student from probation, and to recommend dismissal. Members shall have contributed to the teaching of medical students. Chair: Hanne Jensen, M.D.

**Health Sciences Library Committee:** This is a joint committee with the School of Veterinary Medicine. The committee recommends on acquisitions, operating policy, capital improvements and personnel of the Loren B. Carlson Health Science Library. Chair: Munashe Chigerwe, D.V.M, Ph.D. (Vet Med)

**Committee for Honors and Awards:** Develops and maintains effective system for distribution of honors and awards to students; selects recipients from the medical classes or medical faculty for specifically defined awards; and advises on criteria for the establishment of new awards. Membership limited to Academic Senate faculty. Chair: J. Anthony Seibert, Ph.D.

**Research Space Advisory Committee:** Advises the Associate Dean for Research on the setting of policy for allocation of research space to the Faculty of the School of Medicine, both preclinical and clinical, and advises the Associate Dean for Research regarding the implementation of these policies. Chair: Kermit Carraway, Ph.D.

**Research Space Allocation Appeals Committee:** Hears complaints and appeals of individual faculty members with regard to intra-departmental assignment of research space, and transmits findings and recommendations regarding such appeals to the Associate Dean for Research and the department chair. Chair: Carroll Cross, M.D.

**Committee on Faculty Affairs:** Acts as an ombudsman; advises on publication matters such as plagiarism, censorship and right of authorship; advises in matters involving academic freedom, including issues related to discrimination; considers appeals and special problems relating to faculty appointments and promotions; and considers other matters pertinent to faculty welfare. Membership limited to full professors. Chair: Anthony Stone, M.D.
Faculty Executive Committee: Summary of recent actions

Approved 4th year curriculum

Because of an oversight the 4th year curriculum has undergone changes without approval from FEC. The Chair of the 4th year curriculum committee presented information to the FEC and after study and careful consideration the FEC endorsed the curriculum. The FEC noted that part of 4th year curriculum includes undifferentiated patient rotations; the FEC encourages departments to participate in the 4th year curriculum by proposing rotations that provide undifferentiated patient experience.

Bylaw changes

The FEC approved moving forward with “housekeeping” amendments to the bylaws. These proposed changes clarify some of the bylaws and regulations related to student progress.

Task Force on student evaluation

A task force met numerous times to discuss and examine methods to evaluate students, especially in regard to professionalism. Several key issues were identified: 1) we do not have a consistent way to evaluate professionalism; 2) evaluations are often turned in late which prevents being able to use them in a constructive way; 3) standards of professionalism vary from rotation to rotation. The task force identified ways to address these problems. The report was accepted by FEC and we will consider implementation of its suggestions.

General faculty meeting

Spring General Faculty meeting
Wednesday, May 25, 2011
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
Education Bldg, Lecture Hall 1222
Sacramento campus
&
Genome Bldg, Room 6202
Davis campus

Contact:
Bernadette Abucayan
Faculty Senate Office
UC Davis School Of Medicine
2921 Stockton Blvd
CTSC Annex Bldg, Room 1115
Sacramento, CA 95817
Phone: 916-703-9020
Fax: 916-703-9019
Email: bernadette.abucayan@ucdmc.ucdavis.edu
Website: www.ucdmc.ucdavis.edu/medschool/somsenate
Smartsite: https://smartsite.ucdavis.edu:8443/portal

Faculty Senate Website

To access FEC roster, standing committee Chairs’ list, standing committee membership list, standing committee descriptions, School of Medicine Bylaws, and archived Faculty-to-Faculty newsletters, please visit:
www.ucdmc.ucdavis.edu/medschool/somsenate

In addition, you can access General Faculty meeting minutes and FEC meeting minutes on SmartSite, using your Kerberos login and password, please visit:
https://smartsite.ucdavis.edu:8443/portal