HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL ATTENDANCE ROSTER  
2011 - 2012

| Present: | D Conrad; D Bazzo; S Brown; T Handel; M Jones; R Mehta; D Rapaport; T Savides; S J Brown |
| Unable to attend: | B Cosman; J Drummond; L Freidman; J Hirsch; L Martin; D Easter; S Ancoli-Isreal; K Richman; L Eckmann |
| Absent: | B Snyder |
| Guests & Speakers: | A Ries; J Dimsdale; R Lieber; S A Brown |
| Recorder: | K Kersey |

**Call to Order and Approval of Minutes**
- Chair Douglas Conrad called the meeting to order at 5:09 p.m.

**Chair Announcements**
- Dr Conrad thanked all of the members of the HSFC that are rotating off for their service and commitment
  - Ravi Mehta
  - David Bazzo
  - Marilyn Jones
  - Brian Snyder
  - Sonia Ancoli-Isreal
  - Katherine Richman
  - John Drummond
  - Lars Eckmann
  - David Easter

**Sandra A. Brown, Vice Chancellor for Research Affairs**
- VC Brown shared that, as of June 30th, 2012, this is the third year in a row in which or faculty has produced $1 Billion in grant funding. This includes over 6000 grants and contracts, more than 300 new patents filed, 88 patents issued, 46 inventions licensed and 13 start-up companies (10 in San Diego)
- Health Sciences (HS) brings in more than 50% of the Contracts and Grants for the campus.
- VC Brown reviewed the Office of Research Affairs (ORA) goals, and progress, for this past year
  - Goal: Standardized and Transparent Review & Decision Making Processes throughout the Office of Research Affairs
  - Progress: ORU application and review process, reorganization of limited submissions, and faculty involvement in ORA processes via the involvement of the Academic Senate are all in the “done” column
  - Goal: Technology Transfers Office (TTO) Review
  - Progress: Rapid Action Task Force for TTO resulted in express license for therapeutics, an intellectual property return option, more flexibility in industry agreements (all in the “done” column), as well as the creation of a value assessment
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- **Goal:** Electronic Research Administration Program (eRAP)
  - **Progress:** Proposal development is targeted for completion next spring. Conflict of Interest is implementing later this calendar year, and eMTA are also targeted for later this year

- **Goal:** Research Development Unit
  - **Progress:** Created Division of Innovation and Industry Alliance and hired Associate Vice Chancellor Phil Bourne to head this work, currently interviewing for a Director to report to AVC Bourne

- **Goal:** Undergraduate Research
  - **Progress:** ORA has expanded Post-Doctoral Training Program, opened the Research Opportunity Portal, and is hiring of two Academic Coordinators, internal and external
  - Developing a unit focused on research-industry partnerships
  - Undergraduate research opportunities (want to retain our #1 ranking)

- **ORA Goals for 2012 – 2013**
  1. Continue Faculty Focused Efforts
  2. Expand use of RDPS – Large and Multi-Institution Grants
  3. Model for Industry Collaboration
  4. Expand Community Partnerships
  5. Grow Diversified Research Portfolio

---

**Rick Lieber,**
Professor of Orthopaedics and Bioengineering

- Dr. Lieber gave this is a presentation to the department chairs
- What we are talking about is how much will 415m retirement payment cost
- Items that play a factor in the retirement base are the APU (Academic Program Unit), the number of years at the institution and the covered compensation
- If there is a defined benefit system payout that exceeds the current IRS maximum then the IRS will not let it be paid out of UCRS. The difference is a delta factor that must be paid by the dept which is called the "415m liability."
- Based on UCRS’ age demographics there is currently more money going out then coming in.
  - In a few years this should correct itself based on the IRS’ increase of the 415m limits as well as the increased contributions from both UC employees and UC.

- **APU’s**
  - HS currently has 90 APU’s

---

Click here to view the Presentation: 415m Presentation R1041712
o The minimum number of members in an APU is 2, the maximum number is 123.
o New policy limits the number of members in an APU to a minimum of 5.
o Faculty should know their APU
- Over all, about 28% of faculty represent a potential 415m liability.
- Each faculty member has a date of hire, rank, APU, and age this was discussed with the departments.
- Average age of faculty is ~50. Clinical Faculty members are typically in APU 3.
- Reproductive Medicine has the highest average departmental APU’s
- The use of APUs is a very powerful way to motivate faculty since it directly affects retirement pay.
- In our modeling, the retirement pay will be received for 20 years.
- Does the calculation for the 415m obligation take in consideration the cost of living?
o That is a good question because certain faculty could grow into a 415m liability.
- The departments have asked which faculty members have the highest liability. That information is sent to Ron Espiritu and he distributes it to the department chairs.
- The smaller the faculty pool the higher the 415m liability, and if the faculty members hold off on retirement then the department could save.
- UCRS could be a recruitment issue but this could be a retention bonus.
- Each department is supposed to set money aside for the liability in an escrow account.
o Does this account earn interest?
o Some departments have been paying into the account and others haven’t.
o Where along the line are the faculty paying into it?
  - If you are in a higher APU then you are paying a higher UCRS based on the higher covered compensation.
  - This year will be the first year that we are covering our cost.
  - Employee is contributing 6 % and the Dept is contributing 7%
Since we didn’t pay anything for a number of years, the employer will have to pay in up to 18%.
- The funding source for salaries will have an increased benefits component.
- The flip side of this the problem is that if you are hired after 1994 whatever your APU is, there is a limit to how much salary is pensionable.
- Some of the newer employees will not get the benefit of the APU.
- We have a very good pension system but we have to keep making our contributions.
- If the Gov. Tax initiatives pass it will pick up some of the costs, but that will only benefit the state FTE people.
- It will not do anything if you are supported by a grant. It’s nice news if it passes.
- If faculty come back and work after retirement they still get all of the benefits.
- They can work up to 43% of the time. Your pension and then you come back funded by grants up to 43% a year.
- The 415m is irrelevant.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**Ravi Mehta**

- Dr. Mehta explained the history of DORUSL. The Faculty Council was charged by the dean to review criteria of how Departments, ORU’s and Services Lines are determined.
- Differences in the definitions for a Department, ORU and Service Line were provided as well as the roles and responsibilities of each.
- The proposed criteria for a Department, ORU and Service Line were detailed in the PowerPoint and reviewed
- The ad-hoc committees recommendations for creating a new department were reviewed with the key issues being:
- All application for departmental review should come to the Faculty Council for approval. The process would entail similar steps as exist for ORU’s where the proposing unit is asked to prepare a pre-proposal that is reviewed and approved by a committee appointed by the VCHS prior to submitting a complete proposal.
- It was recommended that department pre-proposals have clearly defined criteria and rating mechanisms as exist for ORU’s.

Click here to view the Presentation: [HSFC DORUSL Report Updated July 17 2012](#)

- Dr. Mehta will send this information out to all HSFC members as a Word document.
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<td>• HSFC should have input into the review of the complete proposal and be willing to endorse it prior to it being submitted to the academic senate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In previous discussions with HSFC Dean Brenner had suggested that prior to complete approval for a department there should be an incubator phase where the proposed department should demonstrate over the first year or two if they can meet specific criteria. Several concerns were raised regarding this issue including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How would an incubator phase be implemented without granting some autonomy to the division faculty from the parent unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ In the case of the two most recent departments Emergency medicine and Radiation Medicine there was no incubator phase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ It was felt that since the process of making a department is generally 24-48 months this is long enough that financial analysis based on wRVU and TRVU metrics, research dollars and whether there is likelihood of reaching their stated goals could be included in the formal assessment to evaluate viability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A key issue that the HSFC committee raised was to prevent erosion of the current departmental structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Since Service lines and ORU’s are generally based on faculty from several departments their ability to engage independently form departments was raised. For instance do service lines take on the liability of covering the entire faculty salary especially for the teaching component? It was felt that this was generally not the case and departments have the ultimate responsibility for faculty appointments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The committee suggested that departments should remain the academic home for faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New hires need to understand who they are working for. We are running into problems with people not realizing what goals they need to meet for promotion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ It was felt that departments should be compensated in some manner for maintaining the academic component of faculty appointments. In a sense departments could</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be considered to outsource faculty to service lines and ORU's. It was felt that these issues would require further deliberation and were not the purview of the committee.

- The committee also recommended that service lines establish formal procedures for being reviewed by HSFC similar to ORU's and departments. The HSFC in principle agreed with the recommendations of the ad-hoc committee and a detailed summary will be prepared and sent to the HSFC for final review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Business</th>
<th>NO NEW BUSINESS WAS DISCUSSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Adjourment
- The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING**
- **Tuesday, September 4, 2012, 5:00 to 6:30 pm**
  - Dean's Large Conference Room BSB1320

**ACTION ITEMS**
- Dr. Mehta will send this information out to all HSFC members as a Word document.
-