February 11, 2008

TO: W. P. (Ward) Beyermann, Vice Chair, (Department of Physics and Astronomy)
    J. E. (Julian) Allison, Chair, Diversity and Equal Opportunity, (Department of Political Science)
    C. (Chris) Chase-Dunn, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel, (Department of Sociology)
    A. Deolalikar (Anil), Chair, Committee on Research
    J. M. (John) Ganim, Chair, Committee on Committees, (Department of English)
    J. (John) Haleblian, Chair AGSM Executive Committee, (A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management)
    A. S. (Andrew) Jacobs, Secretary Parliamentarian, (Department of Religious Studies)
    D. (Dan) Jeske, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Technology, (Department of Statistics)
    P. (Pierre) Keller, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy, (Department of Philosophy)
    C. J. (Carol) Lovatt, Representative to the Assembly, (Department of Botany and Plant Sciences)
    M. L. (Mart) Molle, Junior Representative to the Assembly, (Department of Computer Science and Engineering)
    A. W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Planning and Budget (Department of Biochemistry)
    L. P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee, (Department of Biology)
    T. C. (Tom) Patterson, Chair CHASS Executive Committee, (Department of Anthropology)
    R. (Rick) Redak, Chair, Faculty Welfare, (Department of Entomology)
    P. M. (Pete) Sadler, Chair, Undergraduate Council (Department of Earth Sciences)
    D. (Deborah), Willis Chair, Preparatory Education Committee, (Department of English)
    K. (Kambiz) Vafai, Chair, Physical Resources Planning, (Department of Mechanical Engineering)
    F. M. (Frank) Vahid, Chair, COE Executive Committee, (Computer Science & Engineering)
    A. M. (Ameae) Walker, Chair, Division of Biomedical Sciences, (Biomedical Sciences)
    L. (Lee) Swanson, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee
    Ilya Dumer, Chair, Graduate Council, (Electrical Engineering)

FR: T. Cogswell, Chair
    Riverside Division


This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, February 11, 2008, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building.

Please let me know your attendance plans. *A light lunch will be served!!*
Following is the agenda - please print out a copy and the attachments and bring them to the meeting.

1. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**
   Action items: Approval of the agenda (page 1 - 2)
   Approval of the 01-28-2008 notes (Attached) (page 3 - 10)  
   5 min

2. **CHANCELLOR R. GREY**
   30 min

3. **DISRUPTION POLICY – REGULATION 8 (see Attached) (page 11 - 12)**
   Approve the policy for onward transmission to the Division
   5 min

4. **DISCUSSION OF THE MEDICAL SCHOOL CURRICULUM (see Attached) (page 13 - 17)**
   Review comments from CEP, GC and P&B and forward response to EVC&Provost
   Please note - P&B Report will be sent separately tomorrow
   To review the curriculum, please click here: Medical School Curriculum
   50 min

5. **REMARKS BY THE CHAIR:**
   30 min
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING NOTES
JANUARY 28, 2008

PRESENT:
T. (Tom) Cogswell, Chair, (Department of History)
W. P. (Ward) Beyermann, Vice Chair, (Department of Physics and Astronomy)
Andrew S. Jacobs, Secretary-Parliamentarian (Department of Religious Studies)
J. E. Allison, Chair, Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity, (Department of Political Science)
C. Chase-Dunn, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel, (Sociology)
Ilya Dumer, Chair, Graduate Council, (Electrical Engineering)
J. Ganim, Chair, Committee on Committees, (Department of English)
D. Jeske, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Tech, (Department of Statistics)
P. Keller, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy, (Department of Philosophy)
C. (Carol) Lovatt, Senior Representative to the Assembly, (Department of Botany & Plant Sciences)
Douglas Mitchell, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee, (Graduate School of Education)
A. W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Planning and Budget (Department of Biochemistry)
L. P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee, (Department of Biology)
R. (Rick) Redak, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare, (Department of Entomology)
P. Sadler, Chair, Undergraduate Council, (Department of Earth Sciences)
K. Vafai, Chair, Physical Resources Planning, (Department of Mech Engineering)
F. Vahid, Chair, BCOE Executive Committee, (Department of Computer Science & Engr)
A. Walker, Chair, Division of Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee, (Department of Biomedical Sciences)

ABSENT:
Anil Deolalikar, Chair, Research (Economics Department)
J. Haleblian, Chair, AGSM Executive Committee, (A Gary Anderson School of Management)
M. L. Molle, Representative to the Assembly, (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
T. Patterson, Chair, CHASS Executive Committee, (Department of Anthropology)
D. (Deborah) Willis, Chair, Preparatory Education Committee, (Department of English)

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The notes were approved with no changes.
The informational items were also noted.

RAYMOND L. ORBACH SCIENCE LIBRARY:
The Executive Council members voted unanimously to approve the proposal to rename the Science Library to the Raymond L. Orbach Science Library.

EVC & PROVOST E. WARTELLA – PRESENTATION OF THE BUSINESS PLAN FOR THE MEDICAL SCHOOL:
The EVC Provost Ellen Wartella presented the business plan for the Medical School and in response to a question by a committee member on why each page still said it
was a draft, she indicated that the complete final document would be sent back once she indicated that it will change in response to Academic Senate queries elaborating on questions that they have been asked to elaborate on – the financial part of it will remain the same. The final version will be presented to the EC members around the 18th of February. The members also asked if February 11th indicated as the response date was set and Chair Cogswell indicated that it would be nice to get preliminary comments by that date but that it was not set.

Regarding the need for another school, she briefly pointed out the need for more doctors and that research indicates that there will be a number of doctors retiring in the next 10 years and will need to be replaced. The state of California is not producing enough doctors and we import a number of the doctors from other states and outside the country. It was important to note that this was not just a UCR initiative, but it was one that was fully supported by the UC. Some of the issues highlighted included benefits to UCR, which include generation of additional enrolment growth, draw undergraduate and graduate students to other areas across campus, increase student diversity, support the success of students who are underrepresented minorities and/or socio-economically disadvantaged. She also indicated that the medical school will generate additional direct and indirect cost recovery as well as create additional opportunities for collaborative efforts and stimulate additional industry partnerships. The medical school will also increase the visibility of UCR. Other investments on campus include additional FTE in research technology.

The plan is that the 1st class of 50 medical students will come in 2012-13 with a full class size of 100 medical students expected in 2014-15.

The EVC&Provost also briefly mentioned the curriculum touching on the mission and the vision statement and the fact that years 1 and 2 of the curriculum are already being delivered as part of the UCR/UCLA Haider Biomedical Sciences Program, and years 3 and 4 are really the clinical heart of the curriculum and that is where we will be hiring and engaging clinicians in the Inland empire to help mentor the MD students. We have received endorsements for our curriculum from the Davis Medical School, the Medical Education committee of UCLA, the Dean of UCLA, the Dean at Irvine and from Haile Debus, Chair of the External Advisory Board of the proposed SOM.

By 2020, the Medical School Dean will have to bring in ~$25 million a year in fundraising. In response to a question whether that was a reasonable amount, she indicated that it was and was based on data collected from other medical schools around the country without a hospital.

Regarding Faculty Projections the EVCP indicated that it is projected that we will need to hire 4 research leaders at a senior level to initiate core areas of research and 68 FTE positions will initially be utilized to serve as basic and clinical science faculty. These numbers were actually numbers developed by the committees working on the curriculum for years 3 and 2 and are not wild estimates. They are based on student body. She also pointed out that the state does not fund a full FTE of the Medical school faculty. The state funds medical school faculty at the rate of about $75,000 but their salaries are higher and the rest of the funds come from research funds or income from clinical service. The UCR model is built around the expectations from other medical
schools around the state and nationally to demonstrate that we are building in income from clinical practice and research.

Areas of specialization will include:

- Cardiovascular diseases
- Diabetes and metabolic syndrome
- Emerging infectious diseases
- Neurodegenerative diseases
- Health Services Research, Public Health and Health Care Access

There are strong expectations for what a faculty is supposed to bring in. Faculty mix, revenue and initial complement cost assumptions at each faculty level were assumed to be the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Level</th>
<th>% of Faculty</th>
<th>Grant/Award Assumption (direct revenue per year)</th>
<th>Initial Complements (used for supplies, research equipment, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>50% of FTEs</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$2.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>20% of FTEs</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$1.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>30% of FTEs</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EVCP also indicated that they had identified money for diversity and affirmative action initiatives. They wanted to demonstrate to the system and the community that they were serious about this issue.
Identified Area | Total $
--- | ---
Program Costs (Haider Program, MSP, FastStart)* | $832,000
Staff for Student Support Programs* | $320,000
Scholarships (from student fees)* | $1,165,000
Dean’s Office* | $619,000
PRIME Student Funding* | $205,000
Support for Grant Pursuits* | $64,000
Student Community Projects* | $520,000
Faculty Recruitment (initial complement) | $5,160,000

Subtotal Amount Identified – Diversity Mission | $8,885,000
Goal of $10M - fundraising for scholarships 4 financial need | $10,000,000

Total Amount Identified – Diversity & Affirmative Action | $18,885,000

Clinical Enterprise Options
The Deloitte members identified the following as possible models as options for the UCR Medical School. The four models identified were:

- **Option 1**: Hire private practice MDs on a per diem basis who have a split employment at both UCR and at a clinical setting
  - UCR pays a portion of the clinician’s salary for teaching to medical students and/or residents

- **Option 2**: Develop a network of physicians (through buying practices of retiring physicians or expanding current practices) that represent multiple specialties
  - UCR pays the salaries for clinical faculty, staff, and manages the practice in exchange for the clinical revenue generated for seeing patients (owns the practices)

- **Option 3**: Establish a network of physicians who will be staffed on a part-time basis at clinics within the community
  - UCR pays part of the salaries for clinical faculty and the clinics pay part of the salaries (through the practice plan) – UCR may help with management and billing

- **Option 4**: Establish a collaborative arrangement with local private and/or public hospitals where UCR faculty would be members of the medical center
  - UCR pays part of the salaries for clinical faculty and the medical center pays part of the salaries (through the practice plan)

The EVCP very briefly went over the administrative structure of the medical school deans office and indicated that it is modeled after other medical school dean offices, and includes the hiring of 5 Sr. Associate Deans, an Associate Dean, an Assistant Dean, and faculty chairs with distributed responsibilities. Upon the hiring of the SOM Dean, the structure and support staff will probably change.
The capital plans for the medical school are in two parts as indicated below:

- **Phase I: East Campus Transition**
  - Assumes an opening day in 2012
  - Will accommodate annual enrollment of 50 students per class and approximately 35 faculty for initial years

- **Phase II: West Campus Development**
  - Assumes 40-acre dedicated site west of the 215/60 freeway
  - Will accommodate full enrollment of 100 students per class and approximately 138 FTE faculty
  - Will include the Medical Instruction and Research Building and a Vivarium

The investment for Phase 1 is about $48 million and some of the funds have already been identified. The SOM will have two buildings with the 1st building costing about $130,000,000 and the second building $291,000,000. They will take state bonding authority and we need to get into the next state bonding for health sciences and raise funds.

### School of Medicine West Campus Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Campus</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>$42,000,000</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Instruction and Research Building I</td>
<td>$130,000,000</td>
<td>State/Other Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Instruction and Research Building II</td>
<td>$291,500,000</td>
<td>State/Other Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vivarium Facility</td>
<td>$44,400,000</td>
<td>State/Other Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$507,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EVCP indicated that the funding for the medical school will not take funds from the general campus. It will have to be state investment. There will be two sources of investment money – one from the state – and OP has made it clear that they support the medical school but we have to get the state to agree to fund it upfront - and the rest will be from fundraising efforts.

By 2020, the medical school dean will have to bring in $25 million a year from fund raising.

Questions to the EVCP included:

- Will the Ph.D. program be under the graduate main campus? Yes.
- Will the full number of FTE include adjunct and clinical faculty? Yes.
- What is the role of the senate and will the issue be resolved at this time? We are using the UCSF model.
- $30 m earmarked for the Health Sciences Surge Building seems to be a low estimate – will the medical faculty use their initial complement to outfit the
building? These are estimates based on surge buildings based on a surge building at the University of Arizona, but the specs have not been done.

- What happens if they don’t raise the $25 million funds – the EVCP responded that they will have to cut programs and in response to a question whether the $25 m was reasonable, the EVCP responded that it was and that the amount was based on figures from medical schools around the country without a hospital.
- Who has residency agreements with the local hospitals? The response was Loma Linda and UCI.

The EVCP then went over the target dates and explained the urgency behind the timeline. The proposal has to go through the Division and the Academic Council before June and eventually to the Regents by July or we will lose the momentum. We also need to apply for LCME Preliminary accreditation by July 2009.

DEAN DALLAS RABENSTEIN – GRADUATE STUDENT FUNDING:
Dean Dallas Rabenstein ran through the handout distributed which showed the growth of student population from the early 80’s, pointing out the rapid growth that occurred in 1985 to 1990 and also in the mid1990’s to 2002. Undergraduate growth parallels the growth of the total student population – most of the growth is in the undergraduate student population. The graduate student population did not grow until 2000 when it grew slightly. In 1980, 28% of our students were graduate students and we reached but by 2007 we the number of graduate students had dwindled to 12.2%. One major thing standing between our reputation as a research university is our graduate student population. Grad students are the engine of a research university. His goal has been to try and grow the graduate student population, and although it has grown, the growth has not been as rapid as he would like. Faculty growth has remained flat compared to graduate student growth.

Dean Dallas went over data for the last 5 years for numbers of graduate students per college, he pointed out that graduate student numbers had gone down between 2003 and 2007 in Education, AGSM and Biomedical Sciences. The AGSM numbers include 13 students out at Palm Desert. For Fall 2007, UCR had a grand total of 30% international students – the highest in the UC system. We are the only campus providing 2 years of NRT for international students. On other campuses, faculty are expected to fund this using other funds e.g. research funds. He mentioned that when NRTs are consuming 40% of our recruiting budget, there is less money for competitive scholarships or domestic students.

Because he was asked to talk to the EC about graduate student funding, he indicated that pre 2002-03 cohorts of new graduate students, the funding was allocated by the Graduate Division to Departments/programs as Block Grants. In principle, that was great but unfortunately the Graduate division was running a $2-3 million deficit for several years running and the number of graduate students was not growing, Chancellor Orbach decided he could not keep covering the deficit and at that point they came up with a different model for funding – what is now known as cohort funding model taking it away from graduate division, put it in the colleges making the colleges responsible. The funding was provided on a per student recruited basis and that was all that would be provided for that cohort of students, and it had to be used for students in that cohort only.
Funding for new students in BCOE was allocated directly to BCOE. For the 2008/09 cohort, funding for CNAS, CHASS, Biomed, and GSOE was allocated to the Graduate division but the funding was assigned to specific colleges. Deans participated in the allocation of funds to graduate programs in their college. This system does not give the Dean of Graduate division any flexibility e.g., when a department sends over a file and their allocation is $16,000 per student, but they need $22,000, he will have to send it back because he does not have the flexibility to cover them any more.

A question raised was whether or not the campus is reimbursed for NRT. Dallas responded that he could not answer that. Also raised was whether the NRT that comes to the campus can be redirected to the Graduate Division. For 2008/09 they were expecting a 10% fee increase. For 2008/09, he indicated that the Domestic Non-Resident stipend in the amount of $230,000 had been eliminated. We have a target of 561 students but the real amount available is about $6,300 for fees which is about what we had in 2005-06. In response to a question regarding the terminal MA programs, the Dean indicated that he thought we might have some students but not many. He reminded the EC that there was need to remember that the UC is a Ph.D granting university.

In conclusion, Dean Dallas Rabenstein shared his concerns with the current state of graduate funding and indicated that he was afraid they would lose the momentum. The three reports in circulation right now appear to show that the senate is in disarray. There is competing factions going around and the administration is reluctant to put any more money into graduate education until the senate figures out what it wants. We are in the most critical part of recruiting right now, and we need to impress upon the administration the need to increase graduate funding. He also indicated that overall there is a general enthusiasm among the faculty for growing our graduate student programs. He informed the EC members that the best way for to proceed would be for the EC to approach the Administration and tell them that at minimum there should be a commitment to covering any graduate student fee increase which would automatically add about $800 per student.

Chair Cogswell agreed he would draft a response to the Administration addressing the graduate student funding issue, especially asking for a commitment to cover the expected fee increase. This will be distributed for review before finalizing.

CHAIR’S COMMENTS:
Chair Cogswell shared with the EC members a resolution from the GSOE that was handed to him at the beginning of the meeting. The resolution was signed by all but two of the GSOE faculty. Chair Cogswell indicated that he had had extensive discussions with the Chancellor and the EVCP about the situation in the College and he was assured that the freeze would be lifted, and he was very concerned what the effect of the delays would be to the college. He wondered if the EC would be willing to formulate a response to the resolution or whether they wanted to endorse the one that was sent to the Chancellor and EVCP. The EC members indicated that they were greatly concerned about the situation but could not endorse the resolution based on the evidence contained in it.
Lastly, the chair indicated that his daughter was involved in a serious accident on the freeway. In order to assist her recovery, he was requesting for permission from the EC to turn the Senate over to the Vice Chair, Ward Beyermann, for the next two weeks. The EC approved his request.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sellyna Ehlers  
Executive Director  
Academic Senate
Regulation 8
Classroom Disruption

Each faculty member governs what happens in her/his classroom. Therefore s/he is under no obligation to permit anyone to address the class, whether that person is a student and/or a representative of any campus organization, outside company, or any other announced or unannounced visitor who has not been authorized by the faculty member to speak in the classroom (this is barring some unforeseen emergency and an interruption from law enforcement or other campus personnel to give a mandatory announcement). The final decision as to who is authorized to speak in a faculty member’s classroom is at the discretion of individual faculty members. They are however strongly encouraged to protect instruction time from any interruption.

In the event that someone insists on addressing the class without permission, the instructor should immediately call the campus police at 911.

Legal justification for this regulation can be found in the following sections of the California State Penal Code:

§ 626.6: Committing act, or entry upon campus or facility to commit act, likely to interfere with peaceful activities; direction to leave; refusal to leave or reentry.

According to this section, it is a misdemeanor to enter the campus for an unlawful or obviously disruptive purpose. There are some caveats to this section, Constitutional protections of Free Speech being chief among those. However, someone entering a classroom and refusing to leave or being disruptive after being instructed to cease certainly falls under this section.

§ 602.10: Obstruction of university teachers or students.

This section treats the use of physical force to prevent a teacher or student from attending or teaching at a university. "Teaching" is broadly defined here. It does not mean that one must be specifically hindered or prevented from oral instruction; one might be hindered in the administration of a test or quiz. Also, "force" might amount to something as simple as blocking the door or refusing to give up the front of the classroom by physically blocking the person in charge from speaking.

§ 415.5: Disturbance of peace of school, community college, university or state university.

According to this section, it is a crime to either fight within the buildings belonging to the university or to maliciously and willfully disturb any other person within the building or on the grounds of the school. It is also a crime to use offensive words that are "inhomely likely to provoke an immediate violent reaction". In essence, it is a crime unreasonably to disturb anyone in or on the university campus.
Justification for Regulation 8:

In recent years the Committee on Educational Policy and the Division Chair have learned of an increasing number of troubling incidents in which classes have been disrupted. These incidents usually involve representatives from outside organizations. They often enter a large lecture hall at the beginning of class and request that the faculty member cede a few minutes of class time for the quick presentation of an exciting opportunity for the students. These persons represent a whole gamut of different organizations, ranging from painting companies to financial companies. Some of these individuals have initially introduced themselves as students or as members of a student organization. In many cases, instructors have felt intimidated and/or caught off guard and have been pressured in some way to allow these individuals to speak.

While the final decision about how to regulate class time is left to faculty members to adjudicate, they are all strongly encouraged to refuse such requests, since such requests impede the educational mission of the university.

Approved by:
Committee on Educational Policy: 11/14/07
Rules and Jurisdiction: 1/30/08
BCOE Executive Committee: 1/10/08
CHASS Executive Committee: 1/10/08
CNAS Executive Committee: Not approved
Division of Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee: 1/7/08
Graduate Council: 1/23/08
AGSM Executive Committee: 2/7/08
GSOE Executive Committee:
Executive Council:
January 15, 2008

TO: Tom Cogswell  
Chair, Riverside Division

FM: Len Nunney, Chair  
CNAS Executive Committee

RE: PROPOSED REGULATION 8

The CNAS Executive Committee discussed the proposed regulation 8 at considerable length. While we felt that the perceived need for such a regulation was understandable, we also felt that the regulation, as written, was falling between two possible goals. As such we believe that the regulation needs some additional work.

The two possible types of regulation that we identified were (1) a regulation about classroom disruption in general, or (2) a regulation directed specifically at controlling someone wishing to address a class. The committee had no consensus about which approach was better (feeling this was a matter for CEP), but there was a consensus that the proposed regulation, in its present form, satisfied neither goal.

(1) The title “Classroom Disruption” is very general and thus at odds with the rather specific focus contained within the regulation. For a general regulation, the first sentence “Each faculty member governs what happens in her/his classroom” is excellent and really defines it all. This sentence could, if necessary, be followed by some examples of what this power means.

(2) Alternatively, if the regulation is specifically about someone addressing the class, then the regulation should not be called classroom disruption – since this is highly misleading. Sadly, we could come up with many forms of classroom disruption – and, by omission, they are implicitly excluded under the current format of the Regulation.

One specific issue that was noted: the inclusion of the recommendation that an instructor call 911 seemed somewhat inappropriate for the text of a Regulation, but if it is deemed useful guidance, then it should also be noted that calling 911 from a cell phone would not direct the call to the campus police.
January 24, 2008

TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
   Riverside Division

FR: Pierre Keller, Chair
    Committee on Educational Policy

RE: School of Medicine Curriculum Proposal

The Committee on Educational Policy discussed the School of Medicine curriculum proposal at several of its meetings this fall and after recently receiving the external recommendation letters, we voted in favor of the proposal at our January 23 meeting (8 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 0 Abstention votes).

The CEP endorses the proposed curriculum with the understanding that subsequent revisions of courses and curriculum in the School of Medicine will follow normal procedures for review and approval through the campus-wide Academic Senate.
November 27, 2007

Thomas Cogswell, Chair
Riverside Division
Academic Senate

At its meeting of Wednesday, November 14, 2007, the Graduate Council considered the proposed curriculum for the School of Medicine. The Council voted to approve the curriculum for planning purposes with the expectation that when the curriculum is operationalized, it will come before the Graduate Council or other body for formal review.

Ilya Dumer, Vice-Chair
Graduate Council

ID/vb
TO: Professor Thomas Cogswell  
Chair, Academic Senate  

FR: Neal Schiller, Chair  
Health Affairs Committee  

RE: Proposed Medical School Curriculum  

The Health Affairs Committee has reviewed the proposed 4-year curriculum for the UC Riverside School of Medicine. Dr. Phyllis Guze first presented the proposed curriculum to the Committee at its June 13th meeting. Since then, the Committee has had time to review the complete proposal. The Committee appreciates the fact that the 1st two years of the proposed curriculum are identical to that currently used at UC Riverside to educate the 24 medical students per class in the UCR/UCLA Thomas Haider Program in Biomedical Sciences. This integrated human disease-based curriculum was designed and implemented by the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA and has been fully adopted and used at UC Riverside over the past 4 years. This curriculum was also fully accredited by the Liaison Commission on Medical Education (LCME), the national medical school licensing board.

As described by Dr. Guze and detailed in the proposed curriculum, the 3rd year of medical instruction employs a balance of medical center-based clinical clerkship rotations with community-based clerkships. This unique approach provides the medical student more hands-on experience in community settings, more consonant with the type of medicine which most physicians practice after completing their medical training. This approach is viewed as very desirable and foreshadows the type of clerkship training most medical schools will try to implement in the future. This strategy also fully engages our local community hospitals and clinics in the educational process.

In year 4, the UC Riverside School of Medicine will employ an “Academy” approach, similar to UCLA’s “College” system to cluster students in disciplinary groups with faculty mentorship to assist in future career planning. The proposed curriculum also specifies certain advanced clinical clerkships which students must complete, providing greater oversight in the student’s 4th year of instruction.

It is impressive that the proposed curriculum combines the experience of the UC Riverside medical instruction (years 1 and 2) with an innovative approach to clinical clerkships (in year 3 and 4) while ensuring that all state licensing requirements are being met in regards to length of clinical training experiences in each clerkship.
The Health Affairs Committee provides its unanimous support and endorsement of this proposed medical school curriculum and recommends that it be approved by the membership of the Academic Senate of UC Riverside.

Health Affairs Committee:
Bahman Anvari, Professor of Bioengineering
Craig Byus, Dean, UCR-UCLA Thomas Haider Program in Biomedical Sciences, Professor of Biomedical Sciences and Biochemistry
Monica Carson, Associate Professor, Biomedical Sciences
Kathryn Defea, Assistant Professor, Biomedical Sciences
Christian Lytle, Associate Professor, Biomedical Sciences
Anthony Norman, Emeritus, Presidential Chair, Distinguished Professor of Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences
Neal Schiller, Chair, Associate Dean, UCR-UCLA Thomas Haider Program in Biomedical Sciences, Professor of Biomedical Sciences
John Shyy, Professor, Biomedical Sciences
Donald Siegel, Associate Dean, AGSM - Marketing & Management
Clifford Trafzer, Costco Professor of American Indian Affairs
To: Thomas Coggswell, Chair Academic Senate
From: Ameae Walker, Chair Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee
Re: Proposed Medical School Curriculum
January 7, 2008

This memo is intended to document formal approval of the proposed medical school curriculum by the Biomedical Sciences academic senate faculty. Even though the faculty has been intimately involved in the development of the proposal, I requested a formal vote on December 12th, 2007. Twelve of the thirteen faculty members voted in favor of approval of the proposed curriculum and one faculty member has been non-responsive to the request.