I. Call to Order:
Dr. Jahr called the meeting to order at 5:45pm in the Semel Institute Auditorium.

II. Welcome:
Dr. Jahr greeted and welcomed everyone. He reviewed a list of the current members of the FEC and noted that a roster of the FEC members is available online at the following link:
http://www.medsch.ucla.edu/public/faculty/fec/Docs/roster/Members1314.pdf

III. Greeting from Janet Napolitano:
Dr. Jahr explained that although we invited President Napolitano, as per our FEC Bylaws, she was unable to attend due to other commitments. Dr. Jahr read out loud the letter that she sent to Dr. Jahr.

In addition he noted that Chancellor Block was also invited to attend this meeting. He too was unable to attend due to the meeting that President Napolitano was having the same day with all of the UC Chancellors.

IV. The Moreno Report – M. Ines Boechat, MD, FACP:
Dr. Boechat, representing Dr. Lynn Gordon who was unable to attend, provided an overview of the Moreno Report which was developed by an independent committee led by former California justice, Carlos Moreno and other individuals from the community. She described the process of the investigation that included both individual interviews and town hall meetings of more than 100 faculty and administrators. The entire report, completed on October 15, 2013, is available online at UCLA’s website at the following link:
http://evc.ucla.edu/reports/UCLA External Review Team Report -FINAL.pdf

Dr. Boechat outlined the important findings of the report. The **four main findings** are:

1. UCLA’s nondiscrimination policy fails to adequately define discriminatory conduct.
2. UCLA has failed to adequately train UCLA employees, including faculty, in what constitutes discriminatory, biased, or intolerant behavior.
3. UCLA’s nondiscrimination policy fails to provide for a process for responding to reports of incidents of perceived discrimination that involves investigation and referral to disciplinary proceedings.
4. UCLA leadership has failed to convince at least a vocal subset of faculty members of its commitment to diversity in admissions and hiring.

She also outlined the **central recommendations of the report** that led to specific action items. These include:

- Enhance procedures to provide a standardized processes for:
  - Investigation of incidents of perceived bias, discrimination and intolerance,
• Referral of the matter, if necessary, to the appropriate local disciplinary regime.
• Implementation of educational and training programs that aim to:
  o Prevent such incidents from occurring in the first place,
  o Provide for record-keeping in order to monitor the problem moving forward.
• Institute a Discrimination Officer who, assuming that the university provides adequate resources, can fulfill these important functions of education and training, informal and formal investigation and fact-finding, and record-keeping.

The Chancellor has nominated an implementation committee to move forward on the action items. Dr. Boechat is one of the two members from the School of Medicine who are part of the Moreno Report Implementation Committee. Action items the committee will address and report on by June of 2014 are:
• Develop a job description for the “Discrimination Officer
• Review and reform the policies and procedures for investigating incidents of racial discrimination and harassment.

The School of Medicine has developed a “Faculty Diversity Strategic Plan” and Dr. Boechat provided an overview of that plan. The David Geffen School of Medicine Faculty Diversity Strategic Planning Committee developed Mission and Vision statements and outlined four core values. This report is also available online at the following link: [http://dgsomdiversity.ucla.edu](http://dgsomdiversity.ucla.edu). Dr. Boechat suggested that all faculty should review this strategic plan so that we can make diversity part of our daily practice.

V. Clarence Braddock, III, MD, MPH:
Dr. Jahr introduced Dr. Braddock and provided an overview of his background. Dr. Braddock offered a few words about why he is excited to be here at UCLA. The DGSOM has the opportunity to transform and improve how we provide medical education. Being clear about the competencies and milestones will allow us to be assured that our students are ready for practice when they end their studies. He feels the DGSOM is uniquely positioned because of the passion and commitment to teaching and learning that he has seen at all of our sites to become a model for the world for excellence in medical education. The key to our educational enterprise is to engage in conversations to formulate a clear vision of what we want our graduates to do in the world.

VI. Changes to Medical Student Grading:
Dr. Jahr announced some recent changes to medical student grading that were voted on at the December FEC meeting. The Medical Education Committee (MEC), a standing committee of the FEC, addressed some concerns that a group of 4th year students had about the DGSOM grading system. These changes would help the 4th year students in their process for going on to residency programs. The FEC voted and approved these changes after consultation with students and faculty at two town hall meetings held in October 2013. Implementation of these changes to medical student grading would apply only to new students starting with the next academic year.

VII. Proposed FEC Bylaw Changes and Voting – Dr. Ian Cook:
Dr. Jahr began with an explanation of some of the impetus for the bylaws changes that came out of the recent LCME site accreditation visit. They found issues with the Admissions Committee and the Student Progress and Promotions Committees. The proposed bylaws changes will address some of these LCME concerns. He then introduced Dr. Cook to give an overview of the specifics of the bylaws changes being proposed.

Dr. Cook noted that the bylaws revisions fall into two categories: Housekeeping Updates and Creation of New structures. He then reviewed some of the pertinent details and rationale for these changes. There are two new standing committees being added for a total of 6 committees.

Questions about the Proposed Bylaws changes:
• Q - Why should the admissions committee’s member terms be 5 years instead of 3 years as it is with other committees?
  A - Dr. Cook explained that those involved in the process felt that 5 years made sense for this. Dr. Braddock explained that the issue of the terms is a challenge to provide a continuity of terms and yet have some turn over.

• Q - What are the numbers of the people on the admissions committee?
A - Currently there are 80 but usually about 30-35 are active members. They receive about 8000 applications per year are reviewed and about 600 interviews. It was felt that a shorter term would be difficult for that committee.

- Q - There are three separate programs DREW, PRIME and MSTP that have different admissions processes, will they be impacted?  
  A - No, we will keep those as they are.

With no further questions or concerns, the ballots were handed out for the faculty who were present to vote. Dr. Jahr invited all faculty to please come to the next FEC meeting on February 5th where there will be further discussion.

**Outcome of the Bylaws Vote:**
The vote by Academic Senate faculty members present was unanimously in favor of accepting the bylaws revisions (43 for, none against, no abstentions). The vote by non-academic senate faculty members of the Adjunct and HS Series was also unanimous (27 for, none against, no abstentions).

VIII. **Adjourn**
The meeting adjourned at 7:00pm.

Minutes prepared and distributed by Roberta Rey, Ph.D.