

Letter from the Chair

It is a great honor and privilege for me to serve as Chair of the Academic Senate of this outstanding faculty. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the past officers, committee chairs, and committee members and welcome the enthusiasm of those newly appointed officers, committee chairs, and committee members. Unlike other campuses we are all volunteers, with no compensation for our time other than personal satisfaction. It is my hope and expectation that we as faculty will continue to be actively engaged in all aspects of the intellectual, social, and physical environment at UCSF that affect our well being here as faculty members. This academic term begins with an important turn around in the finances of the Medical Center, with the construction of the first buildings for our research faculty at Mission Bay, and with a long range planning effort in place for situating the new hospital. However, this academic term also begins with the stock market at a three year low, the State burning through its reserves with pessimistic forecasts for state revenues for the coming year, NIH talking about the end of double digit increases, and turmoil in the health care market among plans, providers, and patients. Thus although the year begins with palpable optimism and energy within our faculty and administration, our plans must be tempered by projected limitations in financial resources provided by the state, federal government, and patient income.

What are the big issues on our agenda this year, and how is the Senate to respond? Prophecy is never easy, especially of the future (is this a Yogi Berra quote), but within my crystal ball are the following.

1. **Situating the Medical Center.** Seismic considerations make it necessary to replace Moffitt Hospital, with work needing to start within the next couple of years. Although Long meets seismic standards, the preferred solution is to replace both. The question is where. Five scenarios are currently being explored by a joint administration/faculty committee that includes the Senate Chair and Vice Chair. Two scenarios involve Parnassus Heights, one Mt. Zion, and two Mission Bay. Conceivably additional scenarios could arise including multiple sites or co-localization with SFGH. Clearly the placement of the Medical Center will have profound implications for the Academic Mission of our campus.
2. **Mission Bay.** The first wave of basic scientists has been selected to move into the laboratories being constructed at Mission Bay. The awarding to UCSF of State funds to develop the Institute for Bioengineering, Biotechnology, and Quantitative Biomedicine at Mission Bay as one of the California Institutes for Science plus the settlement with Genentech providing funds for the construction of Genentech Hall has launched this capital development program well. The next phase will be heavily influenced by whether the Medical Center will be moved to Mission Bay, and if so whether to a site within the original 43 acres or to land that would need to be purchased adjacent to the currently owned site. Should Mission Bay remain primarily the province of the basic science program at UCSF, issues regarding the separation of basic science from the rest of the campus will need to be addressed. These issues will be taken up by our Committees of

Academic Planning and Budget (APB), Educational Policy (CEP), and Research (COR).

3. **Parnassus Heights release space.** As a result of the move of much of the basic science program to Mission Bay, approximately 70,000 sq ft of research space is expected to be available for new programs at Parnassus Heights. The Ganem/Jaffe committee has proposed the creation of six programmatic themes that are intended to cross departmental and school boundaries. Faculty associated with these six areas have been identified and their space requirements for developing these programs are being negotiated by a small group from the original Ganem/Jaffe committee. Aligning faculty research space along programmatic themes is a powerful concept, but one which will also lead to complexities in terms of the traditional means of faculty recruitment, departmental administration and affiliation, and departmental teaching programs. COR will be engaged in these discussions.
4. **Expanding the academic enterprise.** An important fact for the clinical departments is that most of the recruitment of new faculty at UCSF has been into the clinical and adjunct series. Many of these new faculty expect to combine their clinical activities with teaching and research. However, their clinical responsibilities and the lack of financial support and space preclude their having the opportunity to develop a full academic program. Furthermore, the clinical and adjunct series do not convey Academic Senate membership, unlike the Clinical X, In Residence, and Ladder Rank series, which contributes to their sense of second class citizenship. This campus has recently removed the cap on the Clinical X series, and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is clarifying the criteria for inclusion in this series with the expectation that more clinical faculty will qualify for this series. Moreover, the Senate through its newly formed Shared Governance working group has initiated a dialog with the Administration to seek ways to facilitate creative activities (research, innovative teaching) among its clinical faculty that would qualify them for the more academic series.
5. **Academic/commercial interactions: potential conflict of interest.** An important component of our academic mission is the extension of our expertise and research discoveries to the outside world. Financial incentives are a legitimate means to encourage the extra time, effort, and risk required to do so. However, financial incentives may also distort the academic mission if less remunerative but academically vital activities such as teaching and university service are ignored, and/or the financial incentives lead to incomplete or misleading reporting of research findings. A task force is being formed to examine this issue with the goal of developing a sensible and defensible conflict of interest policy for both clinical and basic investigators on this campus.
6. **Web based learning.** The wave of the future is the Internet, or so say some. At any rate, more teaching materials are available on the Internet than ever before, and some faculty are putting whole courses on the web. These web-based materials can be used for distance learning activities and/or to supplement more traditional classroom learning activities. Such web-based learning is expected to increase. A number of issues arise,

however, including copyrights for the developers of such materials, proper crediting for the time and effort of faculty developing such courses, providing the resources for faculty wanting to develop such courses and developing the means to validate the good faith of students seeking credit for such courses. To deal with these issues a task force with representatives from the Library Committee, CEP, and Courses of Instruction is being formed to produce and then implement a set of recommendations by which web based learning can be encouraged and properly credited on this campus.

7. **Strategic planning.** The Deans of all schools at UCSF provide strategic planning documents that enter into a five-year plan compiled annually by this campus and sent to the Office of the President. In addition, each school prepares a budget that, presumably, is aligned with the initiatives in the strategic plan. In the past these planning procedures have tended to be done by the schools in isolation and with only minimal faculty input. APB in conjunction with the Faculty Councils and the Deans will be trying a more open process in which these long range planning documents and annual budgets will be discussed with the respective Faculty Councils and APB in an effort to increase faculty input and seek synergy among the schools. One important specific item on the APB agenda in this regard is the potential development of a new school for advanced health policy issues. As the development of such a school will involve faculty in a number of existing departments and schools, campus wide discussion of its feasibility and benefit for this campus is essential. APB will be leading these discussions for the Senate.

These are but the highlights as I see them today. The Academic Senate has fourteen committees and four faculty councils each with its own agenda and dedicated members. I am looking forward to a productive year and plan regular communications with the faculty to provide updates and status on the important issues facing UCSF. I welcome and encourage the participation of all faculty on this campus in the University's system of shared governance.

Sincerely,

Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD

Chair

San Francisco Division Academic Senate