Communication from the Chair of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
Patricia Robertson, MD, Chair

September 21, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
UCSF Academic Senate Chair
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Comments to UCSF Strategic Planning Phase III, Strategy Development

Dear Chair Greenspan,

On September 21, 2006, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget reviewed the document “UCSF - Strategic Planning Phase III Strategy Development” and a presentation of updated information from the Strategic Planning Board provided by APB representative Jack Rodnick.

APB has the following responses to the requested points for comment:

1) Are the right goals listed under the correct groups?

Team F should be inclusive of Goals #2 and #15
Team D should be inclusive of Goals #12 and #14.

2) Identify and recommend Senate or other faculty with focused expertise to participate in the identified groups.

The following members the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget have offered their names for the following Teams:

Team A: Patty Robertson
Team D: Deborah Adey and Elyse Foster
Team E: Paul Green

3) Determine if you would like to add any new goals to the groups.

The Committee would like to support the inclusion of an additional goal as originally submitted by David Irby via School of Medicine Faculty Council:

Goal: To Foster a vibrant and innovative educational community at UCSF.
Key Questions:
   1. What educational facilities are needed to promote exceptional teaching and learning?
   2. What would a futuristic learning environment look like (smart classrooms, simulation and clinical skills centers, etc.)?
3. Where should teaching and learning commons be located (e.g. Parnassus or Mission Bay)? What would be included in such a building (e.g. classrooms, simulation centers, informal gathering areas, student services, faculty services, library learning center, etc.)?

4. What infrastructure is needed to create educational excellence (informational technology, educational technology, wireless networks, teleconferencing, telemedicine, classroom support services, student support services)?

5. How can we create a learner-centered educational environment?

6. What incentives can be used to enhance the educational mission of the University (educational innovation funding, academy network, support for teaching and mentoring)?

7. **What incentives are given to faculty for teaching?** (new question added by APB)

8. **How may UCSF fund innovative teaching?** (new question added by APB)

4) Identify any major areas of omission or error.

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget had a chance to review the Mission Statement and asserts that there should be language regarding the educational mission of the University in this statement (it is mentioned in the Vision Statement). APB has the following modifications or additions to the key questions for the following goals.

**Goal 1:**
- APB proposes the question: “What have our comparison institutions done to successfully enhance recruitment, mentoring, and retention?”
- APB proposes the question: “What can UCSF do to facilitate the movement of post-docs into independent positions?”

**Goal 2:**
- APB proposes the question: “How can UCSF improve K-12 and undergraduate links to increase recruitment of under-represented minorities into careers in the health sciences?”

**Goal 3:**
- APB recommends including “well-being” after “collaboration” in the statement of Goal #3.
- APB recommends changing “protect” to “promote” in Question “a.”
- APB proposes the question: “What additional programs need to be put in place to support well being of students, residents, post-docs, faculty, and staff?”
- APB proposes the question: “Are grievance procedures adequate for faculty and staff?”

**Goal 4:**
- The Committee feels that this goal is phrased too broadly and should be redefined. This goal includes two independent issues: fostering research across multiple sites and identifying priority research areas.
- The process of defining “priority research areas” has not been identified, nor has what being determined a “priority” implies.
- APB proposes the question: “How should UCSF balance the top-down versus bottom-up strategies for developing research programs?”

**Goal 5:**
- APB suggests that the language of Goal #5 include “inter-institution” as well (e.g. entities such as Kaiser-Permanente). “Inter-institution” should also be included in questions “a” and “b.”
- APB proposes the question: “What are School barriers to forming and fostering clinical care teams?”
- APB proposes the question: “How can we better partner with the Medical Center to accomplish translational and clinical research?”

**Goal 6:**
• APB proposes the question: “How do we best integrate and build on existing global health programs?”

Goal 7:
No comments.

Goal 8:
• APB proposes the question: “Given the changing demographics, how can this goal address the workforce and healthcare needs of the state.”
• APB proposes the question: “How should our post-graduate clinical programs work to reduce health disparities in California, particularly given the changing demographics of our population?”
• APB proposes the question: “How can we work to improve the access of all groups to UCSF services?”
• APB proposes the question: “How can students, residents, and faculty become stronger advocates in reducing disparities in access to health care?”
• APB proposes the question: “How can the Schools and the Medical Center align themselves together to meet this goal?”

Goal 9:
• APB suggests changing “cross-training” to “inter-disciplinary and inter-school training.”

Goal 10:
• APB proposes the question: “What are the populations—including the UCSF community of students, faculty, staff, and Bay Area residents—that UCSF clinical programs should serve and how might UCSF maximize the access, quality of care, and satisfaction of those groups?”
• APB proposes the question: “What are the barriers to UCSF clinicians to functioning as a multi-specialty medical group?”
• APB proposes the question: “Should we develop programs to improve clinical leadership in governance?”
• APB proposes the question: “Can we improve or design our information and EMR systems to address this goal?”
• APB recommends specifically including Mount Zion into question “d.”

Goal 11:
• APB proposes the question: “Is UCSF maximizing it potential for patent income?”
• APB proposes the question: “How might UCSF encourage the UC System make the distribution of indirect costs more transparent?”

Goal 12:
• APB proposes the question: “How can UCSF improve the training and re-training of staff and faculty for existing and new IT systems?”

Goal 13:
No comment.

Goal 14:
• APB proposes the question: “How might UCSF assess and maximize childcare facilities and programs as part of its infrastructure design plan, and ensure that such needs are reassessed on a regular basis?”

Goal 15:
No comment.

Goal 16:
• APB proposes the question: “How do we develop systems for providing management training to faculty who assume leadership roles?”
• APB proposes striking the line “Outline an ideal selection process for the future” from question “b,” and inserting “Outline appropriate selection procedures and mechanisms for ensuring that this procedure is followed.”

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this phase of the development of the Strategic Plan for UCSF.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patricia Robertson, MD
Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

cc: All Committee Members