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The Coordinating Committee was called to order by Chair Fuentes-Afflick on May 16, 2011 at 2:04 p.m. in room S 30. A quorum was present.

The minutes of March 7, 2011 were approved.

Chair’s Report – Elena Fuentes-Afflick

Division Meeting
The Division Meeting will be held on June 9, 2011. Chair Fuentes-Afflick and Vice Chair Robert Newcomer are working with faculty and administrative leaders to formulate the agenda.

Update: The San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate met on June 9, 2011 to thank outgoing officers and committee chairs, and to discuss faculty concerns regarding the Operational Excellence
plans for pre-award grant administration at UCSF. The presentation slides, videos and more may be found here.

**Director’s Update – Heather Alden**

**Committee on Committees Members for 2011-2014**

H. Alden announced the results of the elections for the 2011-2014 members of the Committee on Committees, as follows:

- At Large Member: David Saloner
- School of Medicine Member: Elyse Foster
- School of Pharmacy Member: Ruth Greenblatt

**Committee on Faculty Welfare Statement of Same-Sex Marriage Equality – Grayson (Bill) Marshall, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare**

On in March and April 2011, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) worked to prepare a statement supporting marriage equality for UCSF Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and/or Transgender families. CFW Chair Bill Marshall presented the statement and requested Coordinating Committee endorsement.

**Motion: Endorse the Committee on Faculty Welfare Statement of Same-Sex Marriage Equality**

**Action: Unanimous approval**

Coordinating Committee members discussed opportunities to ensure wide distribution of the statement, including dissemination to institutions of higher learning, the UCSF LGBT Center, Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach Renee Navarro and Vice Chancellor for Strategic Communications and University Relations Barbara French for inclusion on the UCSF website.

**Update: On May 24, 2011, the statement was posted on the Academic Senate website. It was also distributed to Renee Navarro and Barbara French and was included in the 2011 ceremony for the Chancellor’s Awards for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and/or Transgender (GLBT) Leadership on June 13, 2011.**

**UCSF Operational Excellence – Robert Newcomer**

Division Vice Chair Robert Newcomer represents Academic Senate leadership on the UCSF Operational Excellence Faculty Committee. Although the Faculty Oversight Committee has not been proactive in the Operational Excellence process, it has had the opportunity to react to plans as presented to them. The plans for changes to Human Resources/Academic Personnel, Information Technology and Finance seem to be relatively non-controversial at this point. However, the Faculty Oversight Committee and other UCSF faculty members are concerned about the plans for changes to pre-award grant administration. Specifically, they are concerned about the accelerated implementation timeline, lack of published metrics for evaluating progress, lack of information about the proposed relationship between pre-award and post-award management and lack of information about how the new pre-award structure will be financed. On May 2, 2011 UCSF Department Chairs voiced similar concerns, noting that they perceive that they had not been adequately consulted in the process to date. Some Department Chairs explained that they plan to run shadow systems during the implementation of the proposed changes to ensure that current processes are not compromised. Some requested to continue to operate as independent units and to allow at least two to three grant cycles for implementation and evaluation.

Furthermore, in an effort to learn more from individual faculty members about their perspectives on the pre-award grant administration process, the Faculty Association posted a survey that yielded about 300 responses that echoed the concerns of the Faculty Oversight Committee and the Department Chairs, including concerns that faculty had not been adequately engaged in the planning process.
Coordinating Committee members agreed that communication and engagement with faculty in the Operational Excellence process has seemed minimal, and when pressed, Operational Excellence representatives were not willing to entertain recommendations for changes to their plans.

One member noted that the Operational Excellence process started with good intent and seems to be doing good work to improve UCSF Information Technology (IT) and Finances. Although faculty members did not raise concerns regarding changes in IT or Finance, they are now quite concerned about the proposed changes to grant administration processes. Several members noted that addressing faculty concerns should be part of the planning process and may simply be a matter of slowing down the implementation long enough to respond to faculty concerns.

Another member articulated that the Operational Excellence promise has been to improve service and reduce costs. However, he has not yet seen sufficient documentation to know that this promise will be kept. Furthermore, he would like to see more information about how the new pre-award administration will handle peak work concentrated around application deadlines, the hierarchy of the workload distribution, and most significantly the funding model for the new administrative structure.

Update: At the June 9, 2011 Division Meeting, R. Newcomer presented faculty concerns with the Operational Excellence plans for changes to pre-award grant administration. His presentation included the following:

**Academic Senate Recommendations**

1. Faculty support improving the management of grant pre- and post-award processes at UCSF

2. Move forward with two complementary models
   a. Faculty experience a wide variation in service quality and costs
   b. Implement Operational Excellence clusters as proposed
   c. Improve service and reduce costs to meet or exceed standards currently set by high-performing units
   d. Delegate signature authority to current high-performing units

3. Faculty support substantially shrinking Contracts and Grants by moving signature authority closer to grant preparation
   a. Improve the evaluation structure
   b. Improve training
   c. Compare and evaluate the two models throughout the implementation process
   d. Streamline operations
   e. Evaluation should include assessment of the effects on the post-award process
   f. Reduce costs
   g. Extend the first evaluation phase to allow sufficient time for refining procedures and practices in both models

4. Remain open to possibility using both models concurrently as a long term solution

Following the presentation, faculty discussed pre-award grant administration with Chancellor Susan Desmond-Hellmann, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Jeff Bluestone and Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration John Plotts. More information can be found here.

**UCSF Academic Senate Membership Task Force Report – Robert Newcomer**

Robert Newcomer chairs the UCSF Academic Senate Membership Task Force and updated the Coordinating Committee on the group’s deliberations to date.

Chair Fuentes-Afflick participated in a discussion with the Division Chairs from the five UC health sciences campuses. The other four Division Chairs were not open to the idea of expanding Academic
Senate membership beyond the three faculty series listed in Standing Order of the Regents 105.1 (Clinical X, In Residence and Ladder Rank). UCSF representative to the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) Paul Garcia found a similar resistance on the issue among UCAP colleagues.

One of the primary concerns for UC faculty outside UCSF regarding including faculty in additional series would be a change in the proportional representation of each campus in the UC Systemwide Academic Assembly. One member noted that some UC colleagues may not be concerned about UCSF; rather they worry about the inclusion of a large number non-Senate faculty from UCLA.

Overall, Coordinating Committee members supported the Task Force’s efforts to date and encouraged them to finalize a recommendation for inclusion of UCSF Adjunct and Health Sciences clinical faculty in the Academic Senate. One member appreciated the thought and effort the Task Force has put into this issue. This topic has been the subject of debate for decades. This is the first comprehensive effort to effectively extend Academic Senate membership to UCSF faculty currently excluded from the Senate. He noted that it may take a long time before the change is made UC Systemwide and urged the Task Force to get approval for local autonomy before trying to change the minds of the other campuses.

The Task Force’s recommendations will include an educational component to help UCSF faculty better understand the issues and how they impact their experience as faculty members. Some of the points the Task Force expects to make in its recommendations include:

- All UCSF faculty in the Academic Senate should be reviewed by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
- How should UCSF Academic Senate membership be defined? Full time? Does full-time mean 100% time, or something less than 100%?
- Is UCSF willing to appoint Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical colleagues as committee chairs and UC Systemwide representatives?

The Task Force intends that their final recommendations should be transparent to colleagues across the UC System, as that might help strengthen UCSF’s case.

One member asked about moving as many Health Sciences Clinical and Adjunct faculty members into Clinical X or In Residence series. CAP has carefully considered this idea and will only recommend that a colleague change series when warranted by their activities. Moving faculty into different series for any other reason could jeopardize that faculty member’s ability to succeed in a series that does not correlate to their actual activities at UCSF.

UC Online Education Pilot Program
Item tabled until the next meeting.

Report from Academic Planning and Budget – Steven Cheung, Chair

Proposed Modifications to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan
The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) recommended three modifications to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan to relax restrictions on the type of work in which faculty could engage outside of their responsibilities to the UCSF. These recommendations are intended to help faculty manage the increase in employer contribution for UCRP will be borne by individual faculty members and to seek parity with other UC campuses. The recommended modifications included the following:

1. Compensation Limit on Occasional Outside Professional Activities
   The maximum annual earnings threshold is set at $40,000 (currently $20,000) or 20% of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (Plan) Salary Scale for the faculty member’s rank, step, and
2. Time Limit on Compensated Outside Professional Activities
A full-time Plan member may engage in compensated outside professional activities for up to 48 days during the months of active service. There are no restrictions on the number of days of compensated outside activity during the periods of vacation leave (unless the faculty member is earning additional University compensation during the vacation leave). This is express adoption of APM-025 Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members, Section 10.b, Page 6 for Plan members.

3. Categories of Income from Occasional Outside Activities Which May Be Retained
Plan members in good standing may retain income from occasional outside patient care and from professional activities related to the training and experience which are the individual's qualifications for University appointment, subject to the new limits on compensation and time described above. This broadens the categories of retainable income from occasional service specified in APM-670 Health Sciences Compensation Plan, Section IV.D, Page 7.

Financial Rebenching for the University of California
Financial Rebenching is the name of the process by which the University of California is reviewing and revising how each of the UC campuses will be funded in the future. As Chair of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) and the UCSF Representative to the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), S. Cheung is well-informed on the Financial Rebenching process. He provided this update for the Committee.

One of the current proposals would be to allocate State of California funds to each UC campus on a per student basis. UCSF does not have a large undergraduate study body to benefit from economies of scale for its operations. In an allocation scenario that does not account for this important distinction between UCSF and its sister campuses, UCSF would be harmed. Therefore, UCSF seeks a more comprehensive methodology for funding this campus.

Old Business
None.

New Business
None.

Adjournment
There being no further business, Chair Fuentes-Afflick adjourned the meeting at 3:55 pm.