Committee on Academic Planning and Budget  
David Teitel, MD, Chair  
February 28, 2013  

Minutes  

Present: David Teitel* (Chair), Farid Chehab, Chad Christine, Oi Saeng Hong*, Helene Lipton, Sharmila Majumdar*, Sally Marshall, Sneha Oberoi, Fred Schaufele, Ellen Weber, Sandra Weiss, Lori Yamauchi*  
*by phone  

Absent: Teresa Costatinidis, Barbara Drew, Jacque Duncan, Shari Dworkin, Mary Gray, Ruth Greenblatt, Elazar Harel, Phillip Moore, John Plotts, Torsten Wittmann  

Guests: None  

Chair David Teitel called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm in HSW 302. A quorum was present.  

The minutes from the January 24, 2013 meeting were approved.  

Chair’s Report – David Teitel  
None  

UCPB Report – Mary Gray  
None  

Academic Senate Staff Report – Heather Alden  
- Senate Membership Survey Results  
- The Academic Senate Call for Service for 2013-14  
- Faculty Research Lecture in Basic Science – John Rubenstein, MD, PhD  
  “Development of the Forebrain: Exploring its Genetic Architecture”  
  Wednesday March 13, 2012, 3:30-5:00 pm in Cole Hall  

Subcommittee Reports  
Operational Excellence - Jacque Duncan, Shari Dworkin, Helene Lipton, Janet Myers (Committee on Research), Fred Schaufele  
Report from meeting with John Plotts on February 4, 2013 – David Teitel  
D. Teitel, R. Newcomer and H. Alden met with John Plotts on February 4 to discuss Operational Excellence. D. Teitel reported that J. Plotts requested the meeting in response to the APB communication requesting the creation of a faculty-based committee to bridge and advise on Operational Excellence efforts across the campus. J. Plotts noted that Operational Excellence began in 2010 with a faculty oversight committee that was eventually closed, as it had not been effective. Furthermore, campus administrators plan to retire the Operational Excellence concept by summer 2013. Therefore, J. Plotts suggested that instead of forming a new committee, that additional Academic Senate representatives be added to existing Advisory Committees.
Following D. Teitel’s update, APB members discussed the following issues:

- The problem highlighted in the letter persists of having separate initiatives.
- The OE efforts are not independent entities, for example HR does relate to Pre-Award administration.
- How will the faculty be involved in the discussions regarding the overarching issues, such as how much money is being saved or lost.
- The Academic Senate needs to expand involvement in existing Advisory Committees and to be involved from the beginning for any new initiative.
- We hear that faculty need greater input in the individual efforts. We agree. We can encourage the faculty members participating on the Advisory Committees to meet periodically to discuss crossover possibilities.
- How would we identify additional faculty members for the Advisory Committees? Start with the APB subcommittees. Invite current participants on the Advisory Committees to meet with the APB subcommittees to learn more about how their involvement has worked to date.
- Invite John Plotts to come to the April APB meeting.
- When will the results from the Dentistry and Nursing Pre-Award surveys be available? What will happen as a result of the data?

**Campus Planning - Chad Christine, Barbara Drew, Mary Gray, Janet Myers**

Activity-based workplace update – David Teitel

D. Teitel noted some activity regarding faculty workspace to date included:

- Academic Senate sent a letter to faculty on February 8
- D. Teitel toured the mock-up site; website updated
- 42 comments received
- RN & DT will meet with Sam Hawgood on March 4
- No response from the administration to date.

APB members discussed the following:

- S. Oberoi recently visited the mock-up space with other surgeons. None of those who visited were happy about the space.
- H. Lipton: What if the administration does not act on the Senate recommendations?
- D. Teitel: If campus leaders do not act, we will need to take stronger action.
- L. Yamauchi noted that campus leaders are aware of Senate concerns. She has been in conversation with Bruce and Bonnie, met with department chairs (Surgery, Anesthesia & other chairs plus MSOs) who will occupy the Clinical Sciences building. The schedule for the CSB project was to start with programming and design for the space in 2013 to start construction in 2015 to be completed by 2017. The Senate’s recommendation for a moratorium on planning for other spaces until data can be reviewed from the MB Academic Building is problematic because of the timing on preparing for the CSB construction.
- F. Schaufele: The design of CSB should be stopped until the results from the MB Academic Building are known.
- L. Yamauchi: If campus leadership want to stop planning by one year, then we will do that, even with cost implications for delaying the project. One of the drivers for the activity-based workplace model has been cost.
- F. Chehab: What would be the alternate plan for MB Academic Building if we find that it does not work?
- D. Teitel: There is currently no alternate plan. That is why we want to meet with Sam Hawgood.
- L. Yamauchi: the plan is to start construction on the building in March 2013. The interiors have already been designed. In some spaces at UCSF, we have built flexible interiors.
- L. Yamauchi: We need to think about the implications of delaying the current projects. We need to quantify the potential costs.
D. Teitel: We also need to think about the cost of proceeding on schedule. Costs about losing faculty and impact on productivity, cost to provider-patient relationships, etc.

S. Marshall: Compile the existing literature for campus leaders.

F. Schaufele: These are all good questions, but they should have been asked in the due diligence phase of this planning process.

L. Yamauchi: At the 654 Minnesota Street office, we have a lot of open workstations. People lower their voices. When the cubicle walls are higher, people tend to speak more loudly.

E. Weber: We won’t know for a long time whether this experiment will work. Can we not simply rethink the strategies for the other buildings?

L. Yamauchi: We haven’t yet designed CSB or UHall, so we could rethink their design. However the Chancellor has expressed a desire for consistency across the buildings. If the spaces are designed for offices, then that would mean space for fewer people due to the space ceilings.

H. Lipton: Costs for the project are always discussed in terms of financial costs, however there are many other costs to consider including HIPAA violations, losses for faculty, etc.

S. Marshall: The cost of a building should not be limited to dollars, but also other factors.

E. Weber: Many faculty members on campus do not have offices, many faculty share an office. For many faculty members, sharing an office would be preferable to workstations.

S. Oberoi: If faculty are sharing space with staff who need to be on the phone often, the amount of sound in the space will be too distracting.

E. Weber: Applying a consistent approach to the office space is not necessarily a best practice since different spaces are used for different purposes.

H. Lipton: Is there office space elsewhere to accommodate additional people at Mission Bay?

D. Teitel: We need to frame the issue in terms of costs to UCSF’s mission.

S. Marshall: Lag time in terms of costs. Also need to engage faculty to think about their own efficiencies.

Campus Finances - Sharmila Majumdar, David Teitel
Composite Benefits Rates – still being worked out
Federal Sequestration - how will UCSF handle the changes to indirect costs?

Development Office - Sandra Weiss, Oi Saeng Hong, Sally Marshall
Meeting with John Ford, Vice Chancellor for University Development and Alumni Relations scheduled for March 25, 2013

Information Technology (IT) - Sneha Oberoi, David Teitel
R. Newcomer wrote to John Plotts to request Academic Senate participation.

Old Business
None

New Business
None

Adjournment
Chair Teitel adjourned the meeting at 2:55 pm.