Academic Senate Coordinating Committee  
Robert Newcomer, PhD, Chair

Minutes

October 1, 2012

Present: Robert Newcomer (Chair), Farid Chehab, Jyu-Lin Chen*, Molly Cooke, Tejal Desai*, Shari Dworkin*, Pat Finley, Pat Fox, Gordon Fung, David Gardner, Paul Green, Ruth Greenblatt, Brad Hare, Janice Humphreys, Sally Marshall, Robert Nissenson, Rich Schneider, Anne Slavotinek, Joseph Sullivan
*by phone

Absent: Mohana Amirtharajah, Elena Fuentes-Afflick, Heather Fullerton, Bonnie Halpern-Felsher, Sam Hawgood, Jeff Lansman, Errol Lobo, Stephen Morin, Susan Promes, Phil Rosenthal, Peter Sargent, David Teitel, David Vlahov, Elizabeth Watkins, Elisabeth Wilson, Torsten Wittmann

Guests: John Ford, Vice Chancellor for University Development & Alumni Relations  
Barbara Drew, Academic Planning & Budget Campus Planning Subcommittee Member  
Oi Saeng Hong, Academic Planning & Budget Campus Planning Subcommittee Member

Chair Robert Newcomer called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. A quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes of June 25, 2012
The minutes from the June 25, 2012 meeting were approved.

Chair’s Report – Robert Newcomer
Chair Newcomer updated the group on the following issues:

- Report and Recommendations of the University of California Rebenching Budget Committee – comments due to the UC Systemwide Academic Senate on December 3, 2012.
  o UCSF is currently excluded from the UC Rebenching model
- A UC Systemwide Laboratory Safety training policy is currently under review by the Academic Senate.
  o At UCSF, the Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Committee on Research will review and provide comment.
- Privacy & Information Security – Faculty Welfare, and possibly the Clinical Affairs Committee
- Transparency – The UCSF Academic Senate will try to be as transparent as possible in communications with the Chancellor, Deans, UC Systemwide Academic Senate, etc. Any faculty member having problems with transparency is welcome to contact R. Newcomer to work together to determine the best next steps.

Director’s Update – Heather Alden
Faculty Research Lecture in Clinical Science – Bruce Miller, MD
“Frontotemporal Dementia: An Understudied but Important Disorder”
Monday October 15, 3:30-5:00 pm, Genentech Hall, Mission Bay Campus
John Ford, Vice Chancellor for University Development & Alumni Relations, started at UCSF in September. He joined the Coordinating Committee to learn more about faculty concerns related to development and alumni relations, and to share about his background and the experience he brings to the position. J. Ford comes to UCSF with 40 years of experience in higher education development including ten years at the California Institute of Technology (CalTech) and the University of Chicago, as well as 30 years at Stanford, at both the campus and the medical center. He retired from Stanford in 2008 and moved to Seattle to consult. He left consulting to come to UCSF as the new Vice Chancellor for Development & Alumni Relations.

University development serves the faculty and students. It starts with the success of the faculty and students. Although he plans to come back to the Academic Senate to discuss UCSF Development further, on this day, he sought faculty questions. While he was at Stanford, he presented to the Faculty Senate each year on development achievements.

Philanthropy tends to focus on buildings, yet there is a need for infrastructure and operating costs. In addition, the UCSF Development office needs to develop strategies to fund projects already underway. Need to figure out how to set priorities that the campus leadership and faculty determine are important. Ultimately, the people who make the final decisions are the donors. J. Ford’s time is most valuablely spent getting to know the donors. He will count on faculty input to learn about what happens within UCSF. Open issues today for UCSF include the outcome of the November election, NIH funding and debt burden.

As philanthropy will play a bigger and bigger role at UCSF in the future, J. Ford wants to bring a sense of stability and direction to the Development and Alumni Relations team.

Following his introduction, J. Ford responded to the following questions and comments.

- The 2011 UCSF Faculty Climate Survey showed that UCSF made progress in areas of faculty concern since the last survey in 2001, but stability for faculty salaries remains an issue. Only 16% of UCSF faculty are receive part or all of a State-funded FTE (Full-Time Equivalent). About 16-17% of faculty members hold endowed chairs and 60-70% of UCSF faculty support themselves via grants and/or clinical income. UCSF needs a large endowment for faculty salaries. UCSF has recommended funding 20% of member’s base salary to allow them to spend one day per week pursuing new research directions, etc. To initiate such a program, UCSF would need to raise approximately $29 million.

  J. Ford will follow up to learn more.

- The UCSF Alumni Association needs leadership. It needs to better track students who leave UCSF, as well as other trainees. UCSF academic graduate students are an untapped resource. They need to be better tracked. The Emeriti Faculty Association also needs to be better administered and could be administered in parallel with the Alumni Association.

  J. Ford: All external functions need to work together including development, the alumni association and public affairs. Public Affairs plays a critical role in creating the environment in which development operates. UCSF just had its first all-alumni event, which was a great success. Enlarging the alumni group to include postdocs and trainees should be further discussed. Should UCSF alumni include faculty? Alumni refers only for those who have a degree from the institution. J. Ford will learn more about how the Alumni Association works at UCSF.

- UCSF faculty members have little to no experience in helping with the philanthropic effort. We are interested and would like access to resources to learn more. The culture of collaboration works at UCSF already. We need some help with infrastructure so we can help with development.
J. Ford: We will initiate trainings for faculty, and will seek to better engage faculty. Basic Sciences faculty do not traditionally have contact with grateful patients. I think bedside clinicians should talk about the entire process of that helped individual patients.

Vice Provost Sally Marshall noted that Academic Affairs has not yet included development aspects in faculty leadership trainings, but we would be glad to include those components in our training opportunities.

J. Ford: We can all work together to better understand the processes and decide how to best work together.

- How will UCSF’s divided geography impact our future?

J. Ford: The philanthropic dollar will be more inclined to follow the new. It will be harder to backfill the spaces at Parnassus, Mt. Zion, etc. What really matters is what will happen in spaces and how to bring it to life.

- The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Budget has formed a subcommittee to help provide feedback.

J. Ford: The Development Office is set up to work with faculty, mostly along departmental lines.

**Academic Senate Membership Update – Paul Garcia, Chair, UCSF Academic Senate Membership Task Force (Attachment 2)**

P. Garcia updated the group on the UCSF efforts to include Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty members in the Academic Senate. In March 2012, UCSF distributed a proposal to include 100%-time Associate and Full Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty members in the Academic Senate by July 1, 2012. The proposal was reviewed and rejected by the University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (UCRJ). The UCSF proposal was based on a revised interpretation of Standing Order of the Regents (SOR) 105.1a. Although UCRJ rejected the UCSF interpretation of SOR 105.1a, the Regents themselves could review the UCSF interpretation and/or revise SOR 105.1a if they choose to add it to a meeting agenda.

UCSF did not include Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty members on July 1 as proposed. Instead, the UCSF Academic Senate Membership Task Force and Division Chair R. Newcomer have been working with UCSF administrators and others to ameliorate disparities between the faculty series at UCSF. The original plan would have remedied a number of issues with a single change. The current efforts are addressing individual disparities such as the right to represent UCSF at the UC Systemwide Academic Senate, voting rights on academic personnel actions within departments, eligibility for home loans, etc. An important component of making these changes will be revising bylaws with language to more expand the inclusion of Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty members in UCSF Academic Senate activities.

To better understand UCSF faculty views on Senate membership, the UCSF Task Force is preparing a brief survey regarding voting rights, eligibility for loans, etc. The objective is to gather information to help determine which Senate membership-related issues are highest priority for faculty.

Simultaneously, the UC Systemwide Academic Senate appointed a task force on Senate membership across the UC campuses. They provided an initial report in July 2012, with the final report expected in October or November 2012.

R. Newcomer noted that Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Jeff Bluestone would be willing to advocate on behalf of faculty on Senate membership-related issues that are of concern to them. Elsewhere in the UC System, faculty members are also concerned about Senate membership. For example, UC San Diego wants to allow their non-Senate faculty to vote on departmental issues. If UCSD goes that direction, UCLA will likely go the same direction. UCI might also support some changes to Senate membership. UCR might also be supportive of the concepts.
Following P. Garcia’s update, members discussed the following issues.

- All the energy for this effort is coming from within the Senate. Who represents the voices of the non-Senate faculty? Who sets their priorities? How do we decide where to spend our energy?
- Which issues do we have the autonomy to change? Which issues do we not have autonomy to change?
- How often are waivers granted for faculty to chair student committees? Every time? Isn’t that evidence of the culture already on our campus?
- Each faculty council has been working on Senate membership within their School.
- One possibility would be to give WOS (without salary) appointments to Adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical faculty members for the purpose of including them in the Academic Senate, i.e. to serve as Chair of a committee, a Division Officer or to represent UCSF at the UC Systemwide level. S. Marshall’s view is that if a faculty member meets the requirements for a Senate series, then they should be appointed to that series. If we created a WOS category for Senate membership purposes only, then CAP would continue to evaluate faculty based on their primary appointment.
- CAP (Committee on Academic Personnel) should continue to advocate that faculty are appointed to the correct series based on their work.
- S. Marshall would like the campus to agree that the Academic Senate will be more inclusive. UC Davis has had a structure parallel to the Senate for about 20 years, however the problems of separate categories persist.
- UCSF could also draft a memorial to the Regents on this issue.
- New UC Provost Aimee Dorr has requested a discussion with Academic Senate leaders about Senate Membership in December 2012.

**UCSF Space Planning (Attachment 2)**

R. Newcomer led a discussion focused on the recommendations of the UCSF Space Committee (see Attachment 1). He noted that space at UCSF has been the purview of Deans and Department Chairs – that will not change. What will change is that the entire campus will agree to abide by a unified space policy and principles. This proposal is the starting point, not the finish line. Part of the objective is to increase the transparency in the process and to help allocate space more rationally. Faculty Councils have identified space as a priority. Faculty Councils need to work with Deans and Department Chairs.

Members discussed the following points:

- The starting point has been the Columbia model. The School of Medicine has been driving this issue. It’s tied to indirect costs from grants, forcing researchers to pay for space or cede it back to the department or Dean’s office.
- How will educational space be catalogued, documented and allocated? The document includes only one mention of education.
- The UCSF Space Committee is composed of almost all administrators and faculty who are bench researchers, with little mention of education or clinical needs. No mention of renting space. What happens when a researcher is committed to space based on a research grant? No role laid out for joint governance in the document.
- How can faculty be fairly represented in this process?
- The going rate for space is $119/sq ft. Some departments have more space and fewer indirects and some departments have more indirects and less space. This is intended to be a management tool for department chairs.

**Reports from the Standing Committees, Faculty Councils and UC Systemwide Committees**

None. (Each committee reported at the Leadership Retreat on September 24, 2012.)

**Old Business**

None

**New Business**

None

**Adjournment**

Chair Newcomer adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.