Minutes

November 5, 2012

Present: Robert Newcomer (Chair), Farid Chehab, Jyu-Lin Chen*, Tejal Desai*, Patrick Finley*, Pat Fox, Heather Fullerton, David Gardner, Paul Green, Ruth Greenblatt, Brad Hare, Janice Humphreys, Jeff Lansman, Tuan Le (for Mohana Amirtharajah), Janice Lee, Matt Jacobson (for Joe Guglielmo), Sharmila Majumdar (for David Teitel), Sally Marshall, Robert Nissenson, Henry Sanchez, Peter Sargent, Rich Schneider, Janet Shim (for Gordon Fung), Anne Slavotinek, Torsten Wittmann

*by phone

Absent: Molly Cooke, Shari Dworkin, Elena Fuentes-Afflick, Bonnie Halpern-Felsher, Sam Hawgood, Errol Lobo, Stephen Morin, Sri Nagarajan, Susan Promes, Phil Rosenthal, Joseph Sullivan, David Vlahov, Elizabeth Watkins, Elisabeth Wilson

Guests: Chad Christine, Member, Campus Planning Subcommittee
        Bruce Wintroub, Co-Chair, UCSF Space Committee
        Lori Yamauchi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning

Chair Robert Newcomer called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm. A quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes of October 1, 2012
The minutes from the October 1, 2012 meeting were approved.

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

- Anne Slavotinek, UCSF Academic Senate Parliamentarian appointed to the University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (UCRJ)
- **UC Path (single payroll system for all UC campuses)** and proposed composite benefits rates: UCSF will be one of the last campuses to begin UC Path. Part of the UC Path implementation plan includes a proposal for composite benefits rates to assess benefits fees as a percentage of salary. UC campuses are currently working to determine the salary categories and percentages to be incorporated into UC Path.
- Academic Senate Membership Update: the Senate Membership Task Force has drafted a survey regarding Senate membership issues. It is expected to be available for faculty in January 2013.

Vice Chair’s Report – Farid Chehab
Vice Chair Chehab attended the last two Academic Council meetings on behalf of R. Newcomer. Those meetings included discussions on the following topics:

- California Proposition 30 and implications for the University of California
- Revised laboratory safety compliance monitoring
- **UC Campus Climate Survey**
- Academic Council will invite five Regents to attend meetings in 2012-13.
- UC total remuneration study requested
- Graduate student report
• UC Provost Aimee Dorr will initiate a review of the Compendium of the Universitywide Review Processes to better define how to close undergraduate programs
• The University Committee on Research Policy (UCRP) responded to a request from Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Steve Beckwith to create an advisory group on UC research investments. UCSF Vice Chancellor for Research Keith Yamamoto will participate.

Director’s Update – Heather Alden
H. Alden will co-Chair the Course Review System Oversight Committee with Registrar Doug Carlson to determine the next steps for online course review at UCSF. Members of the committee include representation from all schools, the Committee on Courses of Instruction, the Registrar’s Office and Student Information Systems.

The next Faculty Research Lecture in Translational Science, “Exploring Development of the Forebrain” will be given by John L. R. Rubenstein, MD, PhD on March 13, 2013, 3:30-5:00 pm in Cole Hall.

UCSF Space Governance Policy and Principles (Attachment 1) – Bruce Wintroub, Co-Chair, UCSF Space Committee
Space is the most important asset at UCSF. Our overriding aim is to make space available to faculty in a fair and equitable way so they can do what they do, and to have space to run the institution and develop new programs. The current space management model is not sustainable.

The School of Medicine began a process three years ago to better manage its space. This laid the groundwork for a campus-wide activity which SDH started in early 2012. The UCSF Space Committee was created to define principles for managing space at UCSF.

All of the Chancellor’s Direct Reports who oversee space will be accountable to the principles established by the Space Committee. The Committee will not address individual faculty members. Individual faculty members will interact with their school or department.

The charge for space will be a virtual system in the first phase. The cost for space was determined based on the open work plan for the new Mission Bay Academic Building (Block 25a), for which 30 assignable square feet (asf) per individual. Hallways and restrooms are factored in to the gross square foot calculations.

We want to go live with the new UCSF space plan in January 2013. We will provide the data to the Chancellor’s direct reports and ask them to implement the space principles. The first year will be a transition year.

Discussion:

• What about classroom and educational space?
  BW: The UCSF Space Committee has not yet addressed classroom and educational space. This is on the list of things to do.

• Where does the Medical Center come into this?
  BW: The Medical Center already uses space efficiently and uses its own rent model. It also has its own space inventory.

• This system could create opportunities for faculty to come up with creative ideas about how to best use space. For example, when I first moved to Mission Bay, our space was occupied by faculty members from two schools and four departments because we all work on the same science.
  BW: There should be a lot of processes within and among schools to determine the best uses of space.

• We’re trying to get the Faculty Councils involved in this process.
  BW: Faculty Councils should be working with their Deans.
• There is an opportunity for innovation in the space planning. Not very many people focused on education on the committee nor people who do dry lab research. May want to consider diversifying the committee to include those types of people.

BW: We try to use subcommittees because the Space Committee doesn’t have enough knowledge within the group to address all the issues.

• If this is group is going to make recommendations to the Chancellor, then the recommendations should be in proportion to the components of the UCSF mission.

• How will this impact faculty recruitment? Retention?

BW: We intend for this to be a living document. I don’t see how we can manage space under the new model without looking at individual faculty member performance. Although the threshold is currently $90/sf it doesn’t mean that everyone needs to perform at $90/sf, but determining average cost per square foot will be up to each of the Chancellor’s direct reports. The threshold is intended to trigger a review of space use.

• What about rented space?

BW: the space committee is not addressing rented space. However, one of the goals of this process includes bringing programs back to UCSF space.

• Would the three-year cycle of the system be sensitive enough to accommodate the fluctuations in funding, faculty careers, etc.

BW: The sensitivity will likely be at the school and department levels.

• What about the costs of investing in space that may be only in use for three years?

BW: There will be challenges.

UCSF Campus Planning Update (Attachment 2) – Lori Yamauchi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning

UCSF Parnassus is over its space cap by ~30,000 sf and is facing upcoming seismic upgrades, maintenance and modernization costs. How to modernize space at Parnassus?

Movement of programs to Mission Bay has freed up space at Parnassus. Current plans to backfill Medical Center space with clinical programs.

Moffitt inpatient acute care needs to be replaced by 2030. Current plans are to build an acute care inpatient facility on the LPPI footprint.

Some old buildings are seismically compromised. The largest of which are U Hall (1917) and C Building (1932). MR-IV (old nursing barracks) building is slated for demolition. Once demolished, they come off the space ceiling cap, so they help UCSF approach compliance with the space ceiling.

Current plan for UC Hall and Clinical Sciences – retrofit and renovate. The C Building has 71,000 sf and UC Hall has 90,000 sf of offices, clinics, labs and classrooms. Wet lab space in these buildings will not be replaced due to the cost and the excess of wet lab space and the need for office and classroom space at Parnassus.

Q: What is the process for working with PIs whose wet labs will be moved?
LY: We have a committee with representation from all four schools to help advise faculty who are moving out of UC Hall and the C Building.

• Clinical Sciences remodel will include the open workspace office model.

• Ophthalmology will not be replaced in Clinical Sciences or UC Hall – the future of that program is currently under negotiation.

• UC Hall current plan – three floors of office space and three floors of housing. With the building of the Moffitt Hospital replacement on LPPI by 2030, could UC Hall become all UC Housing to help lower the impact on the space ceiling overage?

Q: What about the dental clinics in the C Building?
LY: we have a home for them in the Medical Sciences from dentistry practices moving to Mission Bay.
Q: For the activity-based workplace, have you checked with IRB? Issues related to accessibility, etc.
LY: Good suggestion. I will follow up on that.

The Laurel Heights building has about 300,000 sf. About half of it is occupied by researchers and the other half occupied by administrators. The building has about 1,200 people in it. The space use is not efficient and the building is on its last legs.

The UCSF Space Committee has a subcommittee to look into the use of Laurel Heights. Conducted an occupancy survey of the Laurel Heights building. Compared the space utilization against the metric of 150 asf/person. Some units are meeting this metric and some units are not. The data about space utilization will be provided to the Chancellor’s direct reports to make decisions about space assignments. Ultimately looking for an exit strategy for Laurel Heights to avoid a $80-100 million investment in upgrading the building.

Q: Will UCSF sell the building?
LY: Not sure yet – evaluating to determine the most cost-effective plan for that location. Faculty there prefer to be closer to colleagues at Parnassus or Mission Bay. The Chancellor does not see a future for UCSF at Laurel Heights.

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

Academic Planning & Budget (APB) – Sharmila Majumdar, Vice Chair
For 2012-13, APB has created subcommittees on Operational Excellence, Campus Planning, Information Technology, Development and Campus Finances. The subcommittees are meeting separately to learn more about each topic. They will report back to the full APB at our November meeting.

APB Chair David Teitel recently met with Elazar Harel, Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer, to convey faculty concerns about the desktop support, particularly to request that IT revisit its statement that it would not support equipment older than five years. In addition some faculty would like the ability to opt-out of the new desktop support structure. E. Harel will work with D. Teitel in the coming months on these issues.

Discussion:
- Could the campus establish an assistance fund to help units come up to campus standards?
- Will postdocs will be counted in the IT fee headcount? IT will cost out individual units. I think we should get a sampling of this information to help inform the faculty responses.

Faculty Welfare – Paul Green, Chair, Faculty Welfare
UCSF will implement new lab safety training and compliance rules. Faculty are concerned whether they will be indemnified should faculty should an incident occur. Faculty members need clarification on details of indemnification.

Discussion:
- Faculty members who are acting in their capacity as a faculty member have been indemnified.

Old Business
None

New Business
None

Adjournment
Chair Newcomer adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.

Senate Staff:
Heather Alden, Executive Director
heather.alden@ucsf.edu (415) 476-8827