Committee on Academic Planning and Budget  
David Teitel, MD, Chair

DRAFT MINUTES  
October 24, 2013

Present: David Teitel (Chair), Michelle Arkin, Jennifer Arnett, Chad Christine, Barbara Drew, Stefan Habelitz, Oi Saeng Hong, Mehran Hossaini, Sneha Oberoi, Norm Oppenheimer, Russ Pieper*, John Plotts, Shuvo Roy, Catherine Waters (for Shari Dworkin), Sandra Weiss, Jane Wong*
* by phone

Absent: Joe Bengfort, Teresa Costatinidis, Ruth Greenblatt, Sharmila Majumdar, Sally Marshall, Joseph Sullivan, Ellen Weber, Lori Yamauchi

Guests: Matija Peterlin, Member, CSB/UCH Space Planning Committee

Chair Teitel called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm in room MUW 302.

Approval of the Minutes  
The minutes from September 26, 2013 were approved.

Chair’s Report – David Teitel
Mission Hall activity-based workplace update
D. Teitel has been meeting with the Mission Hall planning group. All Mission Bay hospital groups will move in to the building on the first Friday in February. Individual workstation partitions will be 42 inches high. Security on each floor will be addressed by proximity badges. Although the IT and phone systems look good, there will be a significant issue for storing paper materials. There is not enough space for occupant paper storage.

Faculty workspace use study
In May 2013, the Academic Senate requested the implementation of a workspace study. D. Teitel and Nancy Adler and others are working with Michael Bade on the pre-occupancy study. The next step will be to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the entire study. The funding for the study has not yet been identified. Once it is available, D. Teitel will bring the RFP to this committee for review.

UCPB Report – Sharmila Majumdar
No report. The next UCPB meeting will be held on November 5, 2013.

Academic Senate Staff Report – Heather Alden
Faculty Research Lecture in Clinical Science – “Optimizing Cognitive Aging”
Kristine Yaffe, MD, Psychiatry, Neurology and Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Monday October 28, 2013, 3:30-5:00 pm in Cole Hall (with simulcast)  

Clinical Sciences Building/UC Hall (CSB/UCH) Planning Update - Matija Peterlin
M. Peterlin updated the APB members on the CSB/UCH space planning committee efforts to date. The group has met three times since the summer regarding the redesign of CSB/UCH. The main driving
forces are earthquake safety, the community space ceiling, and cost. CSB is slated for remodel in 2015-17, UCH in 2017-19 with an expected cost of $20 million. The current plan is to have both buildings separate from adjacent buildings. All seven floors of the C building are slated to have the same floor plan. Three floors of the U building will be student housing.

UCSF Architect Michael Bade presented three interior space plans: open-workspace, closed offices and a hybrid model. Approximately 80 people need to be accommodated per floor in the C building. The architects prefer the activity-based workspace design. M. Bade claimed that this plan has been implemented at Beth Israel hospital in Boston successfully, however he has not visited the space or talked with anyone who works in the space.

Committee members discussed the following points with M. Peterlin:

- Based on the feedback from the Coordinating Committee, faculty favor the private office model.
- Corridors between buildings are needed on the 2nd and 5th floors, on the 2nd floor for entry to the Nursing building and on the 5th floor for access to the loading dock. Not having corridors between buildings would diminish collaboration and communication between buildings.
- What about disability access between buildings?
- The Committee on Educational Policy is concerned about the educational space during renovation and in the renovated buildings. They met to discuss on October 22.
- Themes for space use need to be determined, but they haven’t yet been discussed.
- Has anyone surveyed faculty who would like to come to UCSF about their willingness to work in activity-based workspace? Conversations with junior researchers indicate that they aspire to have a private workspace.
- When is the decision due for CSB/UCH? November 2014.
- Can faculty view the plans? We will ask Lori Yamauchi about the website she planned to create.

At the next CSB/UCH space planning meeting, M. Peterlin will represent APB member concerns that corridors are desirable, private offices are preferred, desire for a website and concern about access to the loading dock.

**Proposed Revisions to the Current UCSF Model of Gift and Spending Fees - the Infrastructure and Operations Fund – John Plotts, Senior Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration, John Ford Vice Chancellor for University Development & Alumni Relations (UDAR), Steve Downs, Executive Director for Financial Services & Administration, UDAR, and Jennifer Arnett, Associate Vice Chancellor for University Development & Alumni Relations (Attachments 2a & 2b)**

J. Plotts and J. Ford presented the plan to increase gift and spending fees for UCSF to support infrastructure and operations at UCSF (slides attached). In Fall 2011, it became apparent that UCSF needed to increase fundraising. In January 2012 the Chancellor presented to the Regents ideas for revenue enhancement (alongside her governance presentation), including enhanced fundraising efforts.

The model is for the infrastructure and operations costs associated with gifts to be supported by 4% at the time of the gift and 6% at the time the spending occurs. Exceptions made for gifts specifically designated for student support. Other types of gifts that are spent for student support, among other expenses, will not be excepted.

Committee members discussed the following points with J. Plotts, J. Ford, S. Downs and J. Arnett:

- How is UCSF doing at fundraising? Is it growing? We had our second best year to date last year. We are well positioned in a prosperous area. We need to connect more people to UCSF. We are trying to increase the impact of philanthropy on the institution. Fundraising for unrestricted support is a non-starter. That is why a proposal like this one makes sense to generate unrestricted funds for the institution.
- Campus seismic investments expected to be nearly $500 million, primarily CSB, UCH and SFGH by the end of this decade. Deferred maintenance also accounts for significant costs.
- Technology investments are now governed by the IT Steering Committee. The UCSF IT roadmap was recently approved to determine campus IT spending in the next five years (attachment).
- J. Plotts and others have developed a Core Financial Plan for the campus. Every other week the Budget & Investment Committee (J. Plotts, the four Deans, EVCP, MC CEO and Chair of the Senate) meet to discuss significant financial matters, including the use of UCSF Core funds.
The additional spending fees might seem like a bait-and-switch for donors who have already contributed to UCSF. The extra revenue generated will go to Core Campus funds in support of campus infrastructure and operations costs. Perhaps sharing with donors about what those funds will do will help them better understand why it would be implemented. Selling seismic upgrades won’t work for fundraising. Selling the programs that will be housed in the upgraded buildings could work.

Both faculty and students will lose if this proposal is implemented. For example, a faculty member with an endowed chair position to fund research will now have 6% less to allocate for projects, student researchers, etc. J. Plotts and J. Ford indicated, however, that the infrastructure and operations costs to support the activity are real costs that are incurred from the Core Financial plan.

This model asks faculty to support the selling of a new plan that jumps from 4%+1% to 4%+6%.

Has the decrease in federal funding for research been factored into this plan? J. Plotts indicated assumptions for a near term softening in federal research funding has been incorporated into the assumptions.

What about the return of indirect costs to the departments? Return to the departments is already built into the formula.

Most of the fundraising to date has been for buildings. How will fundraising for programs happen going forward? We have had success in selling stories about people and programs.

How will funds raised be equitably distributed across faculty members and programs? There are few donors out there. It is more effective to have a big story. UCSF has been very entrepreneurial and decentralized, not something to change because it has been successful. How can we build another layer that creates a unifying story that compels big gifts.

What can this committee do to help you? This conversation has already been helpful. Our main objective is to understand how to best communicate about this to faculty and donors. Specifically, how to best talk about this with individual groups and how to best communicate with the faculty as a whole. We want your input into how we can be successful. We will also meet with the Medicine Clinical Chairs and each of the Deans. APB members made the following suggestions:

- Present the proposal to the School Faculty Councils. Artemio Cardenas staffs the Faculty Councils and can help with scheduling. Consider also sharing the information with the Graduate Council (Kathleen Dargan can help with scheduling). S. Weiss and the Development Subcommittee will check in once the presentations have been made to the Faculty Councils. APB may write a position statement once the Faculty Councils have heard the presentation.
- Present the proposal to basic science department chairs and/or program directors.
- For donors who are still living, it would be helpful to encourage an additional donation to offset the increased assessment.
- Providing talking points for faculty would be helpful.

Administrative Initiatives Coordinating Board (AICB) - Shari Dworkin, Stefan Habelitz
D. Teitel will send the AICB proposal to Academic Senate leadership to learn more about their perspective before sending it on to campus administrative leaders.

Old Business
None.

New Business
None.

Adjournment
Chair Teitel adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm.