Coordinating Committee
Farid Chehab, PhD, Chair

MINUTES
Monday, October 7, 2013

PRESENT: Farid Chehab (Chair), Ruth Greenblatt (Vice Chair), Shari Dworkin*, Jacque Duncan, Elyse Foster, Gordon Fung, Paul Green, Tom Kearney, Xiaojuan Li*, Jae-Woo Lee (for Pat Finley), Sri Nagarajan*, Robert Newcomer*, Robert Nissenson*, Russ Pieper*, Howard Pollick, Phil Rosenthal, Shuvo Roy, David Saloner, Henry Sanchez*, Peter Sargent, Anne Slavotinek, Arianne Teherani, Daniel Weiss, Sharon Youmans
* by phone

ABSENT: Renee Binder, Jyu-Lin Chen, Russell Cucina, Michele De Coteau, Brad Hare, Mehran Hossaini, Thuan Le, Cynthia Leathers, Sharmila Majumdar, Renee Navarro

GUESTS: Steve Pantilat and Matija Peterlin, Clinical Sciences Building/University Hall Advisory Committee Members

The Coordinating Committee was called to order by Chair Chehab on October 7, 2013 at 2:05 pm in room S 30. A quorum was present.

The minutes of the June 3, 2013 meeting were approved.

Chair’s Report – Farid Chehab

Campus Committee Update
- UCSF space to be assessed at $90/square foot; space committee will determine space use disputes.
- Indirect cost waivers
- Clinical enterprise – changes to UC health benefits, mostly will impact campuses without medical centers.

UC Systemwide Update
- Rebenching – for the next five years, funds will be allocated based on a weighted count of the number of students. At the end of five years, all campuses will be treated equally. No increase in allocation after the five years. Only California residents in state-supported programs will be counted.
- UCSF assessment for Office of the President services will be based on 1/3 on expenditures, 1/3 on number of students and 1/3 on revenue.
- UC total remuneration study expected to cost $2 million.
- Annual faculty merit increases are a legally mandated.

Review of themes for UC President Janet Napolitano visit to UCSF
- The Academic Senate will have an hour with the UC President on November 18.
- Each campus has a theme. UCSF theme – UCSF is different. What are the issues that arise from being different?
  - UCSF best serves the Master Plan for education for California.
No undergraduates mean that our students are graduate students, trainees, residents, fellows, postdocs, so our teaching is different than on other campuses.

50%-50% distribution clinical-research faculty

Recruit international students

Outline what the President can do at the UC Systemwide level to address UCSF’s concerns.
  - Propose a CalGrant for graduate students.
  - Support junior faculty who need research funding – Steve Beckwith

5% of UCSF budget comes from the State

Faculty-administration issues related to changing the culture, i.e. open workspace.

Clinical salaries and research salaries not paid by the State.

Will provide a list of UCSF accomplishments

How UCSF addresses the health care needs in California

UCSF suffers for lack of an endowment – need to endow faculty time rather than buildings

**Academic Senate Staff Update – Heather Alden**

Faculty Research Lecture in Clinical Science – Kristine Yaffe, MD

“Optimizing Cognitive Aging”

Monday October 28, 2013, 3:30-5:00 pm in Cole Hall with simulcast


**Clinical Sciences Building/University Hall (CSB/UCH) Planning Update (Attachments 1a, 1b and 1c) – Matija Peterlin and Steve Pantilat CSB/UCH Advisory Board Members**

M. Peterlin provided the following overview: Clinical Sciences building is the most seismically compromised building at Parnassus, then UCH, then Long. Moffitt-Long will eventually be replaced by a new hospital on the LPPI footprint. CSB decant slated to begin in 2015. Should the new space be classic offices, mixed or open-workspace design? The new buildings will be sealed off without hallways between buildings. This is intended to increase security and allow for the open-workspace design similar to Mission Hall. Faculty on the Advisory Board members asked if Campus Planning would wait on the CSB/UCH design to learn from the Mission Hall implementation to see how the Mission Hall design works before implementing in CSB or UCH. Campus administrators replied that they do not have enough time to wait for results. Although University Hall was slated to come down, apparently if the building comes down, the integrity of the hill would be compromised.

Committee members engaged in the following discussion:

S. Nagarajan: This is the first time I am hearing about closing the hallways between the buildings. This would be very inconvenient.

P. Green: I strongly disagree with the plan to close the corridors. For people to collaborate, we need to move about freely to effectively collaborate.

R. Greenblatt: This will be very difficult for faculty members who have lab space in multiple locations.

A. Slavotinek: what about closing off access on most levels, but have corridors between one or a few floors.

H. Pollick: In the case of an emergency, not everyone should be leaving by the same exit.

P. Green: What about all the deliveries that come in at the 5th floor of CSB?

R. Greenblatt: this seems to coincide with the plan to close Laurel Heights? Where will Laurel Heights occupants go?

M. Peterlin: No discussion about whether the people going into the new space are the right people to go into this space. Has not been any discussion that Laurel Heights occupants would go into the CSB or UCH space.

E. Foster: How many wet labs will remain in CSB/UCH?

M. Peterlin: None. Wet labs will be relocated to Health Sciences towers.
F. Chehab: if we close off the hallways, it will be a culture change for UCSF faculty and make it more difficult to collaborate.

M. Peterlin: closing the corridors would be to accommodate the open-plan workspace.

H. Pollick: There is currently educational space on the 7th floor. Where will educational space be in the new building.

M. Peterlin: the State demands the renovation, so there is a question about asking the State to help with funding.

S. Nagarajan: Closing the hallways is a major problem. Currently CSB and UCH have a diverse usage of space – research, teaching, clinical. In a siloed model, faculty will be segregated according to their work – wet lab, clinical and office space. I have space in the S-building, the C-building and the U-building. I use the corridors all the time. When S. Nagarajan met with Michael Bade, UCSF Architect, he was willing to consider a hybrid model with some small offices and some open-plan workspaces.

F. Chehab: How does the committee feel about the plans?

M. Peterlin: a lot of opposition to totally open workspace. More interested in the hybrid space. If the corridors are essential, then we are only left with the classic office space configuration – which is an expensive option.

R. Greenblatt: any functional discussion about how people use their offices?

M. Peterlin: This is supposed to be for people who do very interactive, team-based work.

R. Greenblatt: the School of Pharmacy did a survey of space-use for people in CSB/UCH. None of this information has been discussed.

P. Green: going ahead with a plan that was universally rejected by people in the Mission Hall plan is a mistake.

R. Greenblatt: what about a software that would allow someone to place a call on hold and transfer it to a different room. What about IRB requirements?

S. Nagarajan: I am concerned that they say that there is a November deadline, but the stakeholders have not been consulted.

M. Peterlin: The idea is that the new space will be for new hires and programmatic moves.

R. Greenblatt: the clinical pharmacy people have tried to get the functional needs on the agenda for these planning meetings without success.

M. Peterlin: we could argue for the three office floors in UCH as open-workspace and the seven floors of CSB in traditional offices.

F. Chehab: I would favor a more traditional or a hybrid space.

D. Weiss: what is the presumed advantage of the open-model?

R. Greenblatt: In the literature, we do not see exclusive open-space models. They are hybrid.

F. Chehab: The labs have been open-space.

A. Slavotinek: What kind of input do you want from us?

F. Chehab: take back our comments and concern to the committee and see what they can do with them.

M. Peterlin: They need to determine what the space will be used for. If they want hospitalists, then an open plan won’t work. If it will be office staff, then perhaps the open plan will work.

F. Chehab: What is the money differential between open-space and offices?

M. Peterlin: that was not discussed.

Steve Pantilat arrived as M. Peterlin needed to leave for another meeting. The committee continued to discuss, as follows:

S. Pantilat: I think the open workspace plan will be a disaster. The issue is that we are trying to fit a large number of people into a limited space. The community has legitimate concerns about traffic, etc. but it also must contribute to the community and the city. We also have projections for growth. If we don’t have the space, perhaps we shouldn’t grow. The current strategy seems to be to squeeze more people into the existing space.

F. Chehab: most concerned about the design and impact on faculty.

S. Pantilat: it is difficult to tell if someone thinks that this is a good way to work or whether it is a function of trying to get a large number of people into existing space.
H. Pollick: is there much discussion about form following function or function following form? What about patients and privacy?
S. Pantilat: haven't seen many options

H. Alden: the themes from the Mission Hall planning process are repeating themselves. The campus administration are not asking form to follow function and they seem inflexible on the deadlines they have established.

P. Green: Lip service to getting input from faculty. Are they listening to you?
S. Pantilat: They are concerned to not repeat the Mission Hall experience. What are the other options? Maybe things need to slow down to take into consideration faculty concerns.
F. Chehab: the committee needs to make a recommendation in November. What is the process? How can we influence the decision?
S. Pantilat: I don't know the process. Will there be a vote?
R. Greenblatt: what about the other faculty on the committee?

H. Pollick: we have a space in Dentistry with partial walls. It is awkward to talk with patients. It's not ideal, but we live with it. I don't think we should plan to live with it.

S. Yeomans: Students won't come to my office if they can't have a private conversation.
S. Nagarajan: We should reject that the corporate model should apply to the academic environment.
A. Teherani: some groups were forced into an open-space that don't work. My staff has asked me to not come to the office when I have calls to make.
R. Greenblatt: Try to engage all of the faculty on the committee in the process. We tried to give positive ideas about using the space. The challenge is to make a space that people will come to work in. The mitigating ideas have not been put forward in an organized way. Noise cancelling headphones for everyone, for example
S. Pantilat: I don't think I've heard all the parameters in order to make an informed conclusion. A letter from the Coordinating Committee about the concerns would help. For this process, form should follow function. This conversation reflects the dominant faculty opinion on the space planning advisory group.
H. Pollick: be sure to reference the materials already provided for the campus administration, including the material on the website (http://senate.ucsf.edu/2012-2013/missionbay.php)

School Faculty Council Updates
Dentistry – Mehran Hossaini
Held until the next meeting.

Medicine – via email from Ellen Weber
At our first meeting on September 17 Matt Springer discussed the indirect cost waiver noting that the proposal is not a new policy but there has never been clarity about it. Lydia Zablotska attended the Academic Senate Leadership Retreat and heard some contradictory views on this. Our main concerns are we are not sure who grants this waiver and that over time, whether this could hurt junior investigators and those who are more senior but tend to do more clinical research and who obtain grants from foundations and professional societies rather than the NIH.

Another item that we are going to pursue is the need for evaluation of secondary leadership in departments by their faculty as well as by the Chairs (e.g. Vice Chairs, section chiefs, division chiefs). This came up in the context of discussing the exit survey that we are just starting to get some data on, as often the reason a faculty member leaves has more to do with their immediate supervisor than their Chair.

After the meeting, we were asked by Dean Hawgood to nominate 3 members for the School of Medicine Bureaucracy Busters committee. Celia Kaplan and Judith Ford have come forward and we are seeking a third. The Faculty Council was asked to suggest nominees outside the council. If we still need someone and perhaps we can appoint a third from the Coordinating Committee or another Senate committee who is interested if we have not had any other recommendations.

Medicine Faculty Council Agenda items for the year will be:
1. Bylaw Revisions
2. Funds Flow Changes
3. Indirect Cost Changes (meeting one)
4. Operational Excellence - updates and input
5. Research Space Planning
6. Monitoring the Redesign of Undergraduate Medical Education Curriculum
7. Changes in the CTSI Grant Guidelines
8. Review of Exit Survey Data
9. Review of Faculty Benefits

Nursing – Shari Dworkin, Faculty Council Chair

Shared Governance
Worked with individual departments and the Dean on improving shared governance in the School. Asked for a faculty seat on the Dean’s Council, which succeeded.

Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP)
Working to create a DNP proposal.
F. Chehab: will this be a self-supporting program?
S. Dworkin: Will likely mesh with redesigned MS programs.

Redesign Master’s Programs
Working to redesign Master’s programs

Project Proposals
APU 3

Benefits Cost Shortfalls (former 19900 funds)
Campus used to cover shortfalls, then pushed to departments, now pushed to individual faculty members. Want to know how other schools are addressing this issue.
H. Pollick: glad that the Nursing Faculty Council is taking this on. In our department faculty in HSCP will now be reduced in step because of the shortfalls.
F. Chehab: I heard that there would be some funds allocated to the School of Nursing
S. Dworkin: I think those funds are being allocated to meeting the APU 3, not the benefits shortfalls
P. Green: Would like to address this at the quarterly Faculty Council Chairs meeting.

Pharmacy – Shuvo Roy, Faculty Council Chair

Held until the next meeting.

Old Business
None.

New Business
None.

Adjournment
Chair Chehab adjourned the meeting at 4:05 pm.