Coordinating Committee
Farid Chehab, PhD, Chair

Monday, February 2, 2015
2:00 – 4:00 pm
Room S 30 or by phone
1-866-394-9509; 87 52 185 #


ABSENT: Brian Aldredge, Carol Miller, Robert Newcomer, Robert Nissenson, George Rutherford, Henry Sanchez, Liz Watkins

GUESTS: Steve Pantilat, Member, UCH/CSH Space Committee

Chair Chehab called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm in room S 30. A quorum was present.

CONSENT CALENDAR*
Approval of Minutes of January 5, 2014 (Attachment 1) with editorial changes were approved.

Chair’s Report – Farid Chehab
Chair Chehab provided an update on the recent Academic Council and other ongoing matters.

UC Systemwide update

Academic Council

- **APM Revisions** –
  - APM 210-1-c-d (Diversity) proposed revisions weren’t approved by the Council. In response to this Susan Carlson has convened a new UCOP workgroup to explore. Those new revisions will be routed to the respective campuses for secondary review.

- **Governor Brown/UC President Napolitano Meeting** – These meetings are ongoing. To insure the UC System receives its allotted funding from the State of California, Governor Brown has insisted no more non-resident students nor any increase in student tuition. The only impact on UCSF is the mandate not to increase professional fees.

- **Healthcare Changes** – In the new Open Enrollment in 2015-2016 academic year, the intention is to eliminate the Blue/Gold healthcare plan and to transition those employees over to UC Care.

- **Proposed UCOP Faculty Salary Raises** – Provost Dorr has created a UCOP administrative committee to address this internally. Four administrators and four Senate faculty (Systemwide Senate Chairs of Faculty Welfare, CAP, APB and Diversity [UCAAD] Committees). At present UCOP has earmarked $90M for faculty increases and another $60M for “quality increases”; the combined $150M is to split amongst all UC campuses. Most campus models put forth models for implementation include an increase in the salary scales. UCAAD advised that UCSF is different
and accommodations must be made for HSCP faculty. UCSF must receive $20M in order to implement across-the-board 3% faculty salary raises. Most likely the raises will be between 1-2%.
  
  - UCSF faculty anticipate only benefits and retirement will benefit from this increase. If this is the path pursued, faculty want the X’ (x prime) to be impacted.

- **Systemwide Open Access Policy** – This policy is opt-out and focuses on non-health sciences faculty. It will also include the NIH UCID policy on the same timeline.

- **UCSF Faculty Association** – This group just released a letter protesting the seventeen percent reduction in benefits for retirees. In particular, if retirees move out of state, they’re not covered by UC health plans (verify). There are also pre-existing gaps in coverage within the state.

- **UC Path** – Testing on this hasn’t gone well. All roll-out dates have been pushed back until further notice.

**UCSF update**

- **Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet** – Academic Affairs has completed its action plan on the Salary Equity Survey. Vice Provost Alldredge, Academic Affairs, will attend the March 2015 Coordinating Committee to present.

- **Coordinating Committee (Academic Senate)** – Vice Chair Greenblatt will chair the March 2015 CC meeting as Chair Chehab will be at an NIH study section.

- **Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost (EVCP) Search** – The School has put $9.6M towards increasing diversity in faculty ranks. It’s unclear how this will be implemented, but information will be provided when available.

**Discussion of Operational Excellence Survey** – David Odato, Associate Vice Chancellor, HR and Jason Stout, Manager, HR Strategy (Attachment 4)

Guests Odato and Stout went over the results of the external HR Operational Excellence Survey and course correction steps being developed.

Key ideas that are being pursued include a dedicated post-doc HR support team. They will directly address issues related to post-doc hiring, especially with delays in on-boarding and because they’re covered by a union. Currently, each HR unit is handling these various issues in slightly different ways. And information provided by UCOP hasn’t adequately addressed UCSF issues.

This support team would have between eight-ten people; no one would lose their position through the creation of this unique team. Graduate students and visa issues would also be addressed by this post-doc HR team.

Committee members raised the question that visa matters should be handled by another team considering the volume of issues and how specifically they must be addressed.

Future HR changes will include Graduate Medical Education (GME) Fellows. Other HR teams would be developed to focus on faculty and staff. Non-faculty academics, Specialists for example, will have another specialized group.

Within February 2015 there will be an overall timeline for implementation created. Overall, a successful on-boarding process should take roughly seven-eight days. At present, with all the various subgroups involved, it can take upwards of eighteen days. That timeline—one complete—will be shared with faculty, as well as a website developed to answer questions.

Moving forward, the four service centers would be reduced to two or three at most. The outside consultants identified too many different people being involved as a contributing factor to decline in response times. Coordinating Committee members also cited issues of responsiveness.
Committee members requested presentations from HR on the outcome/strategy of their retreat. They also highlighted issues relating to visiting students/faculty/post-docs. These used to be a vital part of UCSF community; however, on-boarding process has become so cumbersome that few faculty allow such employees anymore. This is mission-contrary.

Guests advised that some of what committee members were highlighting in re “visiting” employees related to policies they do not create—but are tasked to implement. When these policies change, they will change how such employees are brought on board.

**Chancellor’s Fund $500k Discussion** (Attachment 2)

Members reviewed the combined Business Plan. After discussion, members moved to collectively reduce all of the proposed financial requests by twenty-three percent. A vote was requested and revised business plan (with twenty-three percent reduction) approved with one abstaining vote.

The Senate Office will work with the various committees with Calls for Application to have those calls go out in March 2015. Applications will be accepted April 1, 2015.

Proposals will be requested of those pathways which are straight transfers. Upon receipt of those proposals, the Senate Office will work with Accounting to move the funds quickly.

As of this date, funds have been allocated – but also remain in “final approval” status with Campus Administration.

**Discussion of UCH/CSB Space Committee Report – Steve Pantilat, Member, UCH/CSB Space Committee** (Attachment 3)

Guest Pantilat provided an overview of the status of these buildings' renovation. SOM Vice Dean, Academic Affairs, Catherine Lucey has Chaired this Space Committee. Both buildings are not seismically safe and UCSF has considerable space limitations—which is why building renovations were pursued rather than construction of entirely new buildings elsewhere.

The provided report is near-final but if there’s anything missing, that should be included, space committee members should be advised. In general, more thought was put into faculty offices in both the U and C buildings, than with Mission Hall. However the overall consensus is that there should be one primary office location for faculty – and not numerous locations throughout the campuses.

The Space Committee supported a hybrid model of open space and private offices. The ratio of private office: huddle rooms in these renovated buildings will be 1:2. They went further and developed guidelines on how to decide the following:

- How much space does a faculty member receive?
- How much space should a group receive?
- Who should receive a private office/space?
- Who decides how much space is allocated to a faculty member or group?
- Which faculty members need to be on Parnassus?
- Who should be on which side of the building?
- Space to be allocated on a two-year rotating survey—to continually assess space so as to allow some groups to grow and others to reduce footprint
  - Committee members raised issues with this down the road. In five to ten years this could be very problematic as space may be being planned for use – but not currently in use.

For Mission Hall, a post-occupancy survey is being developed. Senate Chair Chehab proposed doing the same for these buildings. Although a pre-occupancy survey should also be done so as to establish a baseline.
Coordinating Committee members raised issues of privacy at these new buildings, and asked how it differed from the Mission Hall privacy issues. This is still an ongoing discussion at these new buildings, but it’s believed the hybrid model will reduce privacy problems.

Committee members also raised privacy issues related to number of printers and fax numbers. While print/fax jobs can be sent via computer, the wait time for this (and for actual print jobs) is extremely long, due to the few number of printers.

Committee members raised the following questions:
1. How to recruit new faculty to activity-based/open workspaces?
   a. No sense of where someone will sit when hired. That should change.
   b. “Hotel” spaces for clinicians – only available if clinicians are in clinic four days and in office one day a week.
      i. If less than that, they will have a designated space
2. UPS or other deliveries to secure buildings? Where do they get in?
3. Privacy issues related to work stations/computers?
   a. Members raised the idea that computers have swipe-on/swipe-off mechanisms tied to one’s UCSF ID badge
4. Funds set aside for first move out of the U building, and the second move out of the C building. It’s confirmed that funds for the U building move have been set aside, but so far no funds for the C building move have been set aside.

**Next Steps**
The Academic Senate’s proposed revisions will be incorporated into the committee report. It will be sent back as an FYI. That final report then goes up to the Chancellor’s Office for final sign-off.

**Old Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.

**Adjournment**
Chair Chehab adjourned the meeting at 4:10pm.

*Agenda items deemed noncontroversial by the Chair, may be placed on a Consent Calendar agenda item. Approval of all business on the Consent Calendar requires a single unanimous vote. At the request of a committee member, any Consent Calendar item may be extracted for consideration under “New Business” later in the agenda.

Academic Senate Staff:
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