Coordinating Committee
Farid Chehab, PhD, Chair

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


ABSENT: Carol Miller, Robert Newcomer, Robert Nissenson, Howard Pollick, George Rutherford, Henry Sanchez

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

Senate Chair Chehab is in an NIH Study Section and will be arriving late to the meeting. Vice Chair Greenblatt will lead the meeting. She introduced new Executive Director Todd Giedt.

CONSENT CALENDAR*
Members approved the minutes of February 2, 2014 (Attachment 1) with a few editorial changes.

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-d (Diversity) proposed revisions were not approved by the Council. In response to this Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel has convened a new UCOP workgroup to explore possible revisions. Those new revisions will be routed to the respective campuses for secondary expedited 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 upon no more increases in the numbers of non-resident students, nor any increase in student tuition. The only impact on UCSF is the prohibition against increasing professional fees. Governor Brown’s team is visiting some UC campuses. UC President Napolitano remains a strong advocate for both faculty and students.

• Healthcare Changes – UCOP is considering developing a new HMO product within UC Care is under development. Towards that end, a joint work group that includes members of the UCFW Health Care Task Force is investigating the feasibility of a proposed self-funded UC Care HMO plan. Connected to this is the elimination of the HealthNet Plan; this is not a completed deal but it remains an item of exploration.
• **Proposed UCOP Faculty Salary Raises** – Total faculty salary increases of three percent are still intended to be across-the-board. It will remain up to each campus’s administration on how to implement them. At the Systemwide level, questions remain on how off-scale and above-scale (above Step 9) faculty should be included. In brief, two options are being considered: 1) Increase both the on-scale and off-scale components of faculty salaries, and 2) increase the on-scale component of faculty salaries only.
  o As UCSF has zero off-scale faculty, above-scale faculty remain “on the scale,” as what is above-scale is considered covered compensation.
  o UCOP Vice Provost Susan Carlson has formed a Systemwide Task Force. A vote will ultimately be held to determine how to implement the salary increases. The focus of the task force is on year one of the three year proposed salary increases, with a hope that increases in future years will be implemented. At this point, a range adjustment is the favored approach.
  o Senate Executive Director Todd Giedt confirmed that corresponding salary increases for non-represented staff are not intended to be across-the-board, but will be up to the discretion of each campus to implement.

**UCSF Update**

• **Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet** – Chair Chehab provided an overview of key items discussed including:
  o Financial breakdown of the recent C. Feeney $100M gift to UCSF: Fifty percent will go to the Memory & Aging Center; twenty percent will to the Neurosciences Building; and the remaining amount will be spread to other groups, including junior faculty specifically at Mission Bay Campus.
  o Separately, Medical Center CEO Mark Laret presented on key components of its Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), which include:
    ▪ **Major Projects at Parnassus Campus**: Moffitt Building will be vacated and converted into something else, as will Mt. Zion. The Langley-Porter building will be demolished and in its place another building, with a different intended use, will be built.
    ▪ **Competitive Position of UCSF Medical Center in the Market / Increasing Patient Count at Parnassus**: CEO Laret believes UCSF needs to improve its competitive position, as there is increasing competition from Kaiser, Stanford, Sutter Health, and the California Pacific Medical Group (CPMG). Towards that end, one method is increasing the number of operating rooms. He added that the Medical Center does have a backfill plan in place for the vacancies created by the recent move to Mission Bay Campus. Committee members asked about the overall measures being used to evaluate and develop the improvement plan. Although much of the Medical Center’s business is driven by ambulatory care, many of those services are moving to an outpatient model. Therefore, continuing to measure financial success by number of “beds” seems to be a narrow view of the changing healthcare market. Members asked if a newer model was being developed or would be considered.

**Posthumous Degree Policy** *(Attachment 2)*

Graduate Council Vice Chair Jason Rock provided an overview and background on the policy’s creation. He noted that while similar policies already exist within the Schools, the Graduate Division does not currently have such a policy. Members unanimously approved the Posthumous Degree Policy as presented. It will appear on the Consent Calendar at the next Senate Division Meeting for formal ratification.

**Chancellor’s Fund $500k Update**

Vice Chair Greenblatt updated members on the status of the Chancellor’s Fund to date. She advocated for pushing for more funds—up to $1M annually—in order to devote more resources evenly between clinical and non-clinical. While such an allocation could reduce the number of people who could benefit—it is something supported in theory by Coordinating Committee members. VC Greenblatt also encouraged committees to come up with ideas now for next year. Ideas should come from clusters but need not be limited to cluster topics. Immediate ideas included funding for sabbaticals, money to cover HR fees for student volunteers, improvements in the activity-based workplace model, and having a designated faculty shuttle for Senate Division meetings.
Faculty Salary Equity Report (Attachment 3)

Brian Alldredge, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs, provided a historical overview of the campuswide Faculty Salary Equity Report (FSER). School-level and Department-level data were not included in the Systemwide report. Faculty paid partially or fully by an affiliate (VAMC, HHMI, or Gladstone, for example) were removed from the study. Faculty appointed above seventy-six percent were included; attention was paid to insure that women weren’t disproportionally removed due to that cut-off. Outside professional activities were not included in the UCSF results. As of July 1, 2014, eighty-two percent of all faculty were included in the UCSF Faculty Salary Equity Survey. Of the entire study population, eighty-eight percent of them were from SOM.

Vice Provost Alldredge highlighted the following conclusions of the study:
- The Study did not find any statistically significant imbalance in salary, presence of Z payment or accelerated advancement by URM status.
- The Study revealed that women were paid three percent less than men. Of those faculty who received a Z payment, twenty-nine percent of that Z component were women. Most strikingly, it revealed that there is inconsistency in the application of the Z component across the board.
- There is not a statistically significant imbalance in presence of Z payment or accelerated advancement.
- Tests of heterogeneity found that there was not any evidence that the male/female salary imbalances differed by school.

Members raised the notion that there may be a greater gender imbalance at UCSF, as opposed to a gender inequity issue. Some members proposing examining if women were given more administrative leadership roles without stipends than men were. If women are presented with these types of leadership roles, it could be understood by them to not be a choice about their acceptance of such a role. Committee members also asked about time-series historical data on female faculty going back twenty to twenty-five years. VP Alldredge advised that they would examine inequity. Vice Chair Greenblatt asked if there had been an examination of particular departments within SOM or divisions within Department of Medicine, in particular, to see if there are any with wider-than-usual inequity. In the 2006 report, it was broken out. The current data doesn’t go into that level of detail.

With respect to next steps, Vice Provost Alldredge noted that FSER Action Plan recommends to the Chancellor that he charge each Dean with creating a school-specific action plan by July 2015 that, at a minimum, addresses the campus finding of a gender imbalance in salary. If the School-level analysis finds no imbalances, the action plan report must justify this finding. However, if the School-level analysis finds an imbalance, then it will be further determined if the imbalance can be attributed to non-discriminatory legitimate business practices (i.e., inequity vs. non-inequity). If inequities are found, the action plan must include specific strategies to address inequity specific time frames for addressing the inequity. If inequities are not found, the action plan must also justify this finding. Members asked that it should be defined with clarity “what qualifies as an inequity?” and also “what is the metric by which an inequity is established?” The FSER will be delivered to the Chancellor, and then made transparent to the Schools. VC Greenblatt recommended this report be presented at the next Senate Division Meeting.

The Future of UCSF/UCSF 2.0 (Attachment 4)

EVCP Daniel Lowenstein and Asst. EVCP Janhavi Bonville presented on the next steps associated with this project. The UCSF 2025 crowd-sourcing game was intended to generate blue sky ideas, and the strategic planning themes that arose from the game were discussed at the recent Chancellor’s Executive Committee Summit. Developing workshop discussions from the themes, priorities, and desired outcomes are the next steps for this project.

The five themes that emerged from the game — and key aspects already developed around them — are:
- **Transformative Partnership to Advance Health:** A new office of Business Development has been developed, which will oversee all external partnerships that UCSF currently has and expand or deepen their value and use of the University.
- **Culture of Innovation:** One important theme is the sufficient support needed so that all faculty will have what they need in order to be successful. The high cost of living in SF is a major issue being
discussed - including coming up with concrete ways for housing UCSF community. Indeed, UCSF is working with SF founders like Wells Fargo to create housing.

- **Climate of Inclusion – Race/Diversity/Fair Hiring:** A town hall was just held to address issues that arose out of “WhiteCoats4BlackLives”. More is planned to embed into UCSF that race matters.
- **Destination for Continuous Learning:** Due to the fact that technology is impacting learning, more study is need on exactly “how do UCSF students learn?” The campus leadership will work with the Schools to explore this.
- **Bringing Precision to the Full Spectrum of Health:** UCSF will be adding the patient perspective to its pre-existing knowledge of clinical care. Patients will be invited to come and participate directly in discussion around precision health.

The Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet will receive regularly updates on “The Future of UCSF”, and the Senate Chair can update the Coordinating Committee as it moves forward. Chancellor Hawgood’s Fall Address (August/September) will set the tone for the next step of this project. The next summit on this topic will include all Schools.

Committee members asked about overlap with other workshops recently held at UCSF or Chancellor’s Councils. At present, Asst. EVCP Bonville advised that there is no intended overlap. Vice Chair Greenblatt mentioned the “First at College” Student Council as one example. Members also raised the idea of there being numerous nationally-recognized faculty who haven’t been tapped within UCSF to use their expertise on behalf of developing programs within the campus. Instead of looking externally for experts – committee members advised to look and develop from within.

Coordinating Committee members recommended more regular communication on these five themes and outcomes of workshops. Members further articulated that a broader explanation as to what the particular problem/theme is will enable participants to give deeper responses. In the past, faculty did not feel that their input was valued when it was provided, and also felt that campus leadership did not dig deep enough to gather their input. They remarked that there are numerous ways to reach faculty, and advocated the use of the Senate as one method. The better utilization of departments/divisions to reach faculty is another good approach. On some issues, the cross-cutting programs may be advisable for things that are truly interprofessional in nature. Vice Chair Greenblatt also asked if the Senate can be the partner for the Business Development group – in directing faculty to it, especially those who are seeking business partnerships.

**Old Business**
There was not any old business.

**New Business**
There was not any new business.

**Adjournment**
Chair Chehab adjourned the meeting at 4:07pm.

*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.*

---
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