Chair Farid Chehab called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm in room S 30.

The minutes of the March 2, 2015 meeting (Attachment 1) were approved.

Chair’s Report
Chair Chehab reported on the recent conference co-sponsored by the Manhattan Institute, the Mission Hall post-occupancy survey, and other issues of interest from the April 1, 2015 Academic Council meeting:

A. Manhattan Institute: On Friday, March 27, 2015, UCSF held a conference on precision medicine entitled “Data and Technology: Keys to Precision Medicine and 21st Century Cures.” This event was co-sponsored by the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research.
   • As the Manhattan Institute is known for taking controversial policy positions and is an advocate for certain kinds of Federal legislation, the Senate sent an email to UCSF faculty informing them of the event and its co-sponsorship by the Manhattan Institute. This email elicited a number of responses – both positive and negative. Chair Chehab emphasized that the purpose of the email was simply to inform faculty, not to take sides. In addition, the Manhattan Institute had responsibility of collecting faculty RSVPs for the event. Senate leadership had some concerns over the use of UCSF faculty names and email addresses by any external organization involved in such events.
   • He suggested that the Coordinating Committee draft a set of policy guidelines for such conferences in the future.

B. Three Percent Salary Increase for Faculty Members: As mentioned at the March Coordinating Committee meeting, UCOP is planning for a 3% increase to faculty salaries as part of four year plan
to bring salaries back to market. Towards that end, a systemwide joint Senate-Administrative working
group, after considering a number of options associated with the implementation of this salary
increase, have settled on two possible options:

- **Option 1** would increase the salaries of both on-scale and off-scale faculty.
- **Option 2** would increase only on-scale salaries, and leave off-scale salaries alone; and do it
  through a campus-based plan or a systemwide mechanism.

Academic Council members preferred option 2 over option 1. If option 2 is implemented, faculty in the
Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) will benefit because the salary scales will change and
the faculty salaries within the HSCP will increase, thereby positively impacting future retirement
income from UCRP. However, the readjustment of X, X’, and Y components will counteract this. It is
important to note that there are not any off-scale faculty at UCSF. A smoothing of the scales is also
recommended, which means that salary increments would be more equal with each subsequent step.
UC President Napolitano is favoring campus flexibility, which means that the actual salary increase
would be negotiated at the campus level. Chair Chehab will be meeting with Chancellor Hawgood to
discuss further. A related issue will be whether it will be possible to fund all four years of the plan.

C. Post-Occupancy Survey: Last year, the Senate recommended a post-occupancy survey for Mission
Hall. The survey questions are near completion, and the Coordinating Committee should vet them.
This is important, as it is anticipated that these questions will be used for surveys for future buildings.
As a first step, Chair Chehab asked APB and CFW to review the questions and make
recommendations to the Coordinating Committee.

D. UC Care HMO: UCOP continues to consider and plan for a UC Care HMO. Chair Chehab
emphasized that such an HMO would probably not come into being in 2016; 2017 is far more likely. A
decision will be made in April on implementation date. If realized, health care accessibility is a larger
issue for such campuses as UC Berkeley, UC Santa Barbara, and UC Santa Cruz. For UCSF,
accessibility would not be a major issue. The stated purpose of such an HMO is to save money, and
capture the approximate $1.5B in health care benefits by the UC medical centers. There are concerns
about the improvement of the patient experience, and UC may need to contract with additional
providers to fully realize a UC Care HMO.

E. UCOP Chief Operating Officer: Chair Chehab announced that Rachael Nava has been appointed as
UCOP’s new Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer. She has a background in health
care and she will manage a staff of 500 people and a budget of $100M at UCOP. She will oversee
systemwide Human Resources, Information Technology Services, Energy and Sustainability, UCOP’s
Program Management Office, the UC Path Center and all Administrative Services within UCOP.

F. Statement on Academic Freedom from the Systemwide University Committee on Academic Freedom:
The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) is drafting a systemwide statement on
academic freedom, which will be released soon.

**Presentation on the Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey – Nancy Adler, Member, Mission Hall
Post-Occupancy Survey Committee**

Nancy Adler is the Director of the Center for Health and Community and a Professor of Medical
Psychology within the School of Medicine. She became involved with the Mission Hall (MH) post-
occupancy survey because she was concerned about the building plan for MH.

Although she is the technical PI on the project, she does not control the actual survey. She has had input
into the survey, especially around poorly worded questions and inadequate coverage of areas of concern.
At this point, it is a 20-minute questionnaire, and questions have been inserted into the initial survey from
UC Berkeley to measure potential negative impacts on MH occupants, as well as to ascertain whether the
MH design is a wise option to use for future buildings at UCSF. Currently, the principal issue concerns the appropriate analysis of the responses. Towards that end, she advocated Senate involvement and discussion. In particular, the Senate may want to address an appropriate level of negative response that would either necessitate additional funding to remediate the existing problem(s) within MH, and/or prevent the design from being used again in future buildings.

One member asked how the consulting firm is selecting the recipients of the survey. Guest Adler believes that everyone should receive it and have the opportunity to respond. She added that satisfaction with MH will be likely be affected not only by which floor the respondent is located on, but also which functions he or she performs in that space (respondent job titles will be known). She commented further that the survey does ask about the number of times that people are coming into the office as compared to their previous space/office. It will be important for the Senate to establish some kind of minimum threshold to achieve what was intended for the space in terms of interaction and collaboration.

Guest Adler added that non-engagement, lost productivity, and losing faculty to other institutions are areas of concern. Studies have shown that open space does not work well for many organizations and has been untested for academics; most “open space” configurations are mixed (30-70%), and not fully open like is the case with MH. Another variant is the rank of the faculty. Currently, she is trying to reach agreement on which data will be the most informative and how it will be used. Members agreed that the Senate should review the questions, and comment on how the data should/will be analyzed. The Senate could also send out an announcement to faculty members asking them to respond to the survey once it is released.

Another issue is the release date of the survey. Releasing it too soon may bias its results. Indeed, once MH begins to realize higher occupancy rates, the work place satisfaction may fall. Guest Adler added that initially a base-line survey had been planned (e.g., a pre-occupancy), but the delays made this survey impossible to implement. Given the current survey, she saw no harm in slowing the survey down to allow for more thoughtful feedback. Members agreed that the survey should be administered sometime in the fall so that the recent occupants can totally acclimate to the MH space.

Members asked Guest Adler what she sees as a best outcome(s). She responded that 1) for those respondents outside of MH, the survey results could shed light on how much of the MH design should be reused; and 2) and how many of the MH drawbacks should and/or can be remediated for its current occupants. Chair Chehab invited Guest Adler to attend a future Coordinating Committee meeting, along with Michael Bade, Associate VP, Capital Programs & Campus Architecture and John Plotts, Senior Vice Chancellor, FAS.

**Systemwide Bylaw & Policy Reviews**

A. **Presidential Policy on Sexual Harrassment & Violence**: This is currently being reviewed by Equal Opportunity, which has yet to finalize its comments. Among other things, the proposed policy does the following: 1) Process of appeal for persons being investigated; 2) Updates in policy terminology as required by the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA); 3) clarifies appropriate paths for reporting incidents; 4) updates definition of consent; 5) includes “amnesty” provision (De Leon); 6) incorporates “abuse” as included in sexual violence or sexual harassment; and 7) clarifies that policy only addresses “sexual harassment” as required by VAWA.

B. **Bylaw 128.D.2**: The proposed revision to bylaw 128D.2 would regularize the standing committee Vice Chairs such that non Council committees will now have Vice Chairs that serve at large in the same manner as the Council represented committees. This revision will directly affect six committees: UCAF, UCIE, UCOLASC, UCOPE, UCP&T, and UCACC. The University Committee on Committees (UCOC) is proposing to select vice chairs from not only the current systemwide committee membership, but also from those who have served on the same committee in recent years. Up until this time, the Vice Chairs for these committees had to be chosen from among the current Divisional
representatives. The UCSF CoC has reviewed this bylaw change and agrees that it is sound and important to regularize these systemwide committees with other systemwide committees.

C. **Final Review: UC Policy on Copyright & Fair Use:** Currently known as the *1986 Policy on the Reproduction of Copyrighted Materials for Teaching and Research*, this revised policy is intended to support both copyright law and defend the “fair use” policy. This revision has removed guidelines on fair use that are now obsolete. Such guidelines are now located on the UC Copyright website, which can be updated quickly as needed (e.g., new interpretations of copyright law). The current draft of the policy also incorporates Academic Council’s suggestion to explicitly articulate the University’s responsibility to provide support for the faculty’s copyright concerns (e.g., fair use). COLASC does not have any comments on this final review at this time.

D. **Final Review: APM 080, Medical Separation:** APM 080 provides a non-disciplinary way to medical separate a faculty member or academic appointee who has exhausted his or her leave and who remains unable to perform the essential functions of the position for which the appointee is qualified due to a disability or medical condition. UCSF already provided its comments in the initial review. The new language clarified that all elements of the interactive process must be exhausted before the medical separation is initiated. If vested the academic appointee may opt to retire rather than be medically separated. Leave policies are not changing; APM 080 may only be applied after all leaves are exhausted.

**Academic Senate Information Items** (Executive Director Todd Giedt)

A. Chancellor’s Fund Update: 14 Faculty funding request have been received – 1 in *Faculty Learning & Development*, 2 funding requests in *Sustainability* (for conference grants), and 11 funding requests for the *Faculty Enrichment* Fund. There is a total of $91K in this fund, with awards between $250 and $2K. These 11 requests represent about 20% of the total; most funding requests are between $1,000 and $2,000. The *Library & Child/Elder Care* fund has been released (~$106K). The *Bridge Funding* will be released later this month ($22,900 per School for $91K total). The *Diversity Funding* will go out in June once RAP has completed its grant reviews ($76K total; $30K per award). Finally, Senate staff are doing additional outreach for the *Educational Technology Needs for Faculty* fund, and are working with the Educational Technology Services Office to reach out to this office’s “top faculty users” directly.

B. Other Announcements:

- **Distinguished Faculty Awards** will honor recipients of the Distinction in Teaching and Distinction in Mentoring Awards, Wednesday, on May 13, 2015, 3:30pm – 5:00pm, in the Lange Room, UCSF Parnassus Library. This is sponsored by the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Academic Affairs Office.
- “*small thoughts on Big Data*” lecture. Charles McCulloch, PhD, recipient of the 5th Annual Faculty Research Lectureship – Translational Science, will make a presentation on Tuesday, June 2, 2015, 3:30pm – 5:00pm, in Byers Auditorium at Genentech Hall on the Mission Bay Campus. The event will be simulcast and a reception will follow. The lecture is sponsored by the Committee on Research.

**Committee Updates – School of Nursing Faculty Council**

Catherine Waters, the Chair of the Nursing Faculty Council, noted that while the School of Nursing (SON) at UCSF still ranks first in NIH funding, there are ongoing challenges in the recruitment of new faculty members (e.g., cost-of-living, faculty salaries). The SON is the only School that has a Medical Sociology program. Chancellor Hawgood recently visited the Nursing Faculty Council to talk about challenges facing the SON and the campus. The SON has been trying to focus on faculty diversity with respect to ethnicity and race, and has produced some initiatives in this area. The SON is also trying to develop new sources of philanthropy and is working with the development office to do so. A number of leadership positions are
currently open within the SON – two Department Chairs, Associate Dean for Research, and clinical and tenure track faculty positions. For the most part, these faculty members have not retired, but left for competing institutions. In addition, the SON has lost several FTEs, but is progressively getting a few of them back. The SON Dean is also working with the other UC Nursing School Deans and UCOP to enhance pathways between the UC Medical Centers and the Schools of Nursing, as well as on solutions to other shared challenges.”

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

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

**Adjournment**
Chair Chehab adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

*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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