Aims
In summer 2014, the Academic Senate was gifted $500,000 (Core Funds) by incoming Chancellor Hawgood to use toward faculty life.

This amount is intended to be an annual renewal with the funds being spent within each fiscal year.

Guiding Principles
The intention was for these funds to benefit as many faculty as possible, in as many different series as possible.

Funding Source
Chancellor’s Funds come from the core 5000 fund. Interim Director Cleaver has discussed the processing and disbursing of funds with Budget & Resource Management Office for ease of release. Core fund can be linked with the Senate Dept ID for expedited processing.

Further discussions with Budget & Resource Management Office are being held to determine if any funds designated for research purposes must include any recharges or other costs removed prior to use.

Process
In fall 2014 the UCSF Academic Senate began to discuss, at a Standing Committee level, possible directions for the distribution of these funds.

The historical pathways for distribution of such funds included:

- Using the Academic Planning & Budget (APB) Committee to award funds based on received proposals. Up until 2009, the APB disbursed approximately $1.2M as part of the Chancellor's Discretionary Funds. Those funds were eliminated in 2008-2009 academic year.

- Creation of a subcommittee focused on developing key topics and creation of action plan. This subcommittee could then have solicited and received proposals from Standing Committees focused around the key topics.

Both historical pathways were not used as both would’ve put determination of funds use in the hands of a small group. Of utmost interest in this process was parity and the inclusion of all committees input.

Upon receipt of suggested topics including financial asks from respective Standing Committees, this proposed Business Plan was developed.
Key Ideas
After soliciting ideas from each Standing Committee, the following (listed in alphabetical order) consistently appeared as topics to fund:

- Child/Elder Care
- Diversity Efforts
- Faculty Needs (varies by faculty)
- Mentoring Effects
- Open Access
- Supplementing Bridge Funding
- Supplementing Travel Grants

Two other ideas also appeared, however upon further research, neither can be quickly funded. It is encouraged that future academic years examine these as pathways to fund:

- Funding for those running training programs on a volunteer basis (T32 or other)
- Funding for those impacted by the NIH salary cap or salary escalations

Next Steps Proposed
1. Committee clusters meet during month of February to determine if they wish to support one initiative over another.
   a. Combined, the committee clusters (via the Chairs) put forth a single combined proposal for use of their collective funds.
2. Approval of the revised budget breakdown by the Coordinating Committee OR
   a. Creation of a five-member task force focused solely on finalizing budget breakdown and creating future action plan.
      i. Subcommittee formed by appointment through COC
      ii. Anticipated meeting schedule: 2-3 meetings within March
      iii. Final budget delivered end of March 2015
      iv. Having that budget routed through APB Committee for ratification (APB Committee Duties) if deemed necessary

Timeline
Following approval of the budget,

1. For those mechanisms not in need of an application—Bridge Funding or Support of Open Access—those funds can be transferred immediately.
2. For those with Calls, those will be released immediately.

Proposed Timeline for Nominations
1. Senate web programmer needs two weeks to develop/make live online applications
2. Call for Nominations can go out early March 2015
3. Review/approving bodies can review applications in April/May 2015
4. Funding released May/June 2015 for award-specific applications

Strategy & Implementation
1. Currently in development is an online application through Senate Service Portal which will allow applicants to upload a single .pdf application for the respective funding mechanism.
2. Expectation is to fund within six-eight weeks of receipt of application.

Financial Plan – Budget (Proposed) * **

Education, Library, and Academic Welfare $120K
(Ed Policy, COCOI, Graduate Council, and Library & Scholarly Communication)

Faculty Development & Research $120K
(Research, Equal Opportunity, and Academic Freedom)

Faculty Enrichment & Welfare $120K
(Faculty Welfare, Academic Personnel, and Rules & Jurisdiction)

Infrastructure Enhancement $120K
(Academic Planning & Budget, Clinical Affairs, and Faculty Councils)

Sustainability $20K

* At present, the Privilege & Tenure Committee has requested not to be included in funds distribution.
** At present, the Committee on Committees isn’t listed in case it is involved in assigning of members to a task force, which could present a Conflict of Interest.
**Financial Plan – Budget Breakdown** *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, Library, and Academic Welfare</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>$135K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy</td>
<td>$15K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses of Instruction</td>
<td>Pending Feb 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>Pending Feb 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroup Total</strong></td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>$135K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development &amp; Research</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Research</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Academic Freedom</td>
<td>No direct ask/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested use for 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroup Total</strong></td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>$220K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Enrichment &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Welfare</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>$20K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Jurisdiction</td>
<td>$20K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroup Total</strong></td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>$160K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Enhancement</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning</td>
<td>$60K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Affairs</td>
<td>$60K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Councils</td>
<td>SONFC – suggested use Other Faculty Councils – no direct ask</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroup Total</strong></td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>$120K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>$20K</td>
<td>$20K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroup Total</strong></td>
<td>$20K</td>
<td>$20K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined Total</strong></td>
<td>$500K</td>
<td>$655K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* At present, the Privilege & Tenure Committee has requested not to be included in funds distribution

** At present, the Committee on Committees isn’t listed in case it is involved in assigning of members to a task force, which could present a Conflict of Interest.
Financial Plan – Budget Use/Justification (based on input from Standing Committees)

**Education, Library, and Academic Welfare**

Combined proposed uses for funds include: $120K

- Funding for Open Access
- Funding for Journals, Databases, and Inflationary Costs

Review/approving body – As COLASC cannot review and approve its own proposal, an ad hoc committee comprised of representatives from Ed Policy, COCOI, and Graduate Council could review the proposal from Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication.

- Educational Policy supports creation of a fund directed to supporting faculty use of technology for coursework/teaching $15K

Ed Policy further endorses an allocation of $100,000 for the Library & Scholarly Communication Committee’s proposal.

**Faculty Development & Research**

- COR Supplemetning Bridge Funding ($30K to each School) $120K

- CAF supports directing funding towards submitted proposals aimed at bolstering library, No ask travel grants and research funding. It declines to make a formal individual request for this academic year, but requests next year’s funds include development of a “faculty lobbyist” position. While this remains an idea in development, someone whose sole responsibility was to highlight faculty contributions and advocate on the faculty’s behalf, in cooperation with the Academic Senate, could have real impact.

- EQOP Expansion of the CTSI Career Development Award funding mechanism for the “Under-represented Faculty and Senior Fellows in Clinical and Translational Research Program,”
  - Financial ask: $100K
  - This supports fellows and assistant professor faculty from economically under-represented and/or ethnic or racial minority backgrounds for clinical-translational pilot projects via the Resource Allocation Program

EQOP proposes to expand the CTSI Career Development Award for Under-Represented Faculty with the following:

1. Fund two to three awards a year of $50,000 each.
2. Expand eligibility to all faculty, although junior faculty will be given priority.
3. Reincorporate eligibility criteria to explicitly include persons who are under-represented minorities, members of groups toward whom there have been historic patterns of discrimination, or who are under-represented in their fields in the call for nominations, with the goal of advancing faculty diversity and equity.
4. Fund scholarly projects that lead to a tangible product such as a grant application, paper and/or new or revised curriculum with an emphasis on research.
In speaking to CTSI regarding this proposal, they advised:

1. They are happy to have the Senate support this endeavor. They reminded the Senate that these are processed through the Research Allocation Program (RAP) which scores grant applications on scientific merit and neediness.
   a. Grants available for funding aren’t known until December/January and May/June of each academic year.
   b. They cannot guarantee in any funding cycle the number of grant applications received—or receiving a sufficient score for funding—but they are wholly supportive of the Senate also funding.

Review/approving body may not be needed as all of these mechanisms fund pre-existing pathways.

**Faculty Enrichment & Welfare**
- **Faculty Enrichment Projects** $120K
  Supporting faculty in pursuit of professional enrichment not financially covered by usual means. Examples include (1) hiring a PR consultant to assist faculty member in promoting their work; (2) hiring a biostatistician to train a faculty member who doesn’t regularly use biostats in research; (3) participation in training conference not covered by regular grant mechanisms (travel, hotel, registration); (4) software; (5) mentoring efforts.
  o (award amount range - $1,000 - $3,000)

- **CAP supports the use of funds mentoring efforts in each school.** $20K
  CAP further supports its use of the funds to be included in a pre-existing umbrella mechanism aimed at addressing “faculty needs” as proposed by the Committee on Faculty Welfare. A member of the CAP committee is happy to serve on review committee with CFW is so asked.

- **R&J supports the use of funds towards expanding Child and Elder Care** $20K
  o The $20,000 would provide for Priority Enrollment for four spaces in the Kansas Street Bright Horizons facility. This does not provide a discount for service but allows for four faculty children to be first in line as new enrollments are made in the center.
  o R&J also requests the development of a website or webpages within the Academic Senate website optimizing access to bylaws and regulations that faculty can review on a regular basis. Expansion of the current online Faculty Handbook could address these questions as well.

Review/approving body for “projects” – subcommittee comprised of one representative from Faculty Welfare, CAP and R&J Committees.
Infrastructure Enhancement
APB and Clinical Affairs propose the following
- Clinical Enhancements $60K
- Non-clinical Infrastructure Projects $60K

Applications can include:
1. Consultation services
2. Lab Services
3. Include capital expenditures: (1) capital investments; (2) administrative investment
4. Clinical revenue supplements. Examples include (1) RVU (clinical revenue) supplement for teaching or attending a national conference; (2) Consultant hire to review processes or recommendations; (3) Expand lab services – possibly through development of an IT infrastructure

Award amount: $20K-$50K

Review/approving body – APB – with representatives from Faculty Councils and Clinical Affairs

SON Faculty Council Pending
Potential Proposals
1. A consultant to provide recommendations on how to help with Faculty Morale, Diversity and to advance practice
2. Any of the Senate’s Popular Funding Topics – Bridge Funding, Faculty Travel, Research Funding, Development Training, Childcare, etc
3. A Shared Governance Video speaking to the value
4. A consultant to provide recommendations on how faculty can use online applications for fund-raising

Range of Funding Proposals
$1000 - $10000

SON FC thought most of their requests could be subsumed within other committees’ requests. The Academic Senate Office can develop the Shared Governance Video as part of its project within the next academic year.

Other School Faculty Councils Pending
Other School Faculty Councils have declined to put forth a proposal at this time. Instead, they will review and opine on proposals already put forth.
**Sustainability**

**Sustainability conference meetings**
COS will request $10,000 to support registration fees and travel costs for several faculty attending the following sustainability meetings:

1. [California Higher Education Sustainability Conference](#), July 20-25 (San Francisco, CA)
2. [International Institute for Sustainable Laboratories Annual Conference](#), September 21-23 (San Diego, CA)
3. [CleanMed 2015 Conference](#), May 12-14 (Portland, OR)
4. [Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education Conference and Expo](#), October 25-28 (Minneapolis, MN)

COS is seeking faculty who are working on curricula and might be interested in one of these conferences. The faculty would report back next fall via a panel summarizing the information and prioritizing actions that UCSF can take. Additionally, COS is looking into the possibility of inviting a speaker to give a plenary talk.

**Speaker to give plenary talk**
COS will request $2,000 to support the invitation of a nationally recognized leader to deliver a keynote speech for the UCSF symposium on sustainability in health science to occur in the fall of 2015.

**Intern to conduct best practices research**
COS will request $8,000 to hire a student/post doc intern for a limited duration on a contract basis. The contract would require completion of a faculty mentored project in sustainability. Approximately $3,000 would be used for the student and $5,000 for project costs.

The ideal project would identify best practices that could be applied at UCSF.