The Board of Regents of the University of California has delegated to the faculty authority and responsibility for key components of the University enterprise. Through the agency of the Academic Senate, Regents Standing Order 105.2 delegates the responsibility for determining for condition of admission for degree and certificate programs, authorizing and supervising all courses and curricula, and has the right to form committees to advise the Chancellor and/or President on the budget, as well as other issues pertaining to the governance of the University. In practice, this means that the management of the University is in fact shared between the Academic Senate and the University administration, which acts through authorities specifically delegated to the President of the University and the Chancellors. At UCSF, this structure allows faculty to participate in the planning stages of initiatives with campus leadership, as well as raising issues of concern that can be heard by fellow faculty and administration, thereby adding value to the dialogue between the Administration and the faculty.

As noted above, SOR 105 of the Regents of the University of California established the Academic Senate in order to engage in shared governance at each campus (known as “Senate Divisions”), as well as at the systemwide level. The respective Divisional Academic Senates share governance responsibilities with their respective campus leadership and administration, and partner with the UC Office of the President on systemwide issues. Academic Senate business is processed through standing committees and councils that are focused on key subject matters. The Senate views the Chancellor’s Fund as the epitome of shared governance, which not only facilitates faculty support through a system of micro-grants in the areas of faculty development and enrichment, as well as allowing for investment in larger strategic Senate priorities.

In part due to recent changes in the research funding climate in the country at large, as well as increasing pressures in the clinical and teaching arenas, UCSF faculty have increasingly taken on more responsibility in addressing local faculty concerns. For those reasons, the generous financial gift of $500,000 given to the Academic Senate by the Chancellor Hawgood for 2014-15 was appreciated for providing individual faculty the opportunity to procure small items (e.g., lap-top computers and stand-up desks) that made their everyday work lives easier, or facilitating travel to conferences and/or seminars to explore novel research or teaching methods, and/or development courses, which they can bring back to their departments to disseminate more widely. Indeed, the bulk of the funds in the 2014-2015 academic year were distributed via numerous small awards to faculty, as well as larger awards through existing campus mechanisms.
In summer 2014, Chancellor Hawgood provided $500,000 to the UCSF Academic Senate ("Senate") to use toward faculty life, which is generally known as the “Chancellor’s Fund.” These funds were termed Faculty Academic Renewal ("FAR") funds by Accounting and Senate Faculty Academic Renewal ("SFAR") funds by the Senate office. SFAR funds were derived from the Campus Core Fund and generated from a portion of assessments on gifts and endowments. They were intended to be renewed annually for the next decade and expended within the fiscal year in which they were awarded. The 2014-15 Chancellor’s Fund was characterized by a division of the funding into pre-existing funding units (CTSI, Library, Campus Life Services, and the Schools) and to individual Senate standing committees (EQOP, APB/Clinical Affairs, Faculty Welfare, Sustainability, and Educational Policy). Of the pre-existing mechanisms, Campus Life Services and the Schools funded child/elder care and supplemental bridge funding; the Library received funding for Open Access and the Library Special Collections Fund; and CTSI received funding for its Mentoring Development Program to educate faculty on advancement and promotion at UCSF, as well as money to supplement under-represented faculty & senior fellows in clinical/translational research awards. There were four Senate funds – Educational Technology, Faculty Enrichment, Faculty Learning and Development, and Sustainability. The primary goal of the Educational Technology Fund was to defray faculty costs for using technology and/or visual media in classroom, conferences or meetings. The Faculty Enrichment Fund supported work activities and services that enhance work-life or well-being. Working with the Schools (and receiving matching grants from each of the Schools), the Faculty Learning and Development Fund covered faculty costs for participating in a broad range of development activities. Finally, the Sustainability Fund defrayed costs for attending sustainability-related conferences (administered by the Sustainability Committee).

ALLOCATING FUNDING / DETERMINING USES

In fall 2014 the UCSF Academic Senate began to discuss, at the Standing Committee and Council levels, possible uses for these funds. Initial discussions among Senate officers, Senate Standing committee chairs, and faculty council chairs led to the following guiding principles and intentions:

- Use of these funds should benefit as many faculty members as possible, and in as many different series as possible, including Senate and non-Senate faculty (holding at least a 50% appointment), as well as those faculty in the basic, clinical, social/behavioral, and translational sciences;
- Parity;
- Inclusion of all Senate committees’ input in the decision-making process.

Historical methods used to determine distribution of funds from the Chancellor have included:

- Academic Planning & Budget (APB) Committee awarded funds based on received proposals. Up until 2009, the APB disbursed approximately $5 million as part of the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds. These funds were traditionally used to source large
campus projects which indirectly benefitted faculty, such as improvements to the campus shuttle system’s elevators or to refurbish classroom interiors, including new equipment and projectors. Campus groups and offices presented proposals to APB, which were reviewed and voted on by committee members. The Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds were eliminated in the 2008-2009 academic year.

- **Creation of a special subcommittee.** This subcommittee would have focused on developing key topics and creating an action plan. In doing so, it would have solicited and received proposals focused around key topics from standing committees and Faculty Councils.

Both historical pathways were not used, as both would have placed control of the Chancellor’s Fund in the hands of a small minority.

**Role of the Coordinating Committee**

The Coordinating Committee served as a subcommittee charged with allocating funding across Senate standing committees and faculty councils, as its members are either the chairs or vice chairs of different standing committees or faculty councils, or are ex-officio members by virtue of administrative positions within a School or campus office. Combined, their opinions were deemed representative of the San Francisco Senate as a whole.

During fall 2014, the committees and faculty councils presented funding priorities. Between November and December, 2014, Senate Chair Chehab and Senior Analyst Cleaver tried various methods to distribute the $500k equally across the committees and councils. However, this process would have diluted the Chancellor’s Fund to such a degree that its overall impact would be suboptimal. After much debate, Senate leadership opted to return to an idea initially proposed in fall 2014 and cluster the committees based on key overarching foci – education, research, Schools, faculty needs, for example — and give each cluster a specified amount. It could then be voted upon by a smaller group of committees. This process culminated in February 2015 with the Coordinating Committee developing a finalized budget breakdown, which also led to the top ideas being put forward as where to focus the funds. (Appendix 1)

Two committees—Privilege & Tenure (P&T) and the Committee on Committees (CoC)—were not included in the original budget breakdown, nor was the Coordinating Committee itself. P&T was excluded at its request, and CoC also was not included as it was anticipated that this latter committee might need to assign faculty members to a taskforce, thereby eliminating any possibility of a conflict of interest. When a subcommittee proved to be unnecessary, CoC input was solicited and sought on the ongoing process for 2014-2015 and 2015-2016.

**Key Ideas**

The following ideas (listed in alphabetical order) consistently appeared as the top topics to fund regardless of Senate standing committee or councils bylaws or overall charge:

- Child/Elder Care
- Diversity Efforts
Faculty Needs (varied by faculty)

Mentoring Efforts

Open Access

Supplementing Bridge Funding

Supplementing Travel Grants

Two more ideas arose as something funds should be directed towards:

- Educational Technology (supporting faculty use of technology to teach coursework)
- Sustainability Efforts by faculty

General agreement was reached that funding sabbaticals, or establishing bridge funds, would have a significant impact, but was out of reach given the need and the relative overall size of the Chancellor’s Fund. While other ideas were proposed, following due diligence none could be quickly or directly funded. It is hoped that in future academic years, other potential pathways might be examined:

- Assessment of UCSF industry partnerships and intellectual property programs
- Faculty engagement strategies
- Funding for those impacted by the NIH salary cap or salary escalations
- Impact of administrative restructuring on faculty
- UCSF interface with City College of San Francisco

After additional discussion at a committee level, Senate leadership determined that funding could be split into two models:

- Funding pre-established mechanisms;
- Funding that addressed faculty needs through several newly-established application pathways with different foci for each.

**Established Funding Pathways**

There were four pre-established pathways that received lump-sum funds to use as previously determined by their offices. For more detailed breakdown of this process, please see the Administering Awards section on page 9.

- **Child/Elder Care**: $15,200 was given to Campus Life Services, to put towards expanding number of slots for faculty with children at one of their Bright Horizons Childcare Centers.
- **Diversity Efforts**: 1) $76,300 was distributed through the Research Allocation Program (RAP) in partnership with Clinical & Translational Science Institute (CTSI) using the Under-represented Faculty & Senior Fellows in Clinical and Translational Research Awards. 2) The Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP) invested $2,000 in a partnership with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach to purchase a one-year trial institutional membership to the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity.

- **Open Access & Library Special Collections**: $45,800 was given to the University Library for them to bolster faculty open access funds; an additional $45,800 was allocated for the purposes of organizing materials in the Michael Bishop Library Collection.

- **Supplementing Bridge Funding**: A total of $91,600 were given to each School Dean’s Office ($22,900 per School) to administer to faculty requesting bridge funding.

### Newly-established Funding Pathways

The Academic Senate established four new pathways – Educational Technology, Faculty Enrichment, Faculty Learning & Development, and Sustainability. The primary goal of the **Educational Technology Fund** was to defray faculty costs for using technology and/or visual media in classroom, conferences or meetings. Potential uses included license fees for students to download materials, hiring actors to portray medical situations, and annual subscription costs of tracking software to assist the Schools in insuring students progressing through the various education modules.

The **Faculty Enrichment Fund** supported work activities and services that enhance work-life or well-being. It supports activities or needs not financially covered by pre-existing grant or School mechanisms. Examples included hiring a public relations consultant to assist a faculty member in promoting their work, or hiring a biostatistician to train a faculty member who does not regularly use such quantitative metrics in their research, or participation in a new training program.

Working with the Schools (along with the matching grants from each of the Schools), the **Faculty Learning and Development Fund** covered faculty costs for participating in a broad range of development activities. By combining both Senate and School funds, it meant faculty from within each School had upwards of $44K to devote towards requested faculty needs.

Finally, the **Sustainability Fund** defrayed costs for attending sustainability-related conferences. Further funds designated to the Committee on Sustainability were focused on hiring a student intern for a limited duration project focused on sustainability and higher education at UCSF. Some funds were also set aside for a plenary speaker at a fall 2015 event focused on sustainability in the Health Sciences. The fall 2015 event would also be used to promote the spring 2016 education workshop associated with UC President Napolitano’s Carbon Neutrality Initiative. The Academic Senate and its Committee on Sustainability has partnered with the Office of Academic Affairs to develop and promote this workshop.
Newly-established Non-call Pathway – Mentoring Project

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) determined to develop a new online module aimed at supporting mentees in developing a strong professional relationship with their mentees. Much of the UCSF mentoring efforts are focused on mentor development, however less attention is paid to initial mentee development. CAP also aimed to develop a subcommittee of former-CAP members who could attend department meetings to more closely explain the APM guidelines for advancement for particular faculty series; this will enable faculty to determine if they are on track for the next advancement and promotion. CAP is working with both the Faculty Mentoring Program and the CTSI Mentorship Program in the development of this module. Funds in Year 1 are $15,267, which will be divided such that half of the funds go to Drs. M. Feldman and M. Khalili, the respective Directors of the Faculty Mentoring Program and the CTSI Mentoring Program.

The remaining funds will be given as stipends to members of the former-CAP member subcommittee. The content for the online module will be determined in Year 1; the actual development of the online module will take place in Year 2. The module will be released to faculty in Year 3. Former CAP members will begin attending department meetings beginning in the middle of Year 1. Prior to that they would attend a training led by the VPAA Office to ensure that they are current with APM guidelines and could answer any general questions if asked.

LAUNCHING THE APPLICATION

During the fall 2014 discussion, Senior Analyst Cleaver worked with Senate programmer George Michael to develop a simple and straightforward online application process, which utilized the existing Senate infrastructure present in the Senate Service Portal (access through MyAccess). This not only allowed for faculty ease in submitting application, but also the tracking of applications and the awarding of funds by the Senate Office. The Senate launched two separate calls for applications for all four pathways – the first on April 6, 2015 and the second on April 30, 2015. In order to advise faculty of the funds available, these calls went to the appropriate UCSF listservs for Senate faculty and for Clinical/Adjunct Faculty.

Appendices 2 and 3 include screen shots of the two Calls for Applications.

Faculty Enrichment Fund. The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed and approved funding for roughly 97% of all applications received. After CFW approved these applications, they were placed into a lottery given that the total amount requested exceeded the value in the Fund (see below). CFW was guided by a strategy to impact the highest number of faculty. This priority also drove funding decisions. For example, a handful of applications were for software that could be obtained for free through MyResearch. The CFW Analyst directed such faculty to that site instead of funding the applications. Likewise, for any requests for sit/stand desks that exceeded the UCSF Ergonomics Lab recommended amount of $1,055 (which includes sales tax and installation), the CFW analyst consulted with the faculty member to order a different model in order to reduce the cost to the recommended amount. Finally, those few applications that
CFW did not approve for funding were rejected due to the faculty member not having explored pre-existing resources within the department or campus.

Programmer G. Michael created an online lottery system so that once all approved applications were submitted, the system would electronically determine the awardees automatically. This lottery program was custom built to integrate with all the categories, applicants, varying amounts and the Senate Service Portal.

In the end, the Faculty Enrichment Fund received a total of 102 applications and funded 82. Additional funds were given to the Enrichment Fund from the following:

- Committee on Sustainability $3,677.58
- Educational Technology Fund $5,810.01
- SON Faculty Council $300.00
- SOP Faculty Council $9,204.50 – which covered all SOP faculty applications

These supplements raised the Faculty Enrichment’s overall funding to $110,596.09. Please refer to Appendix 4 for more detailed breakdown by award amount and item.

**Faculty Learning & Development Fund.** Each School supplemented this fund with an additional $22,901 each. Applications for this fund fell into three categories:

- **Leadership Training:** Many faculty were assuming new roles within their Departments, Schools, or the new Mission Bay Hospital and sought training to develop their skills.
- **Trainings or Coursework for Teaching or Clinical Skills:** Other faculty sought additional to either remain current or to expand their knowledge in a specific clinical course and/or to assist in their teaching efforts.
- **Conferences:** Faculty sought to expand their knowledge or their professional network by attending conferences tangential to their immediate research area(s).

The chairs of the “funding cluster” (APB, Clinical Affairs, and the faculty councils) formed the review committee which scored and ranked all of the received Learning & Development Fund applications. Examples of such development courses include faculty who are taking Executive Management courses through UCLA on “Strategy in Competitive Markets.” Such knowledge will be shared in the hope that it will make those faculty more competitive in obtaining research funds, beyond such traditional funding agencies, such as the NIH, and particularly, from industry partners. Other faculty sought to conduct research into how their respective Schools had fared in (and could improve) its new partnership with Children’s Hospital Oakland or John Muir Health. The following is a breakdown of the funding in the Faculty Learning and Development Fund by School (please refer to Appendix 5 for a more detailed breakdown):

- **SOD:** Seven applications received. One was rejected due to lack of funds. Six applications funded for $17,804. The remaining funds were returned to the SOD to use in their internal faculty development fund ($5,097).
• SOM: 33 applications received. 19 applications were rejected due to a lack of funds. 14 applications were funded for a total of $45,802. No remaining funds were available to return to the SOM.

• SON: 19 applications received. Eight applications were rejected due to lack of funds. Nine applications were funded for a total of $55,802. No remaining funds were available to return to the SON.

• SOP: No applications were received for this category. However, seven Pharmacy applications were received for the Faculty Enrichment Pathway. With support from SOP Dean J. Guglielmo, funds originally designed for SOP Learning & Development Pathway were used to fund SOP applications initially received for the Faculty Enrichment Fund, which was oversubscribed. Out of the original seven applications received, one was rejected as resources were found within the Department to fund this application. Six applications were funded for a total of $9,025. The remaining funds of $13,697 were returned to the SOP to create and maintain an internal faculty development fund.

It is anticipated that the Senate will continue this particular fund for one more year – and then the Schools will assume ownership over it. The School of Dentistry had a pre-existing Development Fund for faculty, but the other Schools did not. Already the School of Pharmacy has advised Senate leadership that it intends to develop a permanent fund of this nature. Built into the award letters for this particular fund was a request that the faculty members share learned information with colleagues in their respective Divisions and Departments. This is particularly helpful when the coursework is broader in scope – so relevant to those beyond the immediate group of awardees.

**Educational Technology and Sustainability Funds.** Both funds produced an anticipated smaller volume of applications. However both pathways used their designated funds to source faculty requests. Upon the close of the open call period, a small amount of unused funds were moved into the Faculty Enrichment Fund to better fund the numerous applications received (see Appendix 6). The following shows the funding outcomes for these two funds:

- Educational Technology Fund: Five applications received requesting $5,639.99. All funded.
- Sustainability Fund: Three applications received requesting $4,089.42. All funded.

**ADMINISTERING AWARDS**

For the four newly-established funding pathways, the Senate Office administered the transfer of funding to successful applicants via an accounting transfer and provided an award letter to faculty and finance analysts for their records. For those topics that had pre-established funding pathways, the Senate Office reached out to the respective campus office and initiated a dialogue on how to provide them with funding. If requested, the Senate provided a detailed funding letter complete with financial figures. Those offices involved included:

1. **Campus Life Services (Child/Elder Care):** Suzie Kirrane, Family Services Manager, Campus Life Services, initiated a three-month examination and negotiation with the Bright Horizons child care centers to see how to add three additional slots into those allotted for children of
faculty members. She partnered with the Procurement Office in order to develop a formal agreement. It is hoped that this particular pathway can be financially met in the 2015-2016 academic year as well. Those three additional slots – which cost $15,267 – remain a very valued commodity for faculty with young children. (Appendix 7)

2. Research Development Office & Clinical Translational Science Institute (Diversity Efforts):

   a. The Equal Opportunity Committee (EQOP) sought to bolster the funding currently given to the CTSI Under-represented Faculty & Senior Fellows in Clinical and Translational Research Awards grants funded through the Research Allocation Program (RAP) in the Research Development Office.

   b. EQOP partnered with Alice Fishman, Assistant Director, CTSI Programs, to expand the eligibility criteria for this particular grant to all faculty, although junior faculty would be given priority. EQOP worked to have the eligibility criteria explicitly include “persons who are under-represented minorities, members of groups toward whom there have been historical patterns of discrimination, or who are under-represented in their fields, with the goal of advancing faculty diversity and equity.” The criteria was also expanded to include 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.

   c. EQOP participated in the final funding meeting for the RAP’s Spring 2015 cycle. As EQOP and the Academic Senate could only fund faculty, and CTSI has the option of funding both faculty and fellows, the Senate funded two qualified faculty grant applications, and CTSI funded the qualified senior fellows.

   d. It is also hoped that this particular pathway can be financially met in the 2015-2016 academic year. Doing so would be in line with the University’s commitment to developing and providing pathways to success for under-represented faculty and fellows.

3. National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (Diversity Efforts): EQOP partnered with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs (VPAA) and the Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach (ODO) to purchase a one-year trial institutional membership to the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD). After a thorough assessment and vetting by EQOP, it is hoped that this membership will allow UCSF faculty to broaden their mentoring and professional network. Following the trial one year run, EQOP will assist the ODO and the VPAA in assessing the utility and the usage of the NCFDD membership to UCSF faculty (see Appendix 8).

4. Library Services (Open Access): The Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication (COLASC) worked with Karen Butter, Campus Librarian, to determine how funding allocated to the Library could best serve faculty. It was determined that funding could be used to
bolster Open Access funding, as well as documenting and organizing materials in the Michael Bishop Collection – research materials and letters from former Chancellor Bishop, which would be made available to all interested faculty. Upon receipt of this letter from Campus Librarian Butter, which broke down request and need, the Library was gifted the requested amount. It is not anticipated that this particular pathway will be repeated at the original amount (see Appendix 9).

5. Supplemental Bridge Funding (SOD, SOM, SON, and SOP):

   a. The Committee on Research (COR) sought to supplement pre-existing bridge funding for faculty from the respective Dean’s Offices in the amount of an additional $22.9K to each School. It is not anticipated that this particular funding pathway will be repeated.

   b. The School of Medicine has an established bridge funding program with established review processes. The other Schools’ bridge funding programs vary with respect to their respective size(s) and processes.

   c. Several Schools commented that receiving these additional small funding amounts made the difference between awarding one Bridge Funding award and two. For the faculty who received that second award, this was a valuable pathway. Due to both respecting privacy and differences in reporting criteria, COR did not request that each School provide detailed information on who received what funds and the end result of the receipt of such funds. However, COR members did request to know the funds had been used.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2015-16

In total, the Chancellor’s Fund should be considered a success, as it positively impacted faculty across all series. With the exception of half of the monies dedicated to the CAP Mentoring Project, all monies have been distributed. For the pre-existing pathways (Campus Life Services – child/elder care, Library, CTSI and RAP – diversity), and supplemental bridge funding through the individual Schools), Chancellor’s Fund monies were able to facilitate projects that would not have been possible, or fund additional faculty members on the margin (e.g., bridge funding and child/elder care). The oversubscription rates for the Faculty Enrichment Fund, as well as the SOM and SON for the Faculty Learning and Development Fund showed the important need for this kind of funding. Indeed, even for those Schools that did not garner a significant number of Learning and Development applications (e.g., SOD and SOP), the existence of these funds have prompted these Schools to develop or further enhance internal funds dedicated to this purpose. In this way, the Senate was able to provide seed money for these funds. In the end, the Chancellor’s Fund was distributed in the following manner – 2% for educational technology; 3% for sustainability; 3% for the CAP Mentoring Project; 3% for child and elder care; 9% for library and special collections; 9% for open access; 15% to supplement under-represented faculty
research awards; 18% for faculty learning and development; and 19% for faculty enrichment (see Appendices 10A for School breakdown and 10B for percentage breakdown by topic)

Faculty Involvement and Faculty Requests

Initial discussions exhibited faculty concerns that the Chancellor’s Fund might be significantly reduced or even eliminated in future years by the Administration. This concern led to disagreement over the identification of one “big” issue that might be funded with the Chancellor’s Fund. Instead, Senate faculty opted to fund smaller faculty requests that would either enrich their professional lives or further develop their skills or expertise in their respective fields of study. This disagreement also delayed the call for applications until April, which shortened the timeline to both inform and solicit applications for the various funds. One issue that emerged from the Faculty Enrichment Fund was the apparent need for such items as stand-up desks and laptop computers, which would significantly improve the professional lives of UCSF faculty members. Senate leadership is considering whether Senate funds should be used to provide to faculty resources that are typically provided by departments or Schools. Relatedly, the Senate provision of such resources might cause departments to increasingly defer to the Senate to provide such resources to their faculty.

Senate Office Staff Involvement

Staff time dedicated to the funding process varied depending on what each committee elected to do with its allotted funds. For those committees that opted to use existing funding streams (COLASC, EQOP), staff time was minimal and in line with what would be considered regular committee support. For other committees (APB, CFW, CEP, SOD, SOF, SOM, SON, and Sustainability), analysts shepherded specific campaigns to draft criteria, get those criteria approved, implement an online funding application system, create a system of review for the applications, and finally, disbursement of those funds. Analysts also fielded queries regarding the application process. All told, this amounted to an approximate 30% increase in the workload for each of those analysts. This resulted in time not spent on bylaw, policy, process improvements, and other committee work and support. However, given an earlier start to the process, this workload can be planned for and incorporated into Senate capacity so that it does not detrimentally impact general Senate operations and committee support.

2015-16 Chancellor’s Fund

Throughout the initial year, the Senate Office collected best practices for future funds distribution. As several Senior Analysts within the office have had experience with the Research Allocation Program (RAP) through the Research Development Office (RDO), we anticipate developing over summer and fall 2015 a draft Request For Applications (RFA) similar to the one put forth bi-annually by RAP. It is also anticipated that in future years the funds will remain in one large pool, with the standing committees drawing from that pool to fund specific applications – rather than allocating specific amounts to each committee. This latter method used in this year’s SFAR Fund process required additional administrative efforts as some committees did not receive sufficient applications to completely draw down their allocations.
These committees then had to schedule additional meetings in order to approve the transfer of their portions of the FAR Funds to other committees, whose funds were oversubscribed.

At its September 2015 Leadership Retreat, Senate officers and Committee and Council chairs will expand upon their specific criteria making it clear the type of application that would be funded by each committee. Grants would target specific areas of faculty/Senate interest. To streamline the decision-making process, a Qualtrics survey was sent to all incoming standing committee chairs and vice chairs prior to the Senate’s fall Leadership Retreat (see Appendix 11).

The timing of the call will also differ from this past year. A long-term goal is to align the timing of the Senate RFA with that of the RAP cycles – Fall (call for applications in mid-August with the deadline in mid-September) and Spring (call for applications in mid-January with the deadline in February). However, in 2015-16 the Senate RFA will be delayed until early October, so that participants at the Leadership Retreat will have an opportunity to provide input. Over time, the Senate would devote a portion of its website to include FAQs, exemplars, and statistics on the past year’s funding allocations and distribution.
## Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Library</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy</td>
<td>$15K</td>
<td>$11,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses of Instruction</td>
<td>Pending Feb 2015</td>
<td>No direct ask 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>Pending Feb 2015</td>
<td>No direct ask 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>$91,603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroup Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120K</strong></td>
<td><strong>$135K</strong></td>
<td><strong>$103,053</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities &amp; Research</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Research</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>$91,603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Academic Freedom</td>
<td>No direct ask/</td>
<td>No direct ask/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested use for</td>
<td>Suggested use for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>$76,336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroup Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120K</strong></td>
<td><strong>$220K</strong></td>
<td><strong>$167,939</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Enrichment &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Welfare</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>$91,603 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>$20K</td>
<td>$15,267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Jurisdiction</td>
<td>$20K</td>
<td>$15,267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroup Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120K</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160K</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160K</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup</td>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>Academic Planning &amp; Budget (APB)</td>
<td>Clinical Affairs (CAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>$60K</td>
<td>$60K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,802</td>
<td>$45,802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* The Privilege & Tenure Committee has requested not to be included in funds distribution.
* The Committee on Committees is not listed in case it is involved in assigning of members to a task force, which could present a conflict of interest.
*** The final amount FWC funded was $110,596.09 due to additional monies coming from SON Faculty Council, Committee on Sustainability, Educational Policy. These were funds left over that could not fund any remaining full applications in those categories.
## OUTCOME DATA

The table below provides a summary of funding opportunities and the amounts awarded, along with the average amount of award for each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Opportunity</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Average Amount of Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total grants awarded</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$1,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$1,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$3,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$3,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$3,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$1,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Opportunity</td>
<td>Amount Awarded</td>
<td>Average Amount of Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sustainability Conference grants awarded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,363.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sustainability Conference grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sustainability Conference grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,363.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sustainability Conference grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sustainability Conference grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDED APPLICATIONS 2014-2015

Distribution of Chancellor’s Fund

- Sustainability: 3%
- Faculty Learning & Development: 18%
- Faculty Enrichment: 19%
- Educational Technology: 2%
- Supplemental Under-Represented Faculty Research Awards: 15%
- Supplemental Bridge Funding: 19%
- Library & Special Collections: 9%
- Open Access: 9%
- Mentoring Project: 3%
- Child/Elder Care: 3%
QUALTRICS PRE-LEADERSHIP RETREAT SURVEY

Pre-Senate Leadership Retreat Survey 2015

For the purposes of planning the Sept 12th Senate Leadership retreat, the Senate wants to get a feel for the range of opinions from the incoming group of Senate Chairs and Vice Chairs regarding how the Senate distributes the $500K provided to us by the Chancellor, which is also known as the “Chancellor's Fund” (see http://senate.ucsf.edu/2014-2015/chancellorsfund-2015.html for information about the 2014-15 Chancellor's Fund).

1. One issue for discussion is whether the Senate funds should be used to provide to faculty resources that might be typically provided by departments or schools. Examples of this include ergonomic desks or laptop computers. Senate provision of these resources might be very important in improving the work life of faculty. On the other hand, Senate provision of such resources might cause departments to increasingly defer providing them to their faculty.

Please indicate in rank order which resources for faculty listed below you believe the Senate should fund:

- Stand up desks, or other office furniture
- Computers
- Travel support to meetings relevant to the faculty members’ department work (for example a clinical meeting, or research meeting).
- Travel support to meetings related to educational innovation.
- Travel support to meetings related to campus-wide issues or initiative, for example, achieving workplace diversity.
- Travel support for projects to evaluate or build campus infrastructure or services, for example efforts to benchmark administrative support for faculty.
- Travel support for efforts to improve interactions with other UC, CSU or California community colleges
- Foreign travel

2. This past year the $500K was distributed via a large number of small awards to faculty. The Senate can distribute funds via a similar process in 2015-16, or change to a system that supports large Senate initiatives or a combination of small awards and one or two larger Senate initiatives. Assuming that larger Senate initiatives would be reviewed and approved by the Senate’s Coordinating Committee, which is composed of the chairs and vice chairs of Senate standing committees.

Please indicate in rank order which options you support with regards to distribution of funds provided to the senate by the Chancellor:

- All the funds go into small awards to faculty.
- Any funds left over after a single call for applications can be used for larger senate initiatives. $350-$400K used for small awards to faculty, and $100-$150K used for a larger initiative.
- $250-$300K used for small awards to faculty, and $250-$300K used for large initiatives.
- All funds go to large initiatives.