Communication from the Faculty Welfare Committee
Leah Karliner, MD, Chair

October 14, 2015

TO: Ruth Greenblatt, Chair of the UCSF Academic Senate
FROM: Leah Karliner, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee
CC: Todd Giedt, Executive Director of the UCSF Academic Senate Office
RE: Review of Draft Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey

Dear Chair Greenblatt:

On October 8, the Faculty Welfare Committee reviewed and discussed the revised draft of the Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey. Overall, committee members believe that the survey is much improved. The feel and flow of the survey has been enhanced and the question sets are more through. Members believe that the revised draft should perform well in achieving the Academic Senate’s goals in collecting valuable feedback on faculty productivity and well being in Mission Hall if there is good participation and completion of the survey. However, given the improvements, there are still several issues with the survey that should be addressed before the instrument is administered. General recommendations include:

• **Address the Survey Length:** All reviewers were concerned with the extensive length of the survey. With so many questions to answer, committee members believe that respondents will become too fatigued to complete the survey. If questions cannot be consolidated or eliminated, committee members propose the following efforts: First, there must be test of the survey, including all skip-patterns and written comment sections, to determine exactly how long it takes a typical respondent to complete the entire survey. Setting survey time expectations will help faculty set aside the necessary time to provide complete responses. Second, there must be functionality to allow for the survey to be saved, so that faculty can come back at a later time to finish their responses. Third, respondents must be informed that they can submit partially completed surveys. This will ensure that all faculty will have a chance to provide some feedback, even if they do not have time or desire to complete the entire survey. Fourth, the survey should be re-ordered to ensure that questions regarding privacy, concentration, utilization of space, and productivity are at the beginning. Prioritization will allow faculty to quickly provide feedback on issues most important to them. Finally, another option is to deliver a relatively brief survey to all eligible participants, with an option to take a longer survey with more detailed questions on the physical environmental issues (e.g., lighting, air flow, etc.).

• **Ask More General Questions with the Option for Drill-Down Questions:** Committee members recommend asking more general questions upfront – for example, what are your biggest concerns about the Mission Hall workplace, with specific response options (privacy, inability to concentrate, access to conference rooms, etc.), with the addition of drill-down questions for the specific concerns that the respondent identifies. Members believe that the drill-down options will provide more meaningful details on issues faculty may be having, or not having with a particular feature of the space. For example, a question on the survey asking about the utilization of conference room space could produce a lot of different responses that would be difficult to categorize and may not be very useful. A drill-down question would ask for more detail on an issue with a conference room such as services, noise, or availability, but only to those respondents who consider this to be a concern. Committee members feel the additional details on why spaces do and do not work, would be much more meaningful to all those involved. This approach may be particularly helpful in the case of a short
survey upfront, and the option for a longer set of additional questions for those respondents who would like to provide more information (as is done in the airline industry for example).

- **Incentivize Participation:** To encourage survey participation, committee members recommend that there should be an incentive offered to faculty. Gift cards for campus dining, or a small give-away might help increase the overall response rate. The biggest incentive may be the knowledge that concerns identified by the survey will be addressed and improvements made to the Mission Hall workplace.

- **Inform Faculty of the Survey’s Implications:** When announcing the survey, the Academic Senate must ensure that faculty are informed of the importance and implications of the survey. All respondents must know that the survey results will not only influence the design of space in Mission Hall, but also for all other future buildings.

Specific questions recommendation include:

1. Question #3: Faculty options should not include post docs and residents or research fellow – all of these can be listed in Question #2.
2. Question Regarding Personal Workspace Location: This question captures if someone is close to a particular part of the environment (window, hall, elevator, etc.), but not if they are far. Perhaps having options for distance from a window: e.g. within 15 feet 16-30 feet > 30 feet.

New Response Options: It is appreciated that the survey drafters changed to ‘too close’, ‘just right’, ‘too far away’ as response options. However, we cannot know what distance is one of these (too close/just right/too far) without knowing what distance that person sits from the environmental element.

The Faculty Welfare Committee greatly appreciates all consultation efforts and hopes that university leadership will continue to engage the Senate over the design of faculty workspace in the future. If you have any questions please contact me, or Academic Senate analyst Artemio Cardenas, artemio.cardenas@ucsf.edu.

Sincerely,

Leah Karliner, MD
Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee