October 22, 2015

Ruth Greenblatt, MD
Chair 2015-2017
UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Ave, MUE 231
San Francisco, CA 94143

Re: Rules & Jurisdiction Committee Request/Position on Chancellor’s/FAR Funds 2015-2016

Dear Senate Chair Greenblatt:

Thank you for requesting feedback from UCSF Senate Standing Committees on the use of the 2015-2016 Chancellor’s/Faculty Academic Renewal (FAR) Funds

The Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) discussed this at its September 2015 meeting and via email and has the below requests for funding. RJC members have two requests for funding this year: one related to a continued funding item from the 2014-2015 FAR Funds allocation, and another related to a new “big idea”.

This proposal relates to the new idea.

This year RJC members understand the funds will remain in a single pool and not be divvied out to standing committees or councils. However, committees can still petition for a portion of the funds to be used for specific purposes.

**Big Idea – Funding Request $90,000**

RJC members discussed the need for many faculty to handle things previously managed by administrative assistants, with little assistance or direction provided by UCSF.

RJC members recommend the development of a “one-stop shop” website similar to Family@UCSF but focused on Faculty@UCSF. The intention would be to have this site be searchable via Google – and upon it becoming the go-to site for faculty information.

The intention would be to have information currently residing on a myriad of department- or center-specific websites consolidated behind the scenes such that it is searchable from one location. This would assist faculty in finding answers quickly and in a manner that provides clear next steps.

UCSF has several sites—UCSF Pulse and the in-development UCSF Life—which are aiming to become this type of location. However this still presents the same problem of faculty needing to go to various sites to find relevant information. The goal would be to have just one location.

RJC members did appreciate discovering that doing a Google search for “Faculty at UCSF” produces [www.ucsf.edu/pulse](http://www.ucsf.edu/pulse) as the top answer. However at present, neither Pulse nor UCSF Life possesses the kind of robust search engine that we’re seeking to have developed.

The UC Berkeley site “Cal Answers” ([calanswers.berkeley.edu](http://calanswers.berkeley.edu)) is one such University-affiliated example. Although we recognize that it’s sourced through the Planning & Analysis Office at UC Berkeley; so its intended use is different than what RJC members are envisioning.
Argument for Financial Ask
Preliminary discussion with programmers about this project yielded a three-phase timeline. The $90K ask is for:

1. determining if a stand-alone website is the right path; or
   a. if development of a robust search engine within the pre-existing UCSF Pulse would suffice.
2. to partner with ITS to develop a program compatible with UCSF
3. determine next steps for 2016-2017 development and implementation

Initial communication with CIO J. Bengfort advised that the overall cost of developing such a site is dependent on scope, and would most likely be around $200k in total.

This initial cost request also includes the hiring of a programmer (either from within UCSF or beyond) to develop the search engine or bolster a pre-existing one.

Other Suggestions
Members of the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee also suggested:

- Posting questions on this “one-stop shop” site – and having designated faculty answer them.
  o This could be a rotating group of faculty, or it could be one of the Senate Officers.
- Further, this could be combined this also with the Senate’s Question of the Month – have it be an Answer of the Month.
  o Example, “did you know that if you’re returning to research after sabbatical or personal time off, the Senate has the Re-entry Grant available through Research Allocation Program (RAP) specifically designed to assist you in resurrecting your research program.”
- If funding is approved, RJC would hope to partner with the Faculty Welfare Committee (and others) on the development of the content.

Discussions on 2015-2016 Funding Decisions
Separately, RJC requests to opt out of ongoing 2015-2016 FAR Funding discussions, but retains the right to vote on final funding decisions.

Committee members had no comment on the type of review body for new applications.

Finally, RJC members did agree that:

- Faculty with 50% appointment or higher are eligible to apply
- No volunteer faculty should be eligible to apply
- As both the Learning & Development and Enrichment Funding pathways are expected to be offered again this year, they did agree that if a faculty member received an award from either in 2014-2015, they should not be eligible to receive that same award in the same pathway in the current funding year.

Thank you for considering the RJC funding request for 2015-2016.
Sincerely,

Rules & Jurisdiction Committee

Marek Brzezinski, MD, PhD, Chair
Linda Angin, DDS
Dorothy Apollonio, PhD
Michele Bloomer, MD
Sheila Brear, BDS
Mark Seielstad, PhD
Katherine Yang, PharmD
Douglas Carlson, JD, Registrar (Ex Officio)
Jae Woo Lee, MD, UCRJ Representative (Ex Officio)