Coordinating Committee  
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Thursday, February 4, 2016  
2:00 – 4:00 pm  
Parnassus, S-30 or by phone  

PRESENT:  Ruth Greenblatt (Chair), Leah Karliner, Michelle Arkin, Jae-Woo Lee, Pamela Bellefeuille, Marek Brzezinski, Janice Tsoh (T), Arthur Miller, Michael McMaster (T), Don Kishi, Steve Cheung, Cynthia Darling, Janine Cataldo, Joseph Guglielmo, Paul Garcia, Lisa Murphy (T), Torsten Wittman, Timothy Kelley, Janet Myers, Brian Alldredge, Todd Giedt, Alison Cleaver, Ken Laslavic, Shilpa Patel, and Karla Goodbody  

Chair Greenblatt called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm in Parnassus, S-30. A quorum was present.  

I. Chair’s Report & Executive Session – Ruth Greenblatt  
Chair Greenblatt briefed members of systemwide and local issues:  

Systemwide Updates:  
• Cyber Security: There is a current controversy over UCOP’s response to the UCLA cyber-attack in June 2015. This breach, which will cost UC millions, originated on the campus, not in the Medical Center. The invaders apparently were looking for IP, but found their way into the EMR, and breached thousands of personal health records. UCOP responded to this attack by engaging an outside firm to provide expertise and certain monitoring tools. Chair Greenblatt emphasized that UCOP has always had the authority to monitor UC communications, per policy. The new measures monitor electronic communications traffic only. The University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) has made a statement on UCOP’s response, which is posted on the Senate’s website.  
• President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program: The UCAAD committee reports that the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program provides one to two years’ funding for underrepresented minorities (URM) post docs that can be directed at any post-doctoral trainee in the UC system, which now includes the health sciences. Also, once a recipient becomes an UC President’s Postdoctoral Fellow/Scholar, he or she is always considered a scholar, even if the recipient works at another University. If a Scholar does indeed return to UC, there are various salary and start up package benefits included. The first five years of salary is covered, and now other start-up components are also covered.  

UCSF Issues  
• Winter Division Meeting: The Senate had excellent attendance, with over 100 faculty members in participating at all sites; a quorum was reached. The spring meeting will include a true video conference, as well as electronic voting. It was clear that there is a lot of interest in space planning on this campus. Although much space planning has already been done, and decisions have been made, the Senate will intensify its efforts to provide feedback to the various space committees. At the meeting, it was indicated that Sri Nagarajan has been a Senate representative on the “UCSF Campuswide Space Governance Committee”. Chair Greenblatt suggested that the Coordinating Committee create an ad-hoc, or special committee on space, with Sri Nagarajan serving as chair. The other Senate representatives on the other space planning committees would also be members of this ad-hoc committee.  

ACTION: Coordinating Committee members approved the approval of a special ad-hoc committee on space, contingent on advice from the Committee on Committees.  

II. Consent Calendar  
Members approved the consent calendar:  
1) Approval of the Minutes from the January 7, 2016 meeting
III. **Information Technology at UCSF** -- Joe Bengfort, UCSF Chief Information Officer

CIO Bengfort related that at UCSF there is increasing demands and investment in information technology (IT). In particular, his organization must make efforts to bend the high cost curve of UCSF’s IT infrastructure through the consolidation of IT organizations. The estimated cost over the next five years in capital spending in IT is about $270M; this equates to about $27M annually. One area of emphasis is the replacement of legacy equipment and support of high-speed computing. Another issue concerns active strategic planning in the different parts of the institution. For instance, these include the Clinical Enterprise Strategic Plan, the Parnassus/Mt. Zion 2020 Task Force, and the Educational Technology Strategy to name a few. In short, all Schools are in some phase of strategy development with respect to IT. In 2016, UCSF IT priorities are the following: 1) IT partial outsourcing decision and transition; 2) data center migrations and consolidations; and 3) the Benioff Children’s Hospital Oakland IT consolidation. He added that UCSF is considering outsourcing about 20% of IT functions; some data center services are also being targeted. The new data centers would be located in high density computing environments at a much lower operating and energy costs. Other priorities include the interface/integration supporting application environments across research, education, and patient care (e.g., allowing systems to communicate with each other so data does not need to be entered multiple times). The information security program includes a 120-day acceleration, along with a three-year security investment plan. Finally, the enterprise information management includes data warehousing, analytics, data governance, and various dashboards. CIO Bengfort also spoke about the new “UCSF digital experience,” which will allow UCSF to streamline data, including research and patient data, and website for information disbursement. The new systemwide program concerns image management, which would form an archive of images from all units and departments that would be integrated in the medical archive for both patient care and research across all five UC health sciences campuses. A clinical data warehouse is also intended for the five health sciences campuses, which is undergoing a proof-of-concept trial right now.

CIO Bengfort also addressed cyber security, and specifically the UCLA cyber-attack. In doing so, he presented a hypothetical attack on an institution, thereby showing members how such an attack happens. Generally, a hacker will use software to gain administrative access to a vulnerable public-facing web server. The attacker then uses the compromised web server to gain administrator access to other servers. The hacker then obtains user account names, IDs, and encrypted passwords, most of which can ultimately be decrypted. Finally, the hacker gains control of a server storing particular valuable data, perhaps medical or personnel data. He remarked that there were many good reasons for UCOP to have acted quickly immediately after the UCLA attack. The current provider, Fidelis, will be replaced by a firm with a longer-term contract to monitor communication log files of the medical centers, but not the content of the actual communications themselves. UCSF will be changing passwords again soon (but not user IDs), and will be offering a password manager to faculty.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Greenblatt noted that some faculty members have challenges accessing data and information from various website. R&J has proposed a centralized website and search engine to navigate the numerous existing online resources at UCSF (e.g., a single portal to all relevant information within UCSF). She also mentioned that the Senate is interested in strengthening the connection between the Senate and CIO Bengfort’s robust IT governance structure. He responded that there are indeed a number of Senate representatives on some of these IT governance committees. Members also asked about the cost of the IT agenda that may trickle down to faculty. CIO Bengfort responded that each of these projects has a specific funding source. Some are funded through the medical center and/or specific departments; others are being funded via the $5B **IT Road Map**. There is a process to fund many of these projects so that they do not come out of the core – at least initially. He acknowledged that the costs for those projects that are not funded by the medical centers will eventually be passed down to faculty in one way or another. Coordinating Committee members remarked that clear communication needs to go out to faculty in order to detail the IT benefits that accrue to faculty from these incurred costs. The Senate is meant to be a body that can communicate the needs of the faculty to the Office of the CIO through the IT governance structure. Finally, one member asked for more information regarding UCSF’s “digital presence,” noting that this is certainly not a new concept at this institution. CIO Bengfort responded that
there is a general lack of understanding what this concept means. It actually means implementing a “digital channel to the market.” There are multiple examples of firms that have increased their efficiencies and revenue by increasing their channels to the market. He is bringing in such a firm that can help UCSF do this, thereby leveraging external knowledge to assist UCSF in this effort.

IV. Systemwide Reviews
UCSF Comments on the Retirement Options Task Force Report to the President
The Senate is very concerned about the development of a 2016 UCRP tier and its implications for Health Sciences faculty. Principal concerns include:
1. Adverse impact on recruitment and retention in the Health Sciences due to high competition, the long duration of training, the late initiation of retirement savings, and high educational debt. Also many Health Sciences faculty have salaries above the $117K PEPRA limit at the time of their initial appointment.
2. The adverse impact on recruitment and retention may be particularly pronounced for URM candidates and first to college generation due to high educational debt and the high cost of living at most UC campuses.
3. While some competitor institutions have defined contribution plans for retirement, most have a higher salary structure, so total remuneration is better.
4. The new tier may have a larger impact on recruitment than the previous new tier because it is a major change and because retirement of the baby boomers will cause a relatively sizable efflux of faculty in the next decade.
5. UC needs to create an advantageous mechanism for annuities for the defined contribution retirement accounts since the outside market annuity plans often have sizable charges, which can consume any interest that accrues.

APB, CFW, and EQOP have submitted comments. The formal letter will be submitted to the systemwide Senate on February 5. A town hall is scheduled for Monday, February 8. Members discussed concerns, as well as implications of the new tier on recruitment and retention. The systemwide context of this change was also discussed.

V. Update on the Academic Specialists Task Force
COR Chair Janet Myers is the Senate representative on this task force. It is looking at the update to APM-330, which addresses “specialists” at the University. There are 2,500 specialists across the system; UCSF has 600 specialists. Recommendations have been made to professionalize them within the updated APM with respect to promotion. In brief, the task force is charged with bringing UCSF in sync with the systemwide standards in hiring and promoting specialists. The task force is also concerned with the welfare of current specialists at UCSF, as well as their ability to be promoted given the changes to APM-330. There is also only one salary scale for all specialists.

VI. Old Business
None.

VII. New Business
None.

VIII. Adjournment
Chair Greenblatt adjourned the meeting at 4:05 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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