



DATE: February 8, 2013  
TO: [ALLACAD@Listserv.ucsf.edu](mailto:ALLACAD@Listserv.ucsf.edu)  
FROM: UCSF Academic Senate ([academic.senate@ucsf.edu](mailto:academic.senate@ucsf.edu))  
RE: Faculty Workspace: Present and Future Plans

Dear Colleagues,

Many of you have expressed concern about the “activity-based workplace” plan for the new Mission Bay Academic Building that does not include private offices. You may not be aware that the same structure is also planned for new and renovated UCSF space at Parnassus and all other locations.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The activity-based workplace plan for the Mission Bay Academic Building was presented to and accepted by the Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet in March 2012, following several months of work by campus leaders who had reviewed possible configurations within the constraints of space, budget and programmatic expectations. The general faculty began to learn about the plan at departmental and other meetings in the Fall of 2012. At that time, the Academic Senate and others begin to compile their concerns about this design including but not limited to concerns about privacy, productivity and the ability to retain and recruit colleagues.

#### **ACADEMIC SENATE ACTIVITY TO DATE**

In the Fall of 2012, the Committee on Academic Planning & Budget (APB) formed the Mission Bay Academic Building Working Group to address faculty concerns. This group has since expanded to include faculty members slated to move to the new building and others.

On December 18, 2012, the Academic Senate sent a letter to campus leaders via the Mission Bay Advisory Group based on the efforts of the Mission Bay Academic Building Working Group and the Academic Senate Committees on Research (COR) and Clinical Affairs (CAC). The letter documented many of the faculty concerns and proposed solutions. It can be read via:

<http://senate.ucsf.edu/2012-2013/12-18-12-MissionBay-FacultyConcerns.pdf>

On January 3, 2013 members of the Working Group met with Sam Hawgood, Bruce Wintroub and Bonnie Maler to discuss the concerns and possible solutions in the letter. By the close of that meeting, we agreed that the constructive course of action was to increase communications to the faculty about this design and the options available to those who will be moving into the building.

To document these activities and gather input, the Academic Senate created a web page that presents questions and concerns, proposed solutions, and requests comments from faculty. Read more via:

<http://senate.ucsf.edu/2012-2013/missionbay.php>

#### **NEXT STEPS**

We are committed to ensuring that the implementation of this model serves UCSF and its faculty as best as possible. We are separating the steps by faculty groups, as follows:

1. Mission Bay Hospital Faculty: Faculty members whose departments and/or programs must move to the Mission Bay Academic Building. For this group, we request that campus leaders conduct a rigorous study of the implementation of the activity-based workplace model, as well as give their commitment to act upon any deficiencies uncovered, including dismantling the model if necessary. We advocate that UCSF provide workspaces that support our success in research, teaching and clinical care.
2. Faculty currently slated to **electively** move to the Mission Bay Academic Building: Some faculty members in this group have been recruited to move with their clinical program to the Mission Bay Hospital. Others in this group include clinical faculty who are leaving their division/department to be housed in the Academic Building. We ask that campus leaders work with these groups to determine how to best meet their needs, which may include delaying or rethinking their move to the Mission Bay Academic Building.
3. Faculty not slated to move to the Mission Bay Academic Building: Many faculty members are slated to move into activity-based workspaces proposed for renovated or new space in the Clinical Sciences Building, University Hall, and SFGH. We recommend a moratorium on workplace planning for any of these locations until data from the requested study of the Mission Bay Academic Building have been collected and fully analyzed.
4. Academic Senate: The Academic Senate will continue to work with faculty and campus leaders during this process via the Mission Bay Academic Building Working Group, the Committees on Academic Planning & Budget (APB), Research (COR), Clinical Affairs (CAC), Faculty Welfare (CFW) and the School Faculty Councils. David Teitel and Alan Venook have been appointed to, and will work with the Mission Bay Advisory Group. Their participation on the Advisory Group includes advocating on behalf of faculty and reporting new information to the Academic Senate.
5. All Faculty: We have presented the background of the work environment proposed for the Mission Bay Academic Building, our concerns and the possible solutions that we have devised based on meetings of Academic Senate committees and work groups, and conversations among interested parties. We know that the faculty, as a whole, can add greatly to the process by sharing their concerns and solutions. Your participation is critical to the success of the implementation of the model, or alterations in it to meet the needs of the faculty. Please go to our website on this issue to read more and voice your ideas:  
<http://senate.ucsf.edu/2012-2013/missionbay.php>

Lastly, if you would like to be engaged more directly with the Academic Senate, you can also contact any one of us. We look forward to ensuring that all new space at UCSF will be designed to maximize our productivity and happiness.

Sincerely,

Robert Newcomer, PhD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
[robert.newcomer@ucsf.edu](mailto:robert.newcomer@ucsf.edu)

Alan Venook, MD  
Member, Mission Bay Advisory Group  
[venook@cc.ucsf.edu](mailto:venook@cc.ucsf.edu)

David Teitel, MD  
Chair, Committee on Academic Planning &  
Budget  
Member, Mission Bay Advisory Group  
[david.teitel@ucsf.edu](mailto:david.teitel@ucsf.edu)