

Coordinating Committee
Farid Chehab, PhD, Chair

MINUTES

Monday, July 6, 2015

2:00 – 4:00 pm

Room S 30 or by phone (*)

1-800-559-1091; 8652 157#

PRESENT: Farid Chehab, Roberta Keller, Sharmilla Majumdar*, Thomas Ferrin, Jacque Duncan, Janice Tsoh, John Feiner, Catherine Waters, Paul Garcia, Sheila Brear, Janet Myers*, Patricia McDaniels*, Daniel Weiss*, Hope Rugo*, Shilpa Patel, Artemio Cardenas, Alison Cleaver, Michelle Sanko, and Todd Giedt

GUESTS: Daniel Lowenstein, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

San Francisco Division Chair Farid Chehab called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm in room S-30. The minutes of the June 8, 2015 meeting (Attachment 1) were approved.

Chair's Report

Three Percent Salary Increase: UCOP has formally approved a three percent salary increase for all ladder-ranked faculty. However, plans for HSCP members are still forthcoming. The pay increase will be retroactive to July 1, but will appear in the October paychecks. Department chairs will sign off on this; the other 1.5% will go towards faculty diversity issues per the Equity Study. The salary scales (and X¹) will change (for all faculty) by 1.5%, which will benefit UCRP payments.

July Appointments:

- Talmadge King has started as the new SOM Dean;
- John Plotts has retired, and Teresa Constantinides has been selected as the Interim Senior Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration. Mike Clune was appointed as the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Budget and Resource Management.

Police Chief Search Committee: A Senate member has been appointed to this search committee.

Academic Planning Committee:

- The systemwide open access policy (for non-Senate members) is now complete; it will be going to President Napolitano for final approval. UCSF is not bound by the systemwide policy, as UCSF has its own policy.
- The systemwide Self-Supporting Program (SSP) policy is also complete; a teaching buy-out is necessary for faculty who want to teach in SSPs and such courses would be considered part of a faculty member's outside activities.

Chancellor's Retreat:

- UCSF Medical Center CEO Mark Laret presented the five-year plan for UC Health. The funds flow model, which was implemented last year, had a positive impact on faculty (RVU model), which increased productivity by 7%.
- 500 FTEs were hired at the new Mission Bay hospital (instead of 100 FTEs); this will result in a projected one-year loss of approximately \$42M in 2016.

- The 10-year budget forecast for the Schools:
 1. School of Medicine: Overall, Federally-funded research is revenue is slightly down as compared to last year; however, privately-funded research has increased somewhat. The SOM is being held to a research productivity standard (ICR/sqft of \$120 per sqft), and the School is currently looking at those departments that are below that benchmark now (some are at \$85/sqft).
 2. School of Pharmacy: The SOP is redesigning the PharmD curriculum. There will be an opening of a new state-of-the-art spectrometry facility at QB3.
 3. School of Dentistry: The SOD is ranked first in NIH funding in dentistry for the 23rd year. One financial issue confronting the School concerns the fact that UCSF dental clinics are obligated to take MediCal and DentiCal patients, but the State is not currently paying for these patients.
 4. School of Nursing: Although the School is doing well now, it will face significant challenges in the future.
- New Business Unit for Business, Development, External Partnerships, and Entrepreneurship: There is a proposal to create a new business unit for external entrepreneurship; this unit will work directly with faculty to develop partnerships with private industry. Despite QB3, UCSF is traditionally viewed by private industry as difficult to work with. It is likely that the Catalyst in CTSI will be integrated into this business unit. An internal candidate will likely be recruited to direct this unit.
- Philanthropy/Capital Planning: UCSF is doing well in terms of philanthropy – received \$600M in FY 2014-15. One issue that continues to hamstring the UCSF is restricted monies. Building 33 has been decided upon however; it will be going up and is in the core financial plan. The Psychiatry building will also be going up. The construction of other buildings is on hold pending ongoing philanthropy.

Academic Council

Vice Chair Ruth Greenblatt reported on the June meeting of Academic Council.

- Agreement with the Governor: An enrollment funding plan approved by the State Assembly would provide UC with \$25 million in additional funding for the enrollment of 5,000 new undergraduate California residents over the next two years. The bill also asks UC to use
- Nonresident Supplemental Tuition revenue to cover the balance of the \$50 million cost to enroll
- 5,000 students. However, the bill does not provide funding for additional graduate student enrollment. Much of the increase will come from transfers. The Legislature is interested in increasing diversity and outreach; there may be a role for UCSF in this area.
- Sexual Harassment Policy: President Napolitano will issue an interim revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence to meet the July 1 deadline for a policy that meets the requirements of the federal Violence Against Women Act. Meanwhile, UCOP will continue to work on a new revision that accommodates concerns expressed by the Senate and others during the systemwide review.

Genetic Testing Policy

Chair Chehab sent a letter EVCP Daniel Lowenstein regarding the Genetic Testing Policy; the principal suggestions noted in the letter are:

1. Students should have access to genetic counselors for certain concerned students and the campus should cover these costs;
2. Appoint Dan Dohan as the point person to monitor the implementation of this policy.

Strategic Planning for Investment in Educational Facilities at UCSF – Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Daniel Lowenstein

Provost Lowenstein noted that it is important to step back and strategically rethink UCSF's plan on institutional infrastructure for education at UCSF over the next 20 years. While there has been some discussion about upgrades to the library, as well as the integration of facilities at Mission Bay (MB), most of these discussions have not been holistic in nature. One key question is what will the campus look like in 10 to 15 years from the perspective of its educational facilities? A long-standing view held that a

significant portion of UCSF's educational activities would eventually be moved to Mission Bay. However, given the lack of space available at MB, it is becoming clear that UCSF needs to make a commitment to renewing the jewel of Parnassus as an integral part of the UCSF campus (e.g., "Parnassus 2030"). Provost Lowenstein contemplates that if Parnassus is re-envisioned, then the educational space for UCSF's professional school education would stay at the Parnassus campus, but the educational facilities should be rethought. However, the graduate departments may eventually move to MB. The library would become the knowledge and learning center. Health Sciences West would also need to be completely rethought, as its lecture hall space is completely outmoded technology point of view. Millberry Union's role may also need to be re-conceptualized.

DISCUSSION: Vice Chair Ruth Greenblatt mentioned that Parnassus has another characteristic that makes it attractive for UCSF's educational facilities -- its seismic stability. On the other hand, MB is not well-situated for earthquakes, and will not fare well in the event of eventual sea rise(s). Provost Lowenstein suggested that a high-level task force be formed to visualize the educational facilities plan for Parnassus, with another committee being charged with conceptualizing the comprehensive educational space across UCSF. The Parnassus task force would be constituted over the summer; the vision would be developed over the next year. The Education Deans have agreed that progress needs to be made in this area. The Parnassus campus would need to be reimaged in all three mission areas – research, education, and service – to bring it in line with modern technology. Chair Farid asked about the perception of segregation between professional students and graduate students; if this scenario comes to pass, this has the potential to further accentuate this split. Provost Lowenstein responded that professional students would be based at Parnassus for their pre-clinical work.

Manhattan Institute and Restrictions on the Use of University Resources and Facilities for Political Activities – *Ruth Greenblatt, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

On March 27, the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research sponsored a panel conference on "Data and Technology: Keys to Precision Medicine and 21st Century Cures." The Manhattan Institute is very politically active (e.g., lobbyist for tobacco, disputing climate warming, prescription drug coverage, etc.). Indeed, the Manhattan Institute is very active as an advocate regarding Federal regulations for health insurance, FDA approval, pricing of drugs/Medicare. FDA reform is a big issue for the Manhattan Institute, and the point person for this issue ("Project FDA") is the actual person named in the UCSF flyer. Perhaps most concerning was the fact that the Manhattan Institute was responsible for collecting RSVPs for the event, as there is the concern that the Manhattan Institute could use these names and email addresses of UCSF faculty for other purposes at a later date. On March 26, the day before the event, the Senate sent out an email alerting to faculty to the political nature of this organization (by directing faculty to their website). Approximately 75 people attended the event, which included faculty, students, and biotech leaders. Much of the meeting was focused on big data and the acceleration of research. The main session followed by a reception then small group discussion of legislation and the FDA. After the event, Senate leadership reached out to Keith Yamamoto, the Vice Chancellor for Research at UCSF. who responded that 1) UCSF needs to engage with the Manhattan Institute, as they have much influence in congress; and 2) in doing so, UCSF is not endorsing any position. Vice Chair

Vice Chair Greenblatt summarized that whether one's view of this event (and the policy issue surrounding it) as being problematic might depend on the following considerations:

1. Is there a problem? No, the campus is an open forum and all opinions and sponsors are free to participate;
2. In part, because the nature of the sponsor was not clear and the sponsor collected the RSVPs by email; and
3. Yes, the sponsor has a record of distorting science and UCSF should not facilitate their access to our community.

She added that the session after the meeting could have been called a “Lobbying Event,” as it related to the FDA legislation noted above. The Senate is therefore asking for disclosure on political advocacy groups that will meet on campus; and 2) RSVPs for such events should not go directly to the organization in question, and should be handled internally by UCSF (the academic list-serv should not be used for such purposes). A parallel process will be started systemwide, along with UCSF own local initiative.

Academic Senate Information Items

- A. Chancellor’s Fund Update: Members were informed that most of the monies in the Chancellor’s Fund has been awarded; Senate staff is following up on the remaining awardees that are still awaiting distribution of funds.

- B. Other Announcements: The Clinical Sciences Building will be fully vacated and inaccessible by early August 2015 for its retrofit. Way-finding maps will be posted on every floor of UC Hall, MSB, Nursing, and in various other locations to direct staff, faculty and visitors. Ongoing impact will be shared via flyers and posters, the <http://space.ucsf.edu> website and by communicating directly with departments.

Committee Updates

There were not any committee updates.

Old Business

There was not any old business.

New Business

There was not any new business.

Adjournment

Chair Chehab adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

**Agenda items deemed noncontroversial by the Chair, may be placed on a Consent Calendar agenda item, and a single unanimous vote for approval. At the request of a committee member, any Consent Calendar item may be extracted for consideration later.*

Academic Senate Staff:

Todd Giedt, Executive Director
todd.giedt@ucsf.edu, (415) 476-1307