Academic Planning and Budget Committee
Chad Christine, MD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT
2015-2016

Primary Focus Points for the Year:
- Campaign Planning
- Campus Finance
- Campus Planning
- Chancellors Fund
- Faculty Workspace
  - Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey
  - Mission Hall Committee
- HR Reforms
- IT Security
- New UC Retirement Tier

Subcommittees Topics:
- Administrative Initiatives
  - HR Reforms
- Campus Planning
  - Mission Hall Survey
- Information Technology
  - IT Security

Issues for Next Year (2016-2017):
- Campus Finance
- Campus Planning
- Campaign Planning
- IT Security
- Faculty Workspace Planning
  - Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Study
  - Mission Hall Committee and Reforms
- Human Resources Reforms
- Research Management Services

2015-2016 Members

Chad Christine, Chair	**Ex-Officio Members**
Russell Pieper, Vice Chair	Joe Bengfort, Chief Information Officer
Michelle Arkin	David Teitel, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
Howard Fields	John Plotts, Senior VC, Finance & Admin.
Hannah Glass	Lori Yamauchi, Asst. VC, Campus Planning
Stefan Habelitz	**Permanent Guests**
Sally Marshall	Tim Kelly, Medicine Faculty Council Chair
Sean Mong	Patrick Finley, Pharmacy Faculty Council Vice Chair
Norm Oppenheimer	Mike McMaster, Dentistry Faculty Council Chair
Howard Pinderhughes	Janine Cataldo, Nursing Faculty Council Chair
Elliott Seeley	
Paul Volberding	
Margaret Wallhagen	

Number of Meetings: 7 Committee Meetings and Numerous Subcommittee Meetings
Senate Staff: Artemio Cardenas

The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) took up the following Systemwide issues:

New UC Retirement Tier
In October of 2015, it was reported that the UCPB committee had reviewed the details of the 2015-2016 budget. Part of the plan includes a $436 million contribution from the State of California to the UC Retirement Plan. A couple conditions of receiving the additional funding included the implementation of a new pension cap and the development of a new UC retirement tier. A major concern for the Academic Senate was whether a pension cap would make it harder for the university to compete with other universities when recruiting top faculty. In November, President Napolitano informed the Academic Senate that a Retirement Task Force had been assembled to review pension reform options and provide her with recommendations for how to organize the new tier. In January of 2016, the Task Force report was released for systemwide review. After reviewing the recommendations, APB committee members discussed and grouped their concerns into three general categories and submitted these to the systemwide Academic Senate for consideration:

- Overall effect of the plan on retirement benefits: Members noted that with UC salaries below our comparators, for both staff and faculty, the retirement system has been one of the few remaining incentives for employment in the UC system. The 2016 tier, as proposed in the report, represents not a shift in benefits but rather a substantial cut in benefits and total remuneration in comparison the 2013 tier. Because the 2013 tier was essentially neutral, benefits-wise, relative to the UC's comparators and substantially behind salary-wise, the 2016 tier will put UCSF employees further behind in both salary and benefits. APB members are additionally concerned that salary increases, which have been historically difficult to institute, remain the only means to cover the gap in benefits the proposed plan creates. The existing UCRP is a well-funded and well-reasoned plan with small and resolvable deficits. The proposed plan, in contrast appears hastily considered, was not based on a full range of options, and was designed to address a fiscal problem that could be resolved by less drastic measures.

- Effects on recruitment and retention: APB members felt that the total remuneration package offered continues to fall further behind that of our comparators and will limit our ability to recruit the best and brightest to UC and UCSF. Furthermore, although younger hires may be less concerned with retirement packages at the outset, the proposed 2016 tier begins to limit retirement benefits at mid-career, which is exactly the point at which many individuals reach their peak performance. As such the proposed plan increases the temptation for successful mid-career employees to leave the university, and also limits our ability to recruit mid-career individuals with proven records and abilities.

- Equality: The proposed plan creates inequality among faculty and staff in at least two ways. First, new hires post 2016 will receive retirement benefits that are significantly less than those of previous hires. Such approaches do little to encourage co-operation and instead begin to drive wedges between different groups of faculty and staff. Second, the institution of the PEPRA cap will impact UC employees, and UC campuses, disproportionately. Those individuals with higher pay scales, and in particular those in law, business, economics, engineering, and health sciences, will have their benefits limited earlier and more extensively than other UC employees. This is a particular concern for campuses such as UCSF that have a high proportion of individuals on the Health Sciences compensation plan and who are already relatively disadvantaged with respect to covered compensation. The proposed plan amounts to a targeted cut to those programs (science, biotechnology, engineering, health care) that most Californians agree have helped build our vibrant economy. To support an expansion of STEM-based education while at the same time targeting faculty in these areas makes little sense.

Overall, the APB members agreed that they could not support the taskforce recommendations. They encouraged the President to work with the faculty and the Governor to devise a plan that more fairly compensates UC and UCSF employees for their often career-long efforts. Members believed that the absence of such a plan will force UCSF to work with other health care/professional campuses to find

ways of plugging a new and unwarranted hole in our compensation program. On March 15, with consideration of the Retirement Task Force recommendations, President Napolitano released her proposed plan for a new tier. In the proposal, the President decided to split benefits between faculty and staff and make changes to the percentage supplemental matching funds above the PEPRA cap of $117,000. At the end of March, the Regents approved of the new 2016 UC Retirement Plan tier, as proposed by the President. The new tier was implemented on July 1, 2016. APB members intend to monitor the impact of the new tier on recruiting.

UC Planning and Budget Committee Reports
Over the course of the year, UC Planning and Budget Committee member Russ Pieper reported on the following issues:
- New UC Retirement Plan Tier: Throughout the year, UCPB worked to analyze retirement plan options and provide feedback to UCOP.
- Enrollment Funding: During budget negotiations with the state, the legislature offered an additional $25 million of funding for the undergraduate enrollment of 5,000 more California residents. While the university supported the idea, there were concerns that the amount offered from the state would only cover half of the cost to enroll 5,000 more students. After deliberation, President Napolitano decided to take the offer from the state. UCPB then worked throughout the year to address capacity and financial constraints on the campuses.
- UC Berkeley Financial Situation: In April, UC Berkeley Chancellor Nicholas Dirks released a statement that the campus would have a projected deficit of $150 million in next two years. To address the situation, the campus made a series of reforms to streamline business processes. In May, the Chancellor disassembled the Office of Strategic Initiatives, announced layoffs and scaled back campus expansion plans as the non-resident revenue is used to subsidize residents.
- Salary Scale Increases: In May, UCOP announced that faculty pay scales would increase by 1.5% and another 1.5% increase would be anticipated later in the year. These increases are part of a faculty pay increase initiative that the Regents approved of in 2014.
- Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition: In May, UCPB discussed how each campus is using the revenue from non-resident undergraduates. In general, revenue is used for additional financial aid and to enhance the overall educational experience. The big concern for the campuses is whether or not the Regents will agree to impose a cap on the number of non-residents that will be enrolled. This is a big concern for many of the campuses.

Divisional Business

This year, the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

Campaign Planning
In October, APB members were informed that the campus was considering a potential development campaign. In November, Executive Director of Development Olivia Herbert attended the committee meeting to respond to the APB committee's request to learn more about a potential UCSF Campaign:
- Goals for a Potential Campaign
  - Forces strategic thinking and set priorities
  - Raises visibility
  - Inspires next generation of philanthropists to invest in UCSF for the future
- Shift Framework from Needs to Vision
  - What value comes from meeting our needs?
  - Focus on future goals, not present needs
- What are the Key Opportunities?
  - Allow new projects that can't happen at all
  - New collaborations in research

- o Ability to recruit best talent for faculty– we have trouble due to cost of living; this could fill the gap
  - o Collect that seed data to enable the next huge thing
- Engaging IT
  - o How we can work together to change medicine?
  - o Create UCSF community with networking and social media?
  - o Prevention and disease management?
  - o Natural language processing, making patient care more effective
  - o Also an appetite for merging people's new technologies looking for a problem to solve
- Coordinating/Joint campaign with UCB
  - o Collaboration around bioengineering and computer science
  - o How can we be seen as partners instead of competitors?
  - o Shared opportunities with other local UCs
  - o The proposed Richmond campus can be an opportunity
  - o Joint DOD/foundation funds given to UCSF thanks to bioengineering collaboration
- Questions for Faculty
  - o How would UCSF be different if we achieved these goals?
    - Building our endowment
    - Increasing stability
    - Healthy longevity and diseases of aging
    - Health disparity
    - Merging health disparity with technology
  - o How can UCSF AdministrationBetter Communicate with Faculty?
    - Committee members responded that if the campaign focuses on stabilizing and supporting a creative faculty, it would galvanize the faculty community
  - o How to we Attract New Philanthropists?
  - o How to capitalize on the Discovery Fellows?
  - o How to communicate value we have created?
    - Tag lines:
      - The Bay Area wouldn't be the same without UCSF
      - The world wouldn't be the same without UCSF
      - People are really interested in what we do, want to be close to the science

In April, The APB committee was informed that campus leadership was opening up the planning process on a potential new fundraising campaign. To start the discussion on the focus of the campaign, the University Development and Alumni Relations (UDAR) department developed four potential themes. The idea is that these four themes would be broad in scope and involve all UCSF schools and programs. Committee member Michelle Arkin lead the review of the UDAR slide deck and facilitated the APB member discussion. Member feedback on the themes included:

Theme 1: Precision Medicine and Precision Health

Criterion	Committee Comments
Leverages UCSF's distinctive strengths to solve an issue of global concern	While the committee strongly values and supports the campus efforts to further precision medicine, members feel that the phrases "precision medicine" and "precision health" sound exclusive and restrictive. Members believe that the word "precision" makes the initiative sound like it will develop breakthroughs for wealthy populations who can afford the cost of expensive treatments and care.
Reinforces UCSF's leadership in advancing health worldwide.	The committee feels that with a name like "precision medicine," potential donors who are interested in wide-reaching health initiatives, such as global health,

	would be turned off by theme that sounds exclusive.
Requires philanthropy to advance innovation vs. support operations	Members feel that philanthropy will be required to advance "precision medicine" initiatives.
Contributes to the sustainability of a diverse, accessible public institution	Members feel that the use of the word "precision" does not represent UCSF's commitment to being a diverse and accessible public institution.
Demands the contributions of a broad cross-section of people and programs	Members agree. A question was asked on how does precision medicine fit in with the educational mission?
Catalyzes partnerships with other organizations and institutions	Members feel that there are plenty of opportunities for partnerships. For example, UCSF could work with numerous departments at UC Berkeley and other UC campuses. Other organizations include the Sean Parker institute and the VA. Members were particularly intrigued with a potential of partnership with the VA since they have the ability to collect large datasets. In addition, the VA would be well suited to focus on aging. Initiatives to share data across the UC system is also a plus

Theme 2: Health Equity and Health Disparities

Criterion	Committee Comments
Leverages UCSF's distinctive strengths to solve an issue of global concern	n/a
Reinforces UCSF's leadership in advancing health worldwide.	n/a
Requires philanthropy to advance innovation vs. support operations	n/a
Contributes to the sustainability of a diverse, accessible public institution	Members feel that a health equity and health disparities theme aligns very well with UCSF's public mission.
Demands the contributions of a broad cross-section of people and programs	The Committee members noted that they were not clear on how a health equity and disparities theme could be truly crosscutting. While some programs align well, other programs do not. If UCSF is to purse this theme, work needs to be done to inform each program/department/school/institute on how they align with this theme and how they can contribute. Members suggested that the cost of care and treatments should be included as part of the health equity theme. All UCSF faculty should be mindful of the potential cost of the care or treatments they provide/develop.
Catalyzes partnerships with other organizations and institutions	UCSF is also in the perfect position to advance this theme because we are affiliated with other local public health care organizations , such as SFGH and the VA. Other institutions, like Stanford, do not have these ties. This should be a talk point to mention with potential donors.

Theme 3: The Next Generation of Leaders

Criterion	Committee Comments
Leverages UCSF's distinctive strengths to solve an issue of global concern	n/a
Reinforces UCSF's leadership in advancing health worldwide.	Research supported by this campaign would support health advances worldwide
Requires philanthropy to advance innovation vs. support operations	Committee members believe that the next generation of scholars and care providers are at a disadvantage. With cuts in funding and resources, it has become very difficult for new researchers and clinicians to succeed. In order to make sure that our students, faculty and institution as a whole will be successful in the future, there needs to be investment into the people who are here now. Members also noted that there must be investment into student financial aid. Recruiting students to UCSF and the city of San Francisco is difficult and offers from competitor universities have gotten better. If this trend continues, UCSF will fall behind.
Contributes to the sustainability of a diverse, accessible public institution	This initiative could support diversity among students, faculty and staff.
Demands the contributions of a broad cross-section of people and programs	n/a
Catalyzes partnerships with other organizations and institutions	n/a

Theme 4: Innovation/Grand Challenges

Criterion	Committee Comments
Leverages UCSF's distinctive strengths to solve an issue of global concern	Committee members noted that as a leading university, UCSF strength is in research and innovation. However, members noted that UCSF should be careful in using the word "innovation." Members feel that over the past several years, the word "innovation" has been tied to "monetization" and "return on investment." When approaching donors, we should emphasize how new research developments or treatments benefit society as a whole, rather than the university's bottom-line or capital investors.
Reinforces UCSF's leadership in advancing health worldwide.	Members noted that there are several grand challenges that we should consider. One example that was given is the cost of care and insurance. A member stated that in their clinic, their patients sometimes are not able to receive needed care because of insurance restrictions.
Requires philanthropy to advance innovation vs. support operations	Members noted concern with the current funding model for scientific research. As support for research funding has declined, the competition for grants has increased. If donors could help relieve these pressures, faculty could be more productive and innovative.
Contributes to the sustainability of a diverse, accessible public institution	n/a
Demands the contributions of a broad cross-section of people and programs	Committee members believe that UCSF should work to develop ideas that will help to treat the whole

	person. Members believe there are opportunities to bridge health professions to increase the quality of care of patients. For example, a patient that comes in for a dental exam could receive additional tests that might provide clinician and researchers with a complete picture of a patient's health. Members dubbed this type of work as "Comprehensive Health Care." A potential tag line could be " Reimagining Health Care."
Catalyzes partnerships with other organizations and institutions	n/a

Campus Finance Report

In November, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Teresa Costantinidis attended the committee meeting to provide a report on UCSF's financial health (Attachment 1). The presentation covered the following points:

- General Observations
  - UCSF is in Good Financial Shape
    - The University's 2015 Performance exceeded projections by $234 million
    - The UCSF combined enterprise shows a positive net income in each of the next ten years
    - A strong balance sheet remains with critical capital expenditures built into our plan
  - Significant Vulnerabilities Remain
    - Small percentage of dependable income streams
    - Competitive and rapidly changing marketplace for the majority of our revenue
    - Cost of living and faculty recruitment/retention
- 2015 Financial Results
  - More than 80% of UCSF's sources come from competitive and rapidly changing markets
  - Approximately 63% of UCSF combined enterprise uses are driven by personnel-related costs
  - UCSF Health and the UCSF campus have a very integrated relationship. UCSF Health margins have a benefit/risk to the campus.
  - UCSF's consolidated forecast reflects an improved trend compared to the prior year projection
  - Philanthropy along with increased physician productivity are key elements in the forecast
  - UCSF's cash position is expected to grow through 2025. Most cash primarily restricted for designated uses. The campus must find creative ways to direct unrestricted capacity towards enterprise-wide strategies is a priority
  - Capital plans include the renewal of certain Parnassus sites, including required seismic remediation; a new building at SFGH predicated upon seismic requirements; a Mission Bay expansion strategy; and partial solution for faculty investment needs
  - To achieve the capital plan, total debt will increase to $3 billion during the ten-year projection period.
- UCSF Health Projections
  - A strong performance has prepared us for planned losses in 2016 and 2017.
  - There is a projected decline in earnings due to incremental operating costs associated with the opening of the Mission Bay hospitals in 2015 as well as increase interest expense and depreciation.
- Campus Core Financial Plan
  - Only 12% of UCSF's Total Revenue resides in UCSF's centrally-managed operating funds – also called core funds
  - UCSF is on a path where unrestricted funds will go from 472 million to 245 million over time. Actions need to be taken in order to ensure we do not reach a critical stage.
- Summary

- o We continue to make excellent progress and we are planning for the future
- o UCSF is a business operating in competitive, market-driven environment and must quickly seize new opportunities
- o Change is brisk, business cycles are short, and decision-making must accommodate that reality
- o UCSF is in an era of developing alternatives and making choices involving the allocation of resources
- o Lack of steady revenue streams will demand an increased focus on philanthropy as a key area of emphasis and investment

In May, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Budget and Resource Management Michael Clune provided the following Core Financial Plan report (Attachment 2):
- The Core Financial Plan
    - o Management of the Core Financial Plan is governed by several key strategic principles
        - Provide timely, clear and comprehensive financial information
        - Collect the input of stakeholders
        - Shift from silo-based thinking to enterprise-wide thinking
        - Continue to move from short-term tactical actions to a long-term strategic approach
        - Continue to base projections on reasonable assumptions with alternate scenarios
        - Avoid fencing off fund sources
        - Provide management with the capability to choose from among competing demands
        - Maintain appropriate levels and types of reserves
        - Establish sound on-going baseline allocations
        - Keep an eye on UC system-imposed requirements
    - o The Core Financial Plan provides an overview of UCSF's centrally-managed operating core funds
        - The main source of revenues include:
            - Indirect cost recoveries
            - State Funds
            - Infrastructure and Operations Fund
            - Tuition
            - Interest Income
        - Non-core revenues include:
            - Clinical Revenue
            - Contracts and Grants
            - Fees for Service
            - Private Gifts
            - Investment Income
    - o Core funds are mainly used for school and administrative operations and to pay for debt service and UCOP
- 2014-2015 Results
    - o Actual 2014-2015 Recurring Sources: $545 million
        - This amount excludes $89 million one-time Laurel Heights lease
        - Recurring Sources Include the following:
            - In 2014-2015, Recurring Allocations totaled $359 million
            - Annual Allocations in 2014-2015 were $171 million
- Core Financial Plan Changes – 2015-2016 through 2024
    - o During the 2015-2016 budget process, the Chancellor authorized $116 million of funding for UCSF initiatives
        - The topics of these initiatives includes
            - EVCP Strategic Staffing Support

- Library Collections
- Tech Commons/eLearning/Kanbar Center
- IT Security
- Science and Health Partnership
- University Development
- Branding
- Diversity and Outreach
- CTSI Center for Community Engagement
- Pillar on the Culture of Inclusion

- Revenues and Allocations 2015-2016 through 2024 – 2025
  - The key metric we use to monitor the Core Financial Plan over time is the annual ending fund balance. This consists of the recurring sources minus the recurring and annual allocations
  - Projected 2015-2016 Recurring Sources: $595 million
  - In 2015-2016, recurring allocations will total $386 million, reflecting deferrals of some commitments from 2014-2015
  - Annual allocations in 2015-2016 will be $281 million
  - The greatest demand on our resources will continue to be recurring allocation to control points for operations
  - Over the next ten years, sources of funds are expected to rise steadily, but modestly.
  - Over the next ten years, debt service and recurring allocations will contribute to increases in outflows
  - The annual cost of debt service for facilities and infrastructure increases in support of our capital plan
  - Allocations for fixed cost increase, including utilities, become part of the recurring base budget
  - We are making good progress on addressing facilities investment needs
  - The core financial plan includes a ten-year commitment to technology project identified by the IT Governance Committee
  - Strategic Initiatives are funded in part with support from the UCSF Health System
    - $105 million from UCSF Health Strategic Initiatives Support
    - $32 million Strategic Initiatives from Chancellor support
  - In addition to the assessment for UCOP operations, UCSF contributes funds toward systemwide initiatives
    - Projected cumulative costs for UCOP Administrative Tax is $386 million over the next 10 years
    - Projected cost of UCOP initiatives such as UC Path is $127 million over the next 10 years

Campus Planning Reports

Over the course of the year, Associate Vice Chancellor of Campus Planning Lori Yamauchi provided the Academic Planning and Budget Committee with campus planning updates.

In October, Associate Vice Chancellor Yamauchi provided the committee with an update on campus planning projects and initiatives. The following issues were discussed:
- Space.ucsf.edu Website: AVC Yamauchi informed the committee members that the university has a website (space.ucsf.edu) which is a tremendous resource for all types of information on various campus projects. All UCSF campus community members have access to the website and information.
- Parnassus
  - Clinical Sciences Building
    - The Clinical Sciences Building is undergoing seismic retrofit and remodel.

- The total cost of the project will be $95 million. Funding for the project comes from the state, debt financing and campus funds.
- Construction on the building started in mid-2015 and will continue through Mid-2017.
- The workspace of the building will include mixed activity-based and small private office floor plan. The decision to implement this type of floor plan came at the recommendation from a space committee that included several Academic Senate appointed faculty.
  - o UC Hall
    - UC Hall will undergo a seismic retrofit and remodel.
    - Once the retrofit and remodel project is complete, the building will include desktop space/offices on the lower three floors and student housing on the upper three floors.
    - The total cost of the project will be $183 million. Funding will come from debt and campus funds.
    - Construction will start in mid to late 2017 and end in 2020
    - The number of occupants in the building is yet to be determined.
- Mission Bay
  - o Mission Bay East Campus Phase 1 (Block 33)
    - UCSF plans to construct a new building on the east side of the Mission Bay campus. This new building will be 340,000 GSF and will be 6-story base with a 5-story above the base.
    - The total cost of the new building will be $237 million. Funding comes from debt, gifts and campus funds.
    - Construction is projected to start in 2017 and will continue through 2019.
    - The Regents approved funding to develop preliminary plans/design and it is anticipated that they will approve full budget and design in mid-2016.
    - A programming committee has been formed. This group includes several Academic Senate appointed faculty members.
  - o Mission Bay Precision Cancer Medicine Building
    - UCSF plans to construct a new building that will house UCSF Cancer Outpatient Care services. This would be a consolidation of cancer programs now at Mount Zion and Mission Bay.
    - The building would be 170,000 GSF and would be located at the southwest corner of 16th and 3rd streets. This location is currently a parking lot.
    - The total cost of the project is $250 million. The source of the funding comes from campus funds and gifts.
    - The Regents approved funding to develop preliminary plans/designs in September of 2015, and the campus hopes to have Regental approval of full budget and design by mid-2016.
  - o Mission Bay Neurosciences Building (Block 23A)
    - This new building is currently in the early planning stages.
    - The estimated cost of the project would be around $309 million. Funding has yet to be identified.
    - Occupant programs are also yet to be identified
- Child Teen Family Center/Psychiatry Building
  - o UCSF is working on the development of a new Child Teen and Family/Psychiatry Building that will house the Department of Psychiatry's clinics, dry research labs, instructional space and administrative units.
  - o The site of the building will be donated to UCSF
  - o Project costs to be confirmed.
  - o If approved, the project construction could begin in 2017 and end in 2019.
  - o Project approvals are anticipated in late-2016

- o A programming committee for the building has been formed. The Academic Senate representative on this group has yet to be named.
- San Francisco General Hospital Research Building
  - o UCSF has worked with the City and County of San Francisco on the development of a new research building at the SFGH location. The building will be built on the northwest corner of the 23rd and Vermont streets – currently a surface parking lot owned by San Francisco. UCSF will lease the site and own the building.
  - o The project will cost $187 million. Funding will come from debt and campus funds.
  - o If the ground lease and budget and design approval anticipated in mid to late 2016. If on time, construction can begin as early as 2017.
  - o A Planning Committee is being formed, including Academic Senate representatives.
- Minnesota/18th Street
  - o UCSF has acquired three parcels of land on the northwest and southwest corners of 18th and Minnesota streets.
  - o UCSF hopes to develop student and trainee housing on this site.

In March, Associate Vice Chancellor of Campus Planning Lori Yamauchi provided the following campus planning update:
- Open Plan Workspace Governance Task Force Report
  - o In late January 2016, the Open Plan Workspace Governance Task Force released their report - http://space.ucsf.edu/sites/space.ucsf.edu/files/wysiwyg/Open Plan TaskForce Report - FINAL 060616.pdf
  - o Governance
    - ▪ To establish an effective governance structure, the task force recommended the following:
      - Local functional units should be created and be responsible for decision making
      - Space administrative block committees should be created and responsible for oversight and adjudication
      - A building-wide governance committee should be created and responsible for oversight and adjudication
    - ▪ Building use protocols and procedures
    - ▪ Zoning should be performed based on activity types or programmatic adjacencies
    - ▪ There should be management of the expansion and contraction of programs
    - ▪ Governance in alignment with UCSF and School space principles and policies
  - o Workstations
    - ▪ Local management of assignment of office, workstations and support spaces
    - ▪ Campus planners should regularly evaluate assignments based on occupant utilization. APB committee members asked what is a buildings average occupancy percentage? AVC Yamauchi informed the group that data on such a metric is not available. However, the campus has the goal of a 40% occupancy utilization rate for Mission Hall.
    - ▪ Private offices can be incorporated into the design
      - Based on the recommendations of a joint faculty-administration committee that was charged to come up with solution to allocating space in a hybrid office format, private office space will be determined locally within policy guidelines and based upon functional utility
      - The offices can be single or shared
    - ▪ Ratios and placement of support spaces to workstations/offices
      - It is recommended that in the future, workspaces should include fewer Focus/Huddle Rooms than designed in Mission Hall.
  - o Environmental Features
    - ▪ Ergonomics

- Privacy
- Way-finding
- Features of focus/huddle rooms and breakout spaces
- Signage and displays
- Acoustics and sound transmission
- Flexibility
- Technology
    - Enhanced and ongoing training for all technology
    - Classrooms
        - Install high quality microphone and video conferencing equipment
    - Conference Rooms
        - Enable multi-site, multidisciplinary videoconferencing with ceiling microphones which support remote and local communications
    - Focus and Huddle Rooms
        - Equip with desktop computers
    - Copy rooms and shared spaces
        - Study printing demand for shared copiers to determine printer count
    - Workstations
        - Disable speaker phones and provide headsets for occupants
- Conclusions and Recommendations
    - Open Plan Workspace environments should be carefully designed and executed to meet the principles and criteria recommended by the task force.
    - Open Plan environments should include private offices
    - The assignment of private offices will be based on functional needs for a private environment.
    - A formal governance structure for planning and operating the open plan environment should be established.
    - Building-wide protocols and policies should be developed.
    - Establish a formal governance structure and communications program as soon as possible for Mission Hall.
    - The Task Force recommends immediate action be taken to plan and implement improvements and enhancements to Mission Hall.
    - Programming work to begin after acceptance of Task Force recommendations
    - Pursue multi-layered strategy where rapid improvements are implemented while major capital improvements are designed, approved, and constructed
- Parnassus
    - Clinical Science Building
        - Occupants (Initial): (~500 occupants, excluding classroom occupants)
        - Educational space and Admissions Offices for Schools of Medicine/Pharmacy
        - School of Medicine departments such as Medicine (including Hospital Medicine, Gastroenterology, Nephrology, Cardiology, Rheumatology), Neurology, Surgery, Anesthesia, Emergency Medicine, Neurosurgery and Dean's office Medical Education
        Including clinical faculty needed to staff clinical program growth in backfill of Moffitt/Long/ACC space vacated by moves to Mission Bay Medical Center
        - Clinical Pharmacy department in School of Pharmacy
        - School of Dentistry departments such as Orofacial Science, Cell & Tissue Biology, Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery
        - School of Nursing Dean's office
        - Research Management Services (under the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost)
        - Facilities Services/Capital Programs

- Other programs now at Laurel Heights have requested space at Parnassus; until space is identified, they are planned for inclusion in the Mission Bay Block 33 building
- Closed for construction through mid-2018
  - UC Hall Retrofit and Renovation
    - Mid-2018 through early 2020 construction
    - Budget/design approval by Regents anticipated in 2016
    - Occupants of desktop space/offices to be determined (~150 – 200 seats) – will include workspace for clinical faculty needed to staff clinical program growth at Parnassus
    - Initial Façade Stabilization and minor renovations project to accommodate temporary occupancy of CSB desktop programs while CSB is being renovated
- Mission Bay
  - Mission Hall Improvements
    - Local Functional Units and Space Administrative Block Committees are being formed
    - Identify Rapid Improvements (non-construction), develop cost proposals and priorities for users, bring forward for approval/funding (Rapid Improvement Fund formed)
    - Plan, design and implement Rapid Improvements (April – June 2016)
    - Programming: Meet with Space Administrative Block Committees, identify prioritized capital improvements (which involve construction) (~6 months)
    - Evaluate costs and funding (~3 months)
    - Implementation of capital improvements (9-12+ months, depending on project plan)
    - Committee members thanked AVC Yamauchi for the listed timelines
  - Mission Bay East Campus Phase 1 (Block 33)
    - 340,000 GSF building – 6-story base and 5-story tower above base
    - Programming Committee and Working Groups met October through March Academic Senate representative to Programming Committee is Charles McCulloch
    - Selection of design and build team by fall 2016
    - Budget and Design approval anticipated in early 2017
    - 2017 – 2019 construction
    - Clinics, Dry Research, Instructional, Administration space
    - Vision Neurosciences for Ophthalmology and Proctor Foundation (clinics, dry research, admin)
    - School of Medicine programs including Institute for Computational Health Sciences, Institute for Health Policy Studies, Arthritis Research, Geriatrics, Medical Effectiveness Research, Anthropology History & Social Medicine, School of Medicine Dean's Office Finance, Radiology, Department of Medicine, OBGYN, Anesthesia
    - School of Pharmacy programs including Drug Development, Dean's Office
    - School of Nursing programs including Social & Behavioral Sciences and Institute for Health & Aging
    - School of Dentistry programs, such as Center for Health Professions, Preventative and Restorative Dentistry
    - Campus administrative units such as Ethics & Compliance, Research Management Services, Sponsored Research, Innovation/Technology/Alliances, University Relations, Diversity & Outreach), and University Development and Alumni Relations.
  - Precision Cancer Medicine Building
    - 170,000 GSF building

- - Southwest corner of 16th and 3rd Streets – currently surface parking
      - 2017 - 2018 construction
      - Cancer Outpatient Care including clinics, infusion and support services for adult solid tumor cancer treatment
        Consolidation of cancer programs now at Mount Zion and Mission Bay (Gateway Building) and Growth of outpatient cancer programs
    - Mission Bay Neurosciences Building (Block 23A)
      - 270,000 GSF building – six story building
      - Northeast corner of 4th Street and Campus Way – currently surface parking lot
      - Discussion Item presented to Regents at January/February meetings; Preliminary Plan funding approval requested at March Regents meeting
      - Programming Committee and Working Groups to be formed
        Academic Senate representative to be named
      - Clinics/Imaging, Wet/Dry Research, Vivarium space
      - Neurosciences Institute, with a translational focus on neurodegeneration; behavior, emotion and cognition; and nervous system repair.
      - Space for Neurology, Psychiatry, Neurosurgery, the Institute for Neurodegenerative Diseases (IND) and basic neurosciences
      - Clinical/imaging space for existing neurology outpatient clinics moving from Parnassus
      - Vivarium space for vivarium now located at Hunters Point and to support vivarium needs for proposed researchers in building
      - Campus Planning Office is currently looking for an Academic Senate member to serve on the planning committee.
- Child Teen Family Center/Psychiatry Building
  - 140,000 GSF building with parking
  - Southwest corner of 18th and 3rd Streets – currently 3-story building and surface parking (site to be donated to UCSF)
  - Programming Committee has met
    Academic Senate representative to Programming Committee is Descartes Li
  - Project approvals anticipated in late-2016/early-2017
  - 2017 – 2019 construction (to be developed by private developer)
  - Clinics, Dry Research, Instructional and Administration Space for Department of Psychiatry
  - School of Medicine programs now in LPPI buildings at Parnassus
- Research Building at Zukerberg San Francisco General Hospital
  - 175,000 GSF building – 3-story base plus 2-stories above
  - Northwest corner of 23rd & Vermont Streets – currently surface parking lot (B/C lot)
    Owned by City and County of San Francisco, UCSF to lease site and own building
  - Programming Committee has met
    Academic Senate representative to Programming Committee is Fran Aweeka
  - Ground Lease approval and Budget and Design approval anticipated in mid to late 2016
  - 2017 – 2019 construction
  - Wet and Dry Research, Instructional, Administration Space
  - School of Medicine programs now at SFGH
  - School of Medicine programs at Laurel Heights and in leased space
- Minnesota/18th Street
  - Acquisition of two parcels (566/590 and 600 Minnesota Street)
  - Northwest and Southwest corners of 18th and Minnesota Streets – currently warehouses
  - Potential development of UCSF student/trainee housing
    Potential 550 housing units for 775 students and trainees, although site could support up to 630 housing units, depending on mix of unit types (e.g. efficiencies, studios, 2 bedroom)

- o Project cost to be determined
- o Schedule to be determined – target date for completion in mid-2019

After the March update, APB members asked about future plans for student and faculty housing. AVC Yamauchi informed the group that UCSF has several projects in the works. Within a few years students will have access to housing in the Dogpatch neighborhood and at Parnassus. In the long-term, students and faculty will have the opportunity at housing through a partnership with UC Hastings. This project, slated to be downtown near the Hastings campus is projected to be available in 2022 to 2025.

In May, Associate Vice Chancellor of Campus Planning Lori Yamauchi provided the following campus planning update:

- Block 33 Building
  - This building has been programmed with a hybrid of private offices and open-plan workstations
  - There will be room for 1477 individuals. Building occupants include faculty and staff from Ophthalmology department and several other academic and non-academic units.
  - There will be 231 assigned private offices and 1236 assigned open-plan workstations. There will also be 124 private offices will be available for workstation occupants to use.
  - Learning from Mission Hall:
    - o Noise: the new Block 33 building will have a different design to mitigate noise for occupants. For example, workstations will be moved away from common spaces like printer areas and the kitchen.
    - o In addition, workstations will be organized so that the backs of occupants will not face circulation paths.
    - o Focus Rooms: The new focus rooms will be called hotel rooms.
    - o Direction: there will be a way finding system
    - o More printer spaces
    - o More huddle rooms
  - Block 33 will not take up the entire site. The additional area will be devoted to parking until the next Block 34 building can be built. When the next building is built there will be a new parking garage.
- Psychiatric Building
  - The new psychiatric building will be located south of the Beniof Children's Hospital, in the dogpatch neighborhood. Currently there is a building on the site that will be demolished.
  - A private developer has been contracted to construct the building. Once complete, the university will lease the building back from the developer for the period of the lease agreement. At the end of the lease, the university has the option to buy the building.
  - The new psychiatric building plans include clinical space, conference rooms and workspace.
  - The new building will house programs that are currently located at Parnassus and SFGH.
  - The new building will replace the Langley Porter building on the Parnassus campus. The Langley Porter building will be demolished and a new hospital will be constructed on the site.

Chancellors Fund

In September, APB members agreed to defer Chancellors Fund discussions to the other Academic Senate committees.

Faculty Workspace

In 2015-2016, APB members continued their work to address faculty concerns with the activity-based workspace campus-wide and at Mission Hall.

Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey

In April of 2015, the first draft of the Mission Hall Post-Occupancy survey was given to the Academic Senate for comment. After review, the Academic Senate requested that the survey be reduced in size and some questions be revised. In June of 2015, AVC Michael Bade noted that he would make the changes and submit back to the APB committee. In October, a revised version of the survey was resubmitted to the Senate (Attachment 3). A communication was sent from APB to Division Chair Ruth Greenblatt (Attachment 4) regarding the revised draft. After final approval, the Post-Occupancy survey was administered over the month of January and February. In April, the survey results were submitted to the Academic Senate (Attachment 5). In May, the APB committee members reviewed the survey results and provided the following feedback:

- The population of Mission Hall was predominately female
- The survey was not specific to faculty
- There are issues with some of the questions regarding the number of self-identified clinical and non-clinical faculty
- A majority of respondents provided negative feedback regarding their ability to concentrate; have confidential conversations; and adjust the workspace to personal needs.
- Responses were balanced when it came to whether the Mission Hall workspace affected individual ability to coordinate tasks with others; solve problems with others; locate others communicate with a group and overall group productivity.
- Overall results seem to show that respondents do not feel that productivity has gone down significantly. APB members noted that this might be because faculty and staff are committed to their research and will work hard no matter what the environment. However, that does not mean that members are satisfied or appreciate their work environment.
- Respondents still feel positive about UCSF and the work that they do.
- Respondents overwhelming felt that UCSF as an organization does not value them due to the space.
- Noise level is high and sound privacy responses are very negative.

After the initial review of the report, committee members noted concern that the presented results pooled faculty and staff responses together. While committee members understood that the goal of the survey was to gather data on faculty and staff, APB members felt it would be helpful to the Academic Senate to have the faculty responses separated out. Following the meeting, APB committee members submitted a request to Janice Barnes, the consultant firm contact for the survey, asking for a faculty report to be produced. On June 16th, Janice submitted the requested report to the committee (Attachment 6). After receiving the faculty-only report, APB committee members reviewed via email and provided the following comments on the results:

- Productivity: The majority of faculty respondents found the MH workspace much worse or worse for ability to concentrate, have confidential conversations, for overall productivity, or to write papers or proposals. Comparing the faculty only report to the staff and faculty report, the effect is much worse for faculty concentration.
- Work Schedule: The majority of respondents are altering hours in order to complete work (worse on faculty than faculty-staff mean 2.34 vs 2.91)
- Stress: Workplace stress and job satisfaction was worse for the majority of staff but worse for faculty (mean for faculty 2.7 vs mean faculty-staff 3.1)
- Valued by the Institution: The majority of faculty respondents reported feeling "less valued by UCSF" mean for faculty 2.1 vs faculty-staff mean 3.0
- Occupancy of Workspace:
    - Average reported occupancy at prior UCSF workplace was 53%. Faculty are now choosing to work from home
    - A total of 42% respondents report spending less time at Mission Hall due to lack of closed office; 14% spending less time at MH due to length of commute.
    - In a typical week while at MH 42 % of faculty were in their workspace, while the balance of time 58 % was spent in focus/huddle/conference rooms

APB Committee members hope that their feedback will be considered when the campus administration performs additional iterations of the survey.

Mission Hall Committee
In October, Chair Christine informed the committee that EVCP Dan Lowenstein had assembled a new Open Workspace Task Force to address space issues at Mission Hall. The charge of the group was to develop a set of principles for the design of workspace in Mission Hall and in all new buildings. The principles would be developed by faculty and administrators with experience in Mission Hall and would be informed by all of the occupant feedback collected to date. David Teitel chaired the Task Force. In December, the Open Plan Workspace Task Force released their report - http://space.ucsf.edu/sites/space.ucsf.edu/files/wysiwyg/Open%20Plan%20TaskForce%20Report%20-%20FINAL%20060616.pdf

After the report was released, another space committee was assembled and charged with reviewing potential changes for Mission Hall. APB Chair Chad Christine and committee member Paul Volberding were asked to serve on the group. Over the remainder of the academic year, the new space committee met to discuss short and long term changes for the building. In May, it was reported that the group reviewed the workspace plans for Block 33 and the Psychiatry building. The committee was also informed that the Chancellor has decided to move forward with conversion of some Mission Hall focus rooms into private offices. After the review and updates, space committee members stated concern that administration is focusing more on the adding more programs to the building, rather than on making improvements for current occupants. Chair Christine noted that the Mission Hall space committee will continue to meet throughout year and members hope that real changes will be made as a result.

Human Resources Reforms
Over the course of the year, the APB committee received several reports on the status of HR reforms.

In October, Academic Senate Representative on the HR Steering Committee Marcelle Cedars reported on the recent work of the HR Steering Committee. Specifically, she reported on the results of the 2015 HR customer survey.
- Overall Satisfaction
  - Overall satisfaction has remained fairly stagnate over the past few years. When broken out by school and units, some schools have experienced increased satisfaction while others have experienced decreases in satisfaction.
  - Between 2012 through 2015, overall satisfaction increased from 2012 – 2013, then declined in 2014 and has been slowly improving in 2015.
- Satisfaction by Service Type
  - In 2015, satisfaction with most service types has increased.
- HR has identified the following opportunities for improvement
  - Improve timeliness and responsiveness
  - Improve user experience in HR systems
  - Bring clarity to process and avoid customer "run around"
  - Improve process for job posting
  - Improve compensation services
  - Address HR staff turnover
  - Address pace of changes – too many process personnel changes
  - Work on policy reform – remove some burdensome requirements
- 2015 Listening Tour Key Themes
  - Excellent Customer Services includes:
    - Understanding the customer business needs
    - Consistently high quality
    - Simple and consistent process
    - Consistent guidance and consultation
    - Training for customers
    - Easy to use systems to support transaction processing
    - Options for ticketing initiation method

- Timely communication and access to information at time needed
- Currently Planned Process Improvement Work for HR
  - Implement Lean Process Improvements
  - Implement New Technologies
    - CRM Systems
    - SRS Enhancements
    - Improvement Website
  - Improve Customer response time standards and service continuity
  - Improve Timekeeping
  - Improve Customer Training

APB members discussed the reforms and noted that the leading compliant is with the fact that the HR service centers are not updating faculty on the status of transactions. Faculty understand that the HR Department is burdened with a significant workload, but this is no excuse for not following up with customers regarding process and timeline. If faculty were to receive more feedback, the committee believes it would help to ease tensions and frustrations with HR services.

To follow up on the committee concerns, the APB members invited HR Strategy Manager Jason Stout and Esther Carter, Director of Postdoc Services, to come and give a presentation at the January committee meeting (Attachment 7). Both HR leaders attended the APB committee meeting and provided a report on the status of HR services. Their presentation covered the following points:
- Annual Service Partnership Agreement (SPA) Process
  - The survey is conducted annually
    - HR SPA process calls for annual review of the agreement
    - Committee recommendations are sent to the HR Advisory board for review and approval
  - Current Status
    - Staff and Academic SPA committee met in September and October to develop recommendations
    - HR process owners reviewed the recommendations of the committee
    - HR Feedback was sent to SPA committees
  - Next Steps
    - HR Advisory Board approval of updates SPA, edits as needed
    - Post and communication updated SPA
- 2015 Annual Service Partnership Agreement (SPA) Results
  - SPA Subcommittees approve SPA report format in March 2015
  - Monthly report distribution started n May of 2015
  - On the academic side, target success has gotten better since march of 2015
  - On the staff side, overall target success is better
- SPA Sub-committee
  - Academic Outcomes
    - Updated services provided to move recruitment to Academic Affairs Office
    - The Committee recommends 2 service commitment updates
      - Change funding changes from 4.5 day to 5 days
      - Remove separations as a metric
    - The committee developed 8 new process improvement priorities
  - Proposed Improvements to the following academic processes
    - Training: How to submit the ideal academic ticket
    - Training: Postdoc 101
    - Training: Faculty Compensation
    - Training: Overview of Visas
    - Training: Advance – CVs

- Training: Academic Recruitment
- SRS return to department enhancements
- Turnaround and timing document
  - o Staff Outcomes
    - The committee recommends no substantive changes to the service section of the agreement
    - The committee recommends keeping all existing service commitment with no changes to the target turnaround times
    - The committee recommends adding 3 service commitment metrics
    - The committee developed 7 new process improvement priorities and provided a rank order based on impact and difficulty
  - o Proposed Improvements to the following staff processes
    - Offer letter standards
    - Job Advertisement Option Tools
    - Salary Setting Processes
    - Premium Recruitment Services
    - Return for Changes
    - HR Website
    - Funding Changes
- Next Steps
  - o Services commitment recommendations from the sub-committees
  - o Proceeded with 2016 work plan items
    - Continue to evaluate premium recruitment (staff) options and conduct a deeper needs assessment.
  - o Add new turnaround targets to the SPA document in January 2016
    - Results reporting for new metrics to be developed in 2016
  - o Update and communicate SPA in January of 2016

At the end of the presentation, APB members asked for the HR department to collect metrics not only on staff hires, but also academic hires. Faculty should know how long it takes to fill a vacant position. These metrics would help in the communication process with faculty.

IT Security
In November, Chief Information Officer Joe Bengfort provided a report on the status of IT security and what the campus leadership plans to do to address gaps in security. CIO Bengfort reported on the following issues:
- Background and Context: UCSF recently commissioned an assessment of its information security risk. The findings from the report indicated that UCSF's risk level is high and that there are significant vulnerabilities throughout the organization. For example, in a recent evaluation of access points to UCSF, the university found that in a five-day period, there were over a hundred thousand attempts to access open ports into the UCSF system. Out of all the access attempts, it was deemed that over 75 percent were malicious. It was also found that 90 percent of the connection attempts were coming from China. To address the situation, a Data Security Compliance Program is being developed.
- Federal HIPPA Breach Data: When it comes to the number of data leaks, UCSF has had five OCR reported incidents that are under investigation. With federal enforcement activities increasing over the past decade, there is a good chance UCSF could be hit with a fine.
- Overall Campus Compliance: While most of the campus is compliant, there is a lot of work to be done. CIO Bengfort informed members that with several security breaches across the UC system, the President and campus leaders are working hard to implement and enforce new protocols, systems and trainings for faculty, staff and students. After the IT security breach at UCLA, President Napolitano asked the campuses and medical centers to come up with new action plans. UCSF's action plan includes an aggressive roll out of encryption and the implement

network access control that will ensure that all computers that log onto the network meet the security standards of the campus. Finally, CIO Bengfort noted that there would be changes to password requirements. The password policy does not meet industry standards. There will need to be improvements. The IT security department is working to develop a password policy that will ensure security while not being too burdensome on the UCSF community.

- <u>What is the Driving the Risk Profile:</u> Some of the main issues that are driving such a high risk profile include: variable work practices across control points; no IT security compliance oversight to drive progress across the control points; lack of security-related procedures and practices; lack of technical controls; an IT funding system that requires that individual departments make decisions about investing in security controls; and the widespread use of personally owned devices for UCSF work.
- <u>Data Security Compliance Program:</u> The DSCP is an IT risk management program designed to secure UCSF's sensitive data. The goal of the program is foster collaboration between UCSF IT and the school control points and departments.
- <u>Changes to Expect:</u> CIO Bengfort informed the group that changes should be expected. All organizations should adhere to standards of operation to improve security. These include more regulations on granting access to data, physical security of equipment, and consistent patching of computer operating systems (e.g. Windows). There should also be technical controls such as enforcement of encryption on all computers. CIO Bengfort noted that one of the hot topics is the recommendation that UCSF require periodic password changes.
- <u>Actions Taken to Date:</u> Some of the changes that have already taken place include, a new IT security policy mandating encryption; mandatory annual online training and security; process for firewall security tightening; and the Data Security Compliance Program.
- <u>Next Steps:</u> The next steps to increase security include a plan resource the encryption rollout of the campus; improve password compliance; identify and training control points DSCP champions; present at chairs committees, present quarterly updates to the IT Governance committee; and visit constituent groups.

On March 24, the APB Subcommittee on Information Technology (IT) met with Chief Information Officer Joe Bengfort and IT Security Director Patrick Phelan to discuss campus-wide IT issues. Subcommittee Chair Sean Mong reported on the meeting at the April APB meeting:
- <u>Meeting Attendance:</u> The meeting was well attended. In total there were 12 faculty members who were present at the meeting.
- <u>Relocation of Data Center to Dell Facility in Quincy, Washington</u>
    - UC currently operates 30-40 data centers throughout state.
    - UCSF will be saving $10-$11 million in one-time costs by moving the data to Washington. Most of operating cost savings (approximately $3M over 5 years) will come as a result of less expensive power.
    - Medical record application has already moved. Additional applications will be moved at a later date.
    - Back up data center is at UCSD, and will be looking to establish a 2nd southern data center location
- <u>IT Network Security:</u> The campus continues to improve its IT security systems and protocols. UCSF in negotiations with FireEye. If the university reaches an agreement, the new system will be implemented next year.
- <u>IT Governance Committees:</u> CIO Bengfort informed the subcommittee members that the IT office has a governance structure with numerous committees focused on particular topics. Several Academic Senate appointed faculty serve on these groups. CIO Bengfort will follow up with the committee to find a way to link communication between the representatives and APB members.
- <u>APEX Outage:</u> CIO Bengfort informed the subcommittee that there were two recent outages with the APEX system. The first outage was the result of human error. The second outage came as a result of a glitch within the new APEX system. UCSF is one of the few medical centers that are running a new software version of APEX. Unfortunately, UCSF has experienced a lot of bugs with

the new version. EPIC, the company that runs the software, is working to resolve these issues as quickly as possible. Committee members expressed displeasure with the outages and asked if there are any ways for EPIC to compensate UCSF if there are problems in the future. Subcommittee Chair Mong stated that does not think so, but will ask in the future.

• <u>Quarterly Meetings:</u> IT subcommittee members enjoyed the last meeting and have requested that quarterly meetings be established. APB members supported the idea.

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2016-2017:

- Campus Finance
- Campus Planning
- Campaign Planning
- IT Security
- Faculty Workspace Planning
  - o Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Study
  - o Mission Hall Committee and Reforms
- Human Resources Reforms
- Research Management Services

Appendices

This Annual Report is posted online and accessible via the APB Web page on the Academic Senate Web site.

Appendix 1:   November Financial Plan Report

Appendix 2:   May Financial Plan Report

Appendix 3:   Revised Version of the Mission Hall Post-Occupancy

Appendix 4:   Communication from the APB to Division Chair Greenblatt RE: Revised Survey

Appendix 5:   Results from the Post-Occupancy Survey

Appendix 6:   Results for Faculty Only Post-Occupancy Survey

Appendix 7:   HR Report