

Meeting of the San Francisco Division Ruth Greenblatt, MD, Chair

Thursday, January 28, 2016

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

HSW 302

Video link: <http://lecture.ucsf.edu/ets/Play/e36ccd3b08584944b3ebb04dc467e3ef1d>

The winter meeting of the San Francisco Division was called to order by Chair Ruth Greenblatt on January 28, 2016 at 12:00 p.m. in Rock Hall at Mission Bay. A quorum was present.

I. Consent Calendar and Special Orders

1. Approval of the [Minutes](#) of the June 1, 2015 Division Meeting
2. Approval of [Revisions to Bylaw 85.B](#): Composition of Committees
3. Approval of [Revisions to the Committee on Academic Freedom Bylaw 140.A](#): Composition of Committees

ACTION: Senate Members approved the consent calendar.

II. Chair's Report – *Academic Senate Chair Ruth Greenblatt*

Chair Greenblatt made the following announcements:

- Chancellor's Fund
- [Equal Opportunity Statement of Support and Solidarity for the Muslim Community](#)
- Upcoming Faculty Research Lectures for David Morgan for Basic Science (March 17, 2016) and Dean Sheppard for Translational Science (May 19, 2016).

Chair Greenblatt also updated the Faculty on recent developments in Space Planning on the UCSF campus. The Senate has been working closely with the Administration on space planning. In 2015-16, there is a new oversight committee, called the 'UCSF Space Committee', which includes one Senate representative. Over the last several months, the Senate has worked to place additional Senate representatives on the individual building committees (e.g., Block 33, Psychiatry Building, SFGH Research, and Parnassus Heights), the over-arching 'Space Development Committee', and the 'Open Plan Workspace Task Force' (Mission Hall).

III. Chancellor's Campus Update – *Chancellor Sam Hawgood*

In preparation for the meeting, Senate sent Chancellor Hawgood the following questions:

1. What are your concerns about getting and addressing a diversity of opinions in planning major initiatives such as Operational Excellence and Space Planning?

Chair Hawgood began his presentation by remarking on the importance of shared governance, citing Clark Kerr. He then responded to the first question by noting that he welcomes a diversity of opinion. The ongoing challenge is how to do this given UCSF's significant numbers of faculty and staff at its different locations. He said he now understands the importance of appointing actual 'Senate' representatives as opposed to simply appointing faculty members on these planning committees. However, he added that it is vitally important to receive faculty input in relative short time periods in order to respond to challenges and opportunities in a timely manner (e.g., real estate and acquisitions transactions, etc.).

2. Now recognizing the failure of the planning process for Mission Hall (MH), how will you: 1) Determine responsibility for the failure? 2) Identify the problems? 3) Apply lessons learned going forward?

Chancellor Hawgood acknowledged that the Mission Bay planning process could have been better, but he did object to the word 'failure' in this question. He is hopeful that faculty can accept MH as an ongoing experiment in the innovative use of space, but admitted that he has been, and continues to be, a supporter of this building.

3. Who makes decisions about space, when to build, what to acquire, what format to use, and can communications be opened up about this so that plans can be communicated accurately and promptly?

Once again, Chancellor Hawgood remarked that communication is always a challenge, and sometimes input cannot be gathered until after an executive decision has been made. This is especially true with respect to certain opportunities in space planning. However, he pointed to UCSF's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) as an example of planning informed by input. The LRDP takes the campus capital planning from 2015 to 2030, but said that campus leadership must make adjustments to it over time. He added that UCSF receives very little money from the State for capital needs. All new building planning must be financed through equity, debt, and philanthropy. The latter is becoming more and more important for capital projects at UCSF, as most philanthropy restricts UCSF to specific projects.

DISCUSSION: An audience member asked the Chancellor about the new Golden State Warriors' arena, and more specifically, for the Chancellor's position on it. Chancellor Hawgood clarified that he said that UCSF will not oppose the project because he has now negotiated a number of legal protections for the University writ large, including access for emergency vehicles to the Mission Bay Hospital. These protections also include: 1) Any incremental new arena revenue (~\$14M) will be placed in a lockbox that can only be used to mitigate the arena's impact; and 2) a precedent-setting agreement to impose limitations on the number of events if they begin to create unacceptable local impacts (e.g., events that overlap with AT&T Park baseball games, etc.). While it is certainly true that the Warriors will hold other events at the arena, most of these will occur at night, thereby minimizing the traffic impacts. He added that UCSF faced a choice between a Warriors' arena and a new corporate building that would have produced significant day-time traffic impacts that would have been more difficult to mitigate. Another audience member asked if MH might negatively impact UCSF's recruitment of new faculty members. Chancellor Hawgood responded that this has been a central question from the beginning of the MH planning process. He follows UCSF's retention numbers very closely and noted that this metric has not changed over time, but he acknowledged that the MH experiment is only one year old. Speaking to MH's low occupancy rate, he said that the literature does report that occupancy rates for clinicians, even in traditional buildings, is low given the nature of their work. He added that future improvements to MH will be based on functional need, not seniority. Towards that end, he said that the MH recommendations from the Open Plan Workspace Governance Task Force are divided into two groups – the capital improvements and the non-capital improvements; he remarked that it is likely that his Administration can move relatively quickly on the non-capital improvements.

Another question concerned the widening gulf between the opportunities for innovation, as more and more, these opportunities (often in the form of new buildings) seem to be centered at Mission Bay, and not at Parnassus. Chancellor Hawgood responded that Provost Daniel Lowenstein is leading the Parnassus-Mt. Zion 2025 Task Force (PZ 2025), which is addressing these concerns. He stressed that Parnassus and Mission Bay are the key anchors in UCSF's multi-site campus. He added both Mission Bay and Parnassus will share UCSF's clinical activities, and it will remain that way for at least 15-20 years. Finally, it was noted that many of the off-campus COREs are currently undergoing renegotiation of rents, and many of these rents are no longer sustainable through NIH grants. It was asked whether any institutional thinking has been done on how San Francisco's high rents could be mitigated for these off-campus faculty? EVCP Daniel Lowenstein responded that the appropriate distribution of off-campus COREs will be a focus of his office in 2016.

IV. Space Planning at UCSF – Lori Yamauchi, Associate Vice Chancellor - UCSF Campus Planning

AVC Lori Yamauchi began her presentation with a description of the space planning governance structure. There are two principal space committees – the UCSF-wide Space Committee, which is a

standing committee, and the temporary UCSF New Space Development Committee. Both the standing Space Subcommittee and the PZ 2025 Task Force report to the UCSF-wide Space Committee, which sets priorities for existing space and establishes guiding principles towards the use of space. The building programming and occupancy planning subcommittees (e.g., Block 33, Block 23A, PCMB, Psychiatry, SFGH, and CSB/UCH) report to the UCSF New Space Development Committee, which guides the development of new buildings. The Open Plan Workspace Governance Task Force was established at the behest of the Chancellor to ensure that the lessons from MH are transferred to the development of new buildings. The scope of the Task Force's recommendations include the configuration of workspaces, allocation of workspaces and support spaces, environmental features, technology, and governance. There are two major renovation projects ongoing at Parnassus – the Clinical Sciences Building (seismic retrofit and renovation) and UC Hall. At Mission Bay, there are four projects: Block 33; a Precision Cancer Medicine building, Block 23A (Neurosciences), a Psychiatry building, and a building for student/trainee housing.

V. Faculty Panel on Space Planning – Srikantan Nagarajan, Chad Christine, Paul Volberding, David Teitel, Janet Myers, Chuck McCulloch, Steve Hetts, Descartes Li, and Fran Aweeka

The Panel addressed the following questions:

1. How will the findings from the building oversight/review committee for MH be applied to the design of new buildings?

Senate Vice Chair David Teitel responded that all new buildings will need to be based upon the open plan model, which maximizes efficiencies and interaction. The Task Force has concluded that this works best when control is retained locally, and is given to the occupants of the building. One issue with the new buildings is that there is not an already existing population to assist in space planning. Sri Nagarajan, who serves on the UCSF-wide Space Development Committee, added that one of the main problems is the lack of a standing Senate committee on Space. Such a committee would provide a mechanism for faculty to provide input into the planning process. AVC Yamauchi added that the Regents are only asked to approve the overall project budget, funding, and the environmental impact evaluation, but do not approve floor plans, etc. Another audience member strongly advocated gathering input from clinicians to ensure that this important group of faculty is not left out of the space planning process.

2. How is UCSF monitoring the impact of the MH project on morale of existing faculty, and on any impact on recruitment and retention?

Janet Myers, COR Chair and member of the MH Task Force, commented that the MH survey did get at some of the outstanding issues at MH. One issue that has not been addressed is the percentage of time being spent at UCSF as opposed to other locations (e.g., working at home) however. Such a question would measure the usability of MH, as currently configured. Senate Chair Greenblatt added that data on job function is also needed for future space planning.

3. By applying the high occupancy density to faculty who do certain kinds of work, while other faculty have spacious offices proximate to their laboratories, is UCSF creating two tiers of faculty, those who have optimal work space, and those whose space leads to hardship?

Sri Nagarajan commented that COR initially discussed this when MH was being designed. He added that certain faculty would probably be willing to embrace an open-space environment if they were allowed to configure their own space; this did not happen at MH. Other panel members mentioned that some faculty want to have an office, but spend the bulk of their time elsewhere. Provost Lowenstein remarked that UCSF is planning for small offices going forward; this is simply the reality that the University faces in accommodating faculty across all of its sites. Another panel member added that the MH space can work, however some occupants have taken common areas and turned them into ad-hoc private offices. That said, different people have different tolerances for background noise, and certain tasks do require absolute quiet that MH cannot provide.

4. What advice do you have for faculty at SFGH who do not have sufficient space since the planned Research Building will not add space, just replace current space?

Fran Aweeka, who is the Senate representative on the SFGH Planning Committee, commented that the new SFGH space will be more efficient. There will be an effort to co-locate interdisciplinary teams of researchers, as well as retaining the ability (re)allocate the space as needs evolve. Significant outreach efforts will be undertaken to ensure that appropriate faculty feedback is gathered to inform the planning process at SFGH. That said, there may be some building constraints, which may constrain future options.

5. One audience member commented that there is a huge waste of space at buildings such as Genentech Hall. How can this be avoided?

Senate Chair Greenblatt commented that the 'ownership' of space is sometimes connected to a relationship with the donor. On the other hand, sometimes departments can no longer afford the space due to declining NIH grant revenue, which often happens long after the donor is personally involved with the building.

6. Rather than allocating individual offices to every faculty member, can office space be shared?

Senate Chair Greenblatt responded that the Open Plan Workspace Governance Task Force has recommended using software to create pairs of faculty who would be able share office space.

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Chair Greenblatt adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Academic Senate Staff:
Todd Giedt, Executive Director
todd.giedt@ucsf.edu; 415/476-1307