

Coordinating Committee Report

December, 2015



A rather short report this month, but there are some important items to address:

- President Napolitano promises that the Senate will receive the report of the UCRP Task Force, and her comments on it, by January 15th. It is likely that each Division will need to respond with comments in relatively short order. So we should plan on devoting some time to this, and perhaps have an extra Coordinating Committee meeting, via teleconference in mid January.
- Related to this, we have had a record respond to the November "Question of the Month" indicating that many faculty view the existing UCRP as an important counter balance to the lag in salaries for UC faculty. A significant group of faculty members viewed the UCRP as not particularly important to their decisions to come to UCSF or remain at UCSF. However, some of the responses indicated that many faculty are not fully aware of the plan, its complexities, or the potential impact of a new tier. The December "Answer of the Month Mini Mag" aims to provide information about UCRP in a relatively direct and easily digested format.



With regards to the new Faculty Sexual Harassment Task Force, each campus will be asked to provide a P&T member to discuss how their campus complies with existing UC policy and to discuss any local problems.



We need to follow-up on our plan to convene a group meeting of the Senate representatives on campus space planning committees, to share perspective and information. This will be an opportunity for Senate members who have experience with campus space planning to discuss their thoughts and priorities for the ongoing process.



The UCOP Equity for Access concept will need careful consideration in the coming months. This concept builds on the entrepreneurial activities of faculty and students to exchange use of University facilities and resources for these activities for equity in the new business. It may also include access of existing businesses to University resources in exchange for equity. Campuses may create new programs or modify existing programs via this process. The idea was inspired by the practices of private industry which exchanges equity in any new companies that result from use of industry resources. The concept is currently in a 3 year pilot. The pilot documentation indicates that the arguments in favor of the concept include the development of new forms of revenue from activities that are now occurring. The Senate may be interested in determining how this process will interface, and potentially impact teaching. Additionally consideration may be given to how the revenue interests might influence decisions made regarding direction of research, selection of new faculty and how resources are allocated.