

October 19, 2015

Michael Bade  
Associate Vice Chancellor, Capital Programs and Campus Architect  
654 Minnesota Street, Room 262  
San Francisco, CA 94107

Re: UCSF Academic Senate Response to the *Draft Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Study*

Dear Michael,

The members of the Coordinating Committee, along with the Academic Planning and Budget Committee (APB) and the Faculty Welfare Committee (CFW), have reviewed the revised draft of the Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey. Overall, committee members believe that the survey is much improved. However, despite these improvements, there are still several issues with the survey that should be addressed before the instrument is administered. The most prominent of these still concern the survey's length, as well as the split emphasis of the survey itself. APB remarks that the survey is still trying to address two questions – on the one hand, does Mission Hall provide the necessary basic workplace accommodations for faculty work, and on the other, how well does the building support faculty efficiencies? In the following paragraphs, I will address these issues and make recommendations on the final form of the survey:

#### Survey Length

All faculty who reviewed the draft remarked that the survey is still too long. Indeed, many committee members believe that respondents will become fatigued, and fail to complete the survey or focus on their responses consistently. As noted above, many reviewers feel that the survey's length is the result of the instrument's dual aims. While it may be optimal to administer this material via two different surveys (see below), if this is not possible, the committee members recommend the following to address the survey length:

- *Setting Accurate Time Expectations:* The survey should be tested to determine exactly how long it takes a typical respondent to complete the entire survey. Functionality to allow the survey to be saved must also be incorporated, so that faculty can come back at a later time to finish their responses. In general, survey research experts note that administration times of 15 minutes or less result in the most consistent and meaningful data.
- *Allow for Partially Completed Surveys:* Respondents must be informed that they can submit a partially completed survey. This will ensure that all faculty will have a chance to provide some feedback, even if they do not have time to complete the entire survey.
- *Re-Order the Survey Questions:* Re-order the survey to ensure that questions regarding privacy, concentration, utilization of space, and productivity are placed at the beginning. These issues are those that will most likely engage the faculty, and placing them up front may generate higher levels of interest in the respondents.

500 Parnassus Avenue  
San Francisco, CA  
94143-0764  
415-476-1308

**Ruth M. Greenblatt, MD**  
*Chairperson*

**David Teitel, MD**  
*Vice Chair*

**Arthur Miller, PhD**  
*Secretary*

**Todd Giedt, MA**  
*Executive Director*

#### **Committees**

Academic Freedom  
Academic Personnel  
Academic Planning & Budget  
Clinical Affairs  
Committee on Committees  
Coordinating  
Courses of Instruction  
Educational Policy  
Equal Opportunity  
Faculty Welfare  
Graduate Council  
Library & Scholarly Communication  
Privilege and Tenure  
Research  
Rules and Jurisdiction  
Sustainability

#### **Faculty Councils**

School of Dentistry  
School of Medicine  
School of Nursing  
School of Pharmacy

#### **University of California**

Academic Assembly of UC  
Academic Council of UC

- *Group Questions into Matrices:* Group similarly worded satisfaction questions into matrices to allow for more efficient completion of the survey.

#### Drill-Down Questions

In addition to the concerns about the length of the survey, committee members note that some of the general questions will not provide the necessary detail to formulate actions (CFW). To address this issue, members recommend asking the more general questions upfront. One such question might relate to a faculty member's, biggest concerns about the Mission Hall workplace. Specific response options to such a question should be provided (e.g., privacy, inability to concentrate, access to conference rooms, etc.). The addition of drill-down questions to the specific concerns that the respondent identifies will provide more meaningful details on issues faculty may be having, or not having, with a particular feature of the space, and would prove much more meaningful to all those involved. For instance, a question on the survey asking about the utilization of conference room space could produce many different responses that would be difficult to categorize and may not be very useful in the end. A drill-down question would ask for more detail on an issue with a conference room, such as services, noise, or availability.

Given the significant issues identified by the faculty, one idea is to simply administer two surveys, one devoted to basic workplace attributes and another to issues that may impact faculty productivity. However, this solution would require that both surveys include similar demographic measures. One option is to generate an individual ID number after one survey is completed, which can then be used to skip out of the demographics data collection for the second survey.

Finally, faculty must be informed that the information generated by the surveys may apply not only to Mission Hall, but also to the design of planned future buildings – Mission Bay Block 33, Mission Bay Block 23A (Neurosciences Research Building), SFGH Research Building, the Psychology Department Building, and the Clinical Sciences Building and UC Hall retrofit/renovation. It goes without saying that when the survey is launched, potential respondents need to be informed of the importance and implications of its results. Indeed, it is vitally important that the Senate remain involved with the data analysis of survey results.

The Academic Senate appreciates your efforts to consult with the faculty on this important survey instrument. In that spirit, we hope that University leadership will continue to engage the Senate over the design of future faculty workspace(s). If you have any specific questions on the comments provided, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Ruth Greenblatt, MD  
2015-2017 Chair  
UCSF Academic Senate

CC: Daniel H. Lowenstein, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost  
David Teitel, Academic Senate Vice Chair  
Chad Christine, Academic Planning and Budget Chair  
Leah Karliner, Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair  
Janice Barnes, Perkins & Will

Encl. (2)

**Communication from the Academic Planning and Budget Committee**  
**Chad Christine, MD, Chair**

October 13, 2015

TO: Ruth Greenblatt, Chair of the UCSF Academic Senate  
FROM: Chad Christine, Chair of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee  
CC: Todd Giedt, Executive Director of the UCSF Academic Senate Office  
RE: Review of Draft Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey

Dear Chair Greenblatt:

The Academic Planning and Budget Committee and the Campus Planning Subcommittee have reviewed the revised draft of the Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey. While members are pleased with the improvements, some concerns remain with the overall length and focus of the survey.

Members feel that the survey's challenges are due to the fact that the instrument is evaluating two separate questions. The first question is how well does Mission Hall provide faculty with basic workspace accommodations such as proper lighting, temperature control and noise abatement? The second question is how well does the Mission Hall support faculty productivity? The answers to these two questions will inform the design of future workspace at UCSF. The apparent result of combining the two evaluations together is a somewhat lengthy instrument. One option would be to create two surveys, one devoted to basic workplace attributes and another to faculty productivity. However, this solution would probably require that both surveys include similar demographic sections. Therefore our members recommend that the best approach would be to streamline the current survey, for example by changing the format of many similarly worded satisfaction questions into matrices to allow for more efficient completion of the survey.

The Academic Planning and Budget Committee and the Campus Planning Subcommittee greatly appreciates all consultation efforts and hopes that university leadership will continue to engage the Senate over the design of faculty workspace in the future. If you have any questions please contact me, or Academic Senate analyst Artemio Cardenas [artemio.cardenas@ucsf.edu](mailto:artemio.cardenas@ucsf.edu).

Sincerely,

Chad Christine, MD  
Chair of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee

## Communication from the Faculty Welfare Committee

Leah Karliner, MD, Chair

October 14, 2015

TO: Ruth Greenblatt, Chair of the UCSF Academic Senate  
FROM: Leah Karliner, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee  
CC: Todd Giedt, Executive Director of the UCSF Academic Senate Office  
RE: Review of Draft Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey

Dear Chair Greenblatt:

On October 8, the Faculty Welfare Committee reviewed and discussed the revised draft of the Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey. Overall, committee members believe that the survey is much improved. The feel and flow of the survey has been enhanced and the question sets are more thorough. Members believe that the revised draft should perform well in achieving the Academic Senate's goals in collecting valuable feedback on faculty productivity and well being in Mission Hall if there is good participation and completion of the survey. However, given the improvements, there are still several issues with the survey that should be addressed before the instrument is administered. General recommendations include:

- Address the Survey Length: All reviewers were concerned with the extensive length of the survey. With so many questions to answer, committee members believe that respondents will become too fatigued to complete the survey. If questions cannot be consolidated or eliminated, committee members propose the following efforts: First, there must be test of the survey, including all skip-patterns and written comment sections, to determine exactly how long it takes a typical respondent to complete the entire survey. Setting survey time expectations will help faculty set aside the necessary time to provide complete responses. Second, there must be functionality to allow for the survey to be saved, so that faculty can come back at a later time to finish their responses. Third, respondents must be informed that they can submit partially completed surveys. This will ensure that all faculty will have a chance to provide some feedback, even if they do not have time or desire to complete the entire survey. Fourth, the survey should be re-ordered to ensure that questions regarding privacy, concentration, utilization of space, and productivity are at the beginning. Prioritization will allow faculty to quickly provide feedback on issues most important to them. Finally, another option is to deliver a relatively brief survey to all eligible participants, with an option to take a longer survey with more detailed questions on the physical environmental issues (e.g., lighting, air flow, etc.).
- Ask More General Questions with the Option for Drill-Down Questions: Committee members recommend asking more general questions upfront – for example, what are your biggest concerns about the Mission Hall workplace, with specific response options (privacy, inability to concentrate, access to conference rooms, etc.), with the addition of drill-down questions for the specific concerns that the respondent identifies. Members believe that the drill-down options will provide more meaningful details on issues faculty may be having, or not having with a particular feature of the space. For example, a question on the survey asking about the utilization of conference room space could produce a lot of different responses that would be difficult to categorize and may not be very useful. A drill-down question would ask for more detail on an issue with a conference room such as services, noise, or availability, but only to those respondents who consider this to be a concern. Committee members feel the additional details on why spaces do and do not work, would be much more meaningful to all those involved. This approach may be particularly helpful in the case of a short

survey upfront, and the option for a longer set of additional questions for those respondents who would like to provide more information (as is done in the airline industry for example).

- Incentivize Participation: To encourage survey participation, committee members recommend that there should be an incentive offered to faculty. Gift cards for campus dining, or a small give-away might help increase the overall response rate. The biggest incentive may be the knowledge that concerns identified by the survey will be addressed and improvements made to the Mission Hall workplace.
- Inform Faculty of the Survey's Implications: When announcing the survey, the Academic Senate must ensure that faculty are informed of the importance and implications of the survey. All respondents must know that the survey results will not only influence the design of space in Mission Hall, but also for all other future buildings.

Specific questions recommendation include:

1. Question #3: Faculty options should not include post docs and residents or research fellow – all of these can be listed in Question #2.
2. Question Regarding Personal Workspace Location: This question captures if someone is close to a particular part of the environment (window, hall, elevator, etc.), but not if they are far. Perhaps having options for distance from a window: e.g. within 15 feet 16-30 feet > 30 feet.  
New Response Options: It is appreciated that the survey drafters changed to 'too close', 'just right', 'too far away' as response options. However, we cannot know what distance is one of these (too close/just right/too far) without knowing what distance that person sits from the environmental element.

The Faculty Welfare Committee greatly appreciates all consultation efforts and hopes that university leadership will continue to engage the Senate over the design of faculty workspace in the future. If you have any questions please contact me, or Academic Senate analyst Artemio Cardenas [artemio.cardenas@ucsf.edu](mailto:artemio.cardenas@ucsf.edu).

Sincerely,

Leah Karliner, MD  
Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee