

Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Marek Brzezinski, MD, PhD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT 2015-2016

Primary Focus Points for the Year:

- Review and Interpretation of UCSF Bylaws as requested by other Senate Standing Committees and Senate Director Giedt.
 - a. This academic year, Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) members reviewed eighteen different items of business, as listed in Appendices below.
 - i. All were finalized by end of academic year except the bylaws related to the new Senate Standing Committee on Space Planning (Appendix 9). Business for this will continue in the 2016-2017 academic year.
 - b. This is more than double the volume of business seen in the committee's past academic years.
- Discussion of the use of Chancellor's/Faculty Academic Renewal Funds (2015-2016) to continue support of childcare services for faculty and for the development of a faculty-focused website or portal allowing for "one-stop-shopping" for time-pressed faculty. (Appendix 3)

2015-2016 Members

Marek Brzezinski, Chair

Linda Angin
Dorie Apollonio
Michele Bloomer
Sheila Brear
Mark Seielstad
Katherine Yang

Ex-Officio Members

Doug Carlson, Registrar
Jae-Woo Lee, Parliamentarian

Number of In-person Meetings: 7; electronic discussion as needed

Senate Analyst: Alison Cleaver

<http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-committee/m-rules.html>

Task Forces and Other Committee Service

Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) members didn't sit on any task forces this year related to their role on the RJC.

Going Forward

Pending issues for the Academic Senate Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction to carry forward into 2016-2017:

- Continued review of proposed bylaw revisions
- Updating of Academic Senate Informational Documents pertaining to parliamentary procedures
- As related to the Senate's Chancellors/Faculty Academic Renewal Funds, ongoing involvement in the creation of a faculty-focused website or portal providing "one-stop-shopping" for all faculty needs. The committee continues to partner with ITS and CIO Joseph Bengfort on these efforts.
 - RJC Chair Brzezinski will sit on upcoming task forces.

Appendices

- Request for Interpretation of UCSF Bylaw *122.A.1. Committee on Equal Opportunity: Membership* from Committee on Committees who questioned how to define and determine who was a Graduate Division representative. (Appendix 1)
- Request for Interpretation of UCSF Bylaw *130.A. Membership* and *130.B. Duties* governing the Coordinating Committee from Senate Director Giedt. (Appendix 2)
- Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) Requests for Chancellor's/Faculty Academic Renewal Funds for 2015-2016 to Senate Chair Greenblatt: an Ongoing Request and a Big Idea Request. (Appendix 3a and 3b)
- Request for Interpretation of UCSF Bylaw *85B. Composition of Committees* from Senate Director Giedt (Appendix 4)
- Request for Interpretation of UCSF Bylaw *145B. Committee on Courses of Instruction: Duties* by that Committee's members who questioned if the current bylaws didn't clearly declare the full authority of the committee. (Appendix 5)
- Justification of approval of proposed bylaw revisions from *Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI)* on *Bylaw 145B. COCOI: Duties* following RJC's earlier interpretation of same bylaw. (Appendix 6)
- Request for Interpretation of UCSF Bylaw *135.B. Committee on Research: Duties* from that RJC members who sought to determine if current language was sufficient to cover involvement by that committee with the UCSF campus's Research Allocation Program (RAP), or if the language should be made more explicit (Appendix 7)
- Review of proposed Draft and Charge for new Senate Standing Committee on Space Planning (Appendix 8)
- Review of new proposed UCSF Bylaw *185.A. Membership* and *185.B. Duties* pertaining to new Senate Standing *Committee on Space Planning*. (Appendix 9)
- Justification of approval of proposed revisions to UCSF Bylaw *112.A.2. Committee on Academic Planning & Budget: Membership* to correct titles of ex officio members, from committee members. (Appendix 10)
- Justification of approval of proposed revisions to UCSF Bylaw *160.A. Committee on Faculty Welfare: Membership* to correct the Divisional representative on Systemwide UCFW. (Appendix 11)

- Review of proposed revisions to *SOM Regulations* and *Appendix IV* by the SOM Dean's Office to bring language in line with the new Bridges Curriculum being launched officially Fall 2016 (Appendix 12— Regulations and Appendix 13—Appendix IV)
- Review of proposed revisions to UCSF Bylaw *175.A. Membership* and *175.B. Duties* pertaining to the *Clinical Affairs Committee* (CAC). Revisions were proposed by members of the CAC. (Appendix 14)
- Review of new proposed School of Pharmacy (SOP) Bylaw *8.2.5 Standing Committees: Assessment and Evaluation Committee* pertaining to the creation of a new School standing committee. (Appendix 15)
- Request for Interpretation of UCSF Division Bylaw *35.F. Modification of Legislation: Faculty Council Legislation* from the SOP Faculty Council.
 - a. Request pertains to bylaw amendments made to a pre-existing SOP Standing Committee, and to what extent non-SOP faculty—who deliver portions of the PharmD curriculum—will be impacted by the Council's bylaw amendments.
 - b. Outcome of interpretation will determine if amendments warrant a full Senate review and approval, or if final action on the amendments resting with the SOP Faculty. (Appendix 16)
- Review of proposed revisions to UCSF Bylaw *102.A. Committee on Committees: Membership*, which aim to clarify membership (Appendix 17)
- Review of proposed revisions to UCSF Bylaw *180.A. Membership* and *180.B. Duties* for the *Committee on Sustainability*. Proposal is to abolish Standing Committee and revert it to being a Task Force. (Appendix 18)

Senate Staff:
 Alison Cleaver, Senior Analyst
alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu; 415/514-3808

September 21, 2015

Rena Fox, MD, Chair
Committee on Committees
Janice Tsoh, PhD, Chair
Committee on Equal Opportunity
500 Parnassus Ave, MUE 231
San Francisco, CA 94143

Re: Interpretation of Equal Opportunity Committee Senate Bylaw 122(A)(1)

Dear Chairs Fox and Tsoh:

Pursuant to Division Bylaw 120(B)(5), the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) reviewed and discussed interpretation of *SB 122(A)(1) Committee on Equal Opportunity: Membership*. This was in response to a request for interpretation in spring 2015 from Committee on Committees (COC) who questioned how to define within this bylaw who was a Graduate Division representative.

The bylaw in question reads as follows:

122. Committee on Equal Opportunity

- A. Membership: This Committee shall consist of at least ten members.
1. The membership shall include at least one representative from each of the Schools and the Graduate Division. [Am 5 June 91, 1 Sep 03]

Before moving to committee discussion, RJC requested the Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP) provide some background to assist RJC in their discussion. Questions asked and responses received are reflected in the attached Appendix 1.

Following discussion, RJC members interpreted as follows:

- In review of other standing committees bylaws, RJC assessed that as currently authored, *SB bylaw 122(A)(1)* could be interpreted to refer to a faculty member – rather than a student representative – as the intended EQOP committee member. They were not inclined at this time to recommend a bylaw change to make this clearer.
- Instead they propose that keeping the bylaw as currently-authored allows the COC EQOP liaison the ability to pursue either a faculty or student representative deeply involved in the Graduate Division to serve as the Graduate Division representative on the EQOP Committee.
- RJC encourages the COC EQOP liaison to reach out to the Graduate Division Dean for recommendations of such faculty or students.
- RJC members further recommended that the Graduate Division representative not also be one of the required School committee members; these should be separate individuals on the committee.
- If COC selects a faculty member to serve as the Graduate Division representative on EQOP, RJC also encourages EQOP to receive input from both student and post-doc representatives at least once a year.

The proposed interpretation must be approved by a vote of the UCSF Academic Senate Coordinating Committee, and also by a vote of the Division before they may go into effect. This proposed reinterpretation will be included in the Consent Calendar of the Winter 2016 Senate Division Meeting.

Sincerely,

Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

Marek Brzezinski, MD, PhD, Chair

Linda Angin, DDS

Dorothy Apollonio, PhD

Michele Bloomer, MD

Sheila Brear, BDS

Mark Seielstad, PhD

Katherine Yang, PharmD, MPH

Ex Officio Members

Douglas Carlson, JD

Jae-Woo Lee, MD, Parliamentarian and UCRJ Representative

Committee on Equal Opportunity Janice Tsoh, PhD, Chair

June 10, 2015

Jae Woo Lee, MD, Chair
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Response to Committee on Committee's Request to Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) for Clarification of Senate Bylaw 122(A)(1) pertaining to the Committee on Equal Opportunity.

Dear Chair Lee,

The Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP) has reviewed the May 22nd request from the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) to review Senate Bylaw (SB) 122(A)(1). Below are our findings.

History

At April 24, 2015 Committee on Committees (COC) meeting, COC was unclear on how to interpret (SB) 122(A)(1), specifically, what a Graduate Division Representative is. COC requested clarification from R&J.

At the May 4, 2015 Coordinating Committee meeting, R&J Vice Chair Catherine Waters informed EQOP Vice Chair Audrey Lyndon that R&J would be sending EQOP some questions to aid in R&J's review of SB 122(A)(1). R&J requested this review on May 15, 2015. ([Appendix 1](#))

122. Committee on Equal Opportunity

- A. Membership: This Committee shall consist of at least ten members.
1. The membership shall include at least one representative from each of the Schools and the Graduate Division. [Am 5 June 91, 1 Sep 03]
 2. [Am 1 Sep 03]
 3. The Vice Chancellor of Diversity and Outreach shall serve as a non-voting ex-officio member.
 4. The membership shall include at least one appointee from the Clinical and one from the Adjunct series. [Am 1 Sep 03]
 5. All members shall be voting members except when proscribed by Academic Senate bylaws and regulations. [Am 1 Sep 03]
 6. A quorum shall consist of five voting members. [Am 1 Sep 03]
- B. Duties:
1. To review the status of underrepresented groups in those areas in which the Senate has jurisdiction. [Am 1 Sep 03]
 2. To report annually on the policies and the progress of the Division toward achieving equal opportunity for underrepresented groups. [En 12 May 77] [Am 1 Sep 03]
 3. To serve as the review Committee for the Faculty Development (formerly Pre-Tenure) Awards, originating out of the Chancellor's office. [Am 1 Sep 03]
 4. To review regularly and revise as necessary the Faculty Handbook for Advancement and Promotion at UCSF. The Committee should consult with other Divisional committees,

campus committees, and administrative bodies regarding this handbook as appropriate.
[Am 1 Sep 03]

EQOP Review

SB 122(A)(1): The membership shall include at least one representative from each of the Schools and the Graduate Division.

EQOP reviewed this request and had these comments:

- (1) The Committee has not had a designated "Graduate Division Representative" within the last 13 years of recorded membership.
- (2) EQOP had no comment on the interpretation of the bylaw as it falls outside of the purview of the committee.
- (3) EQOP has not been getting the Graduate Division perspective and feels strongly that that unit be represented.
- (4) EQOP prefers that the appointment be of a faculty member, but again, will defer to R&J and their deliberations.

Should you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Shilpa Patel.

Sincerely,



Janice Tsoh, PhD

Chair, Committee on Equal Opportunity

Senate Staff:
Shilpa Patel, Senior Analyst
shilpa.patel@ucsf.edu; 415/514-2696

February 29, 2016

Todd Giedt
Executive Director
UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Ave, MUE 231
San Francisco, CA 94143

Re: Interpretation of Coordinating Committee Bylaw 130

Dear Director Giedt:

Pursuant to Division Bylaw 120(B)(5), the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) reviewed and discussed interpretation of *SB 130 Coordinating Committee: A. Membership and B. Duties*. This was in response to a request for interpretation in Summer 2015 from Senate Director Giedt who questioned:

- 1) How to define quorum for this committee
 - a. Due to the committee's size, having sufficient members present for a vote can prove problematic
- 2) Reinterpret student involvement or presentations to the committee during any academic year
- 3) Any editorial corrections that might be necessary

Background

The bylaw in question currently reads as follows:

130. Coordinating Committee

A. Membership: This Committee shall consist of the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary of the San Francisco Division, who shall act as the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary respectively, of the Committee; the Chair of each of the other standing committees of the San Francisco Division; the Chair of each Faculty Council; the Chair of the Graduate Council of the San Francisco Division; and each Dean who by Academic Senate Bylaw 50 (C) is an ex officio member of the Faculty Council of a School of the San Francisco Division; the Divisional Representatives to the Assembly and the alternate; the Divisional Parliamentarian; the previous Chair ex officio; and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, ex officio. [Am 9 Dec 71, 23 Mar 72, 1 Sep 03]

B. Duties:

1. To study the policies, actions, and reports of the standing committees of the San Francisco Division and communicate to these bodies such information as may, in its judgment, serve to coordinate them and to promote harmony and efficiency in the conduct of their work.
2. To maintain liaison with students in parallel areas of interest via the official student body organizations recognized by the Division. It shall invite representatives or agencies of those organizations to a joint meeting of the Coordinating Committee or a subcommittee as appropriate. [En 12 Mar 70]
3. To study the need for legislation by the San Francisco Division and from time to time recommend, through the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, such legislation as it may deem necessary or desirable.
4. To perform such other duties not assigned by the Bylaws of the Division to other committees.

Outcome of Discussion

On the Question of Quorum (SB 130A)

Following the Coordinating Committee discussion in January 2016, RJC members re-discussed and determined the quorum for the committee should be set at fifteen members.

This allows for attendance by core members which include Senate Officers and Chairs of Standing Committees and Councils, recognizing that some may have prior commitments and might be unable to attend all Coordinating Committee meetings. This option also allows all members to retain voting rights, and is consistent with past attendance at meetings. If all such members attended, the committee would have twenty-three members present.

“The bylaws of an organization should state the number of proportion of members that constitutes the quorum. In the absence of such a provision, parliamentary law fixes the quorum at a majority of the members.” (The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, A. Sturgis, pg. 111)

Student Representatives and Presentations (SB 130B)

Following discussion of student representatives and presentations at the Coordinating Committee meeting, RJC members determined the following:

- To remove mention of hosting a separate joint or subcommittee meeting with representatives or agencies of recognized official student body organizations. The committee will maintain having agencies of those organizations attend Coordinating Committee and provide updates on student matters as appropriate. Examples provided of such agencies include Chair of Graduate Council or Chair of those Faculty Councils with standing student representatives.
- At this time, RJC members didn't wish to include such examples within amended bylaws, but cite here for Divisional awareness.

Editorial Corrections

Finally, RJC members noted several areas in the bylaws that needed editorial correction:

- Moved mention of the Divisional Parliamentarian up to the first line of the Membership section, so as to be on equal footing as the other officers within the Divisional Academic Senate and to make clear the role of the Parliamentarian within the Coordinating Committee.
- Editorial changes were made to provide clarification in the revised Membership section.
- While it has been the Divisional practice to consider the Graduate Dean amongst the School Deans on the Coordinating Committee, it hasn't been explicitly mentioned in the bylaws. RJC members have corrected this by adding “the Graduate Dean” to *SB 130A. Membership*.
- RJC members noted the title “Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs” in *SB 130A*. No such position currently exists at UCSF. RJC proposed revising to read “Vice Provost, Academic Affairs.”

Proposed revisions in track changes are on attached document (Attachment 1). Editorial corrections are in green track changes; all others are in red.

The proposed interpretation must be approved by a vote of the UCSF Academic Senate Coordinating Committee, and also by a vote of the Division before they may go into effect. This proposed reinterpretation will be included in the Consent Calendar of the Winter 2016 Senate Division Meeting.

Sincerely,

Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

Marek Brzezinski, MD, PhD, Chair

Linda Angin, DDS

Dorothy Apollonio, PhD

Michele Bloomer, MD

Sheila Brear, BDS

Mark Seielstad, PhD

Katherine Yang, PharmD, MPH

Ex Officio Members

Douglas Carlson, JD

Jae-Woo Lee, MD, Parliamentarian and UCRJ Representative

October 22, 2015

Ruth Greenblatt, MD
Chair 2015-2017
UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Ave, MUE 231
San Francisco, CA 94143

Re: Rules & Jurisdiction Committee Request/Position on Chancellor's/FAR Funds 2015-2016

Dear Senate Chair Greenblatt:

Thank you for requesting feedback from UCSF Senate Standing Committees on the use of the 2015-2016 Chancellor's/Faculty Academic Renewal (FAR) Funds

The Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) discussed this at its September 2015 meeting and via email and has the below requests for funding. Overall, RJC has two funding requests. This communication speaks to the first proposal, which is a continued request from the 2014-2015 academic year.

This year RJC members understand the funds will remain in a single pool and not be divvied out to standing committees or councils. However, committees can still petition for a portion of the funds to be used for specific purposes.

Ongoing Request - \$16,538

RJC members want a portion to go towards expanded childcare through Bright Horizons, which for the 2016-2017 academic year would cost **\$16,538**.

This amount secures three additional slots for children of faculty. This financial figure was provided by Suzie Kirrane, Family Services Manager, UCSF.

Thank you for considering this RJC funding request for 2015-2016.

Sincerely,

Rules & Jurisdiction Committee

Marek Brzezinski, MD, PhD, Chair
Linda Angin, DDS
Dorothy Apollonio, PhD
Michele Bloomer, MD
Sheila Brear, BDS
Mark Seielstad, PhD
Katherine Yang, PharmD
Douglas Carlson, JD, Registrar (Ex Officio)
Jae Woo Lee, MD, UCRJ Representative (Ex Officio)

January 6, 2016

Ruth Greenblatt, MD
Chair 2015-2017
UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Ave, MUE 231
San Francisco, CA 94143

Re: Rules & Jurisdiction Committee Request/Position on Chancellor's/FAR Funds 2015-2016

Dear Senate Chair Greenblatt:

Thank you for requesting feedback from UCSF Senate Standing Committees on the use of the 2015-2016 Chancellor's/Faculty Academic Renewal (FAR) Funds.

The Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) has discussed this during its fall 2015 meetings and via email and has the below requests for funding. RJC members propose the below new ideas to support faculty in their administrative and information-gathering efforts within UCSF.

Big Idea – Funding Request

1. Abstract

Our faculty is in need of a centralized website and search engine to navigate the numerous **existing** online resources. Ideally, faculty would be able to go to one site and find (from that single portal) all relevant information within UCSF. This "one-stop-shop" would pull from various sites, such as Academic Affairs, School- or Department-relevant information.

The development of a centralized site and search engine is overdue: members of the faculty are now being called upon to handle matters previously managed by administrative assistants, and there are only limited resources or directions to fill in the gap. Faculty may need to reference various sources within UCSF and find that the information is spread out over more than 1,200 independent websites with no centralized search capacity. Right now, the best way to locate information within UCSF is to access it from an outside search engine (e.g. Google), and the varying indexing and tagging between the independent websites hinders faculty from finding the answers they seek.

Having this background, RJC members recommend the following:

1. The development of a faculty-focused portal (Faculty@UCSF) with a robust search engine pulling information from numerous sites across UCSF;
2. The development of a centralized tagging and indexing system for all UCSF-related websites. Departments or groups could still manage the content of these sites, but the indexing or tagging should be consistent.

RJC members recognize that both of these issues are outside of their purview, and that of the UCSF Academic Senate, to address. However the RJC is willing to conduct initial discovery and design of such a faculty-focused website if the Administration starts to address the business needs of the faculty on item # 2 identified above.

For the first year of discovery (2015-2016) RJC has been allocated \$15,000. Due diligence has shown that those funds would cover three weeks of independent website research by an outside

consultant to do very targeted research. This is a multi-year project. Future budget requests will be examined and revised at each stage of development.

\$15,000 (2015-2016) – Phase 1 (discovery and design)

\$60,000 (2016-2017) – Phase 2 (depending on outcome of Phase 1)

\$20,000 (2017-2018) – Phase 3 (depending on outcome of Phase 2)

2. Background

The recent UCSF faculty survey demonstrated a high degree of frustration among the faculty and a lack of engagement. A growing body of literature suggests that this is not an uncommon finding among academic faculty. Even though there are non-modifiable reasons (e.g., workload), there are a number of factors that we can positively affect with an effective website:

- Feeling of loss and frustration due to lack of understanding of key parts of academic and non-academic life, like advancement, benefits, insurance, or “perks” offered to UCSF faculty; Making the matters worse, many members of the faculty are now being called upon to handle matters previously managed by administrative assistants, with little assistance or direction provided by UCSF. To complete such tasks, members of the faculty may need to reference various sources of information within UCSF. However information at UCSF is spread out over more than 1,200 independent websites (it could be as many as 20,000 UCSF-related websites) with no centralized search capacity.
- The increasingly more complex legal world with a plethora of new and changing policies (that are not easily accessible)
- Conflicting information on different UCSF websites as individual departments and other UCSF entities update their websites at different intervals. Also, each of these independent department or group sites may tag or index information differently, hindering faculty’s ability to find the necessary information quickly.
- Lack of “social interactions” among faculty (social silos). – And while this is obviously a very wide area, there is an increased appreciation that the “social side” is a key to a success of any organization.
- Lack of easy access to educational resources at UCSF: e.g., “Where do I send my research assistant to be more versatile with PubMed searches?”, “Can I improve my grant writing skills?”, or “Are there any statistical courses?”
- Lack of easy access to services available at UCSF, e.g., “How do I get a statistical advice on my project?”

A similar site at UC Berkeley—for all employees and students— “CalAnswers” (calanswers.berkeley.edu) is housed within the Planning & Analysis Office under the Division of Finance Administration Services. CalAnswers is also used by departments and divisions in the development of their annual budget requests to the Administration.

UCSF has multiple sites—UCSF Pulse and the in-development UCSF Life—which aim to become this type of “one-stop shop”. However, this still presents the same problem of faculty needing to go to multiple sites to find relevant information. Further, each independent department or group site may tag or index information differently, hindering faculty’s ability to find the necessary information quickly. The goal is to have just one location with a sufficiently robust search engine to scour all UCSF and UCSF-related sites at once.

RJC members did appreciate discovering that doing a Google search for “Faculty at UCSF” produces www.ucsf.edu/pulse as the top answer. Yet at present, neither Pulse nor UCSF Life possesses the kind of robust search engine that we’re seeking to have developed.

Initial communication with CIO Joe Bengfort advised that the overall cost of developing a new site would most likely be around \$200k in total. It would cost much less to bolster the pre-existing UCSF

webpages – which are created, updated, and managed via a free website development tool called Drupal – and would therefore cost around \$100k.

The key issue surrounding this project is scope – and therefore beginning the project means decisively determining our needs. Preliminary discussion with UCSF ITS programmers about this project identified a two- or possibly three-phase timeline, with Phase 1 occurring in 2015-2016 and Phases 2 and/or 3 happening in following years. RJC will put in a request for funds for Phase 2 and 3 during the next academic year.

3. Initial Overview and Next Steps (Phase 1)

The requested amount of \$15,000 for academic year 2015-2016 will allow RJC members to conduct business analysis and outreach through to June 2016 in partnership with UCSF ITS, IT Website Development Office, and an outside consultant on the following:

- Appropriate scope of faculty-focused website creation or webpage changes
- Develop and host faculty focus groups OR send out a Qualtrics survey to acquire case studies
 - Faculty will be asked following types of questions:
 - What information did you seek but couldn't find?
 - Did you eventually find what you needed?
 - What did you need to do with the information upon finding it?
 - How is the information to be used?
 - What was the timeframe within which you needed the information?
 - And overall, how do faculty define "useful information" – what format does it need to be in?
- Organize responses to determine key areas within UCSF website and webpages that are missing information
- Determine ownership of webpages in question

Phase 2 (and Phase 3)

- If, post-discovery, it's determined that a new website is the best pathway, funds will go into programmer effort to create the new site as well as indexing of relevant UCSF information currently available.
 - Preliminary research has revealed that this pathway would likely require a Phase 3 focused on site testing with a select group of faculty. Projected cost would be around \$20,000.

4. Partners:

The Rules & Jurisdiction Committee will work closely with various people within ITS. As analysis progresses, we may change contacts as needed. At present, the below represent initial points of contact related specifically to website development and webpage changes, as well as background related cost of such a project, overview on other such projects happening at UCSF, and business analysis methodology:

- Joseph Bengfort
Chief Information Officer
UCSF

- John Kealy, Manager
Customer Communications
IT Website Development
UCSF
- Erik Wieland, Application Manager
IT—Enterprise Applications
UCSF

Thank you for the opportunity to present this proposal for discussion. RJC members look forward to future development of the above ideas including submitting a formal Communication to EVCP Lowenstein's office for review.

Sincerely,

Rules & Jurisdiction Committee

Marek Brzezinski, MD, PhD, Chair
Linda Angin, DDS
Dorothy Apollonio, PhD
Michele Bloomer, MD
Sheila Brear, BDS
Mark Seielstad, PhD
Katherine Yang, PharmD
Douglas Carlson, JD, Registrar (Ex Officio)
Jae Woo Lee, MD, UCRJ Representative (Ex Officio)

Proposed Revisions to Divisional Bylaw 85.B.

Justification

Pursuant to Division Bylaw 120(B)(5), the Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction reviewed Divisional Bylaw 85.B. in comparison to Systemwide Bylaw IV.128H as pertains to membership on Standing Committees of faculty with other non-Senate administrative duties. The Bylaws in question read:

- **Divisional (UCSF) Bylaw 85.B:** *Composition of Committees: Committees may be constituted of a combination of ex officio, elected, or appointed members. Ex officio members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs may vote and exercise the same powers as other members, unless limitations are imposed when the committee is established. Some committees may be restricted to faculty without administrative appointments (which are defined as Dean, Vice Dean, Assistant Dean, Associate Dean, or Acting Dean). [Am 1 Sep 03]*
- **Systemwide Bylaw IV.128.H:** *Members holding an administrative position higher than department chair may not serve as members of Assembly committees. However, Department Chairs may serve on Assembly Committees, with the exception of the Committee on Academic Personnel, the Committee on Academic Freedom and the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure.*

The Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction recommends UCSF Division of the Academic Senate change its Bylaw 85B to be more consistent with Systemwide IV.128.H. Doing so will eliminate potential conflicts of interest and likewise appearance of conflicts of interest for those faculty who also hold administrative positions within their respective Departments or Schools. It will also clarify for the Senate's Committee on Committees who is eligible for appointment on which Academic Senate Standing Committees.

Proposed Bylaw 85.B.

Composition of Committees: Committees may be constituted of a combination of ex officio, elected, or appointed members. Ex officio members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs may vote and exercise the same powers as other members, unless limitations are imposed when the committee is established.

Department Chairs may serve on Senate Standing Committees, with the exception of the Committee on Academic Personnel, the Committee on Academic Freedom and the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure. *Some committees may be **further** restricted to faculty without administrative appointments (which are defined as Dean, Vice Dean, Assistant Dean, Associate Dean, or Acting Dean). [Am 1 Sep 03; **Am 28 January 16]***

Communication from the Committee on Courses of Instruction

Pam Bellefeuille, RN, MN, CNS, Chair

February 11, 2016

TO: Marek Brzezinski, Chair of the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee
FROM: Pam Bellefeuille, Chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction
RE: Request for Review of Committee on Courses of Instruction Revised Bylaws

Dear Chair Brzezinski:

The Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI) thanks the Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) Committee for their initial review of the current COCOI bylaws. Committee members also appreciate R&J's recommendation for the COCOI to propose revisions. On February 10, the members of the COCOI reviewed their bylaw language and agreed to propose the following new language:

Chapter VI Faculties and Committees; Section III. Standing Committees for the San Francisco Division; Subsection 145. Committee on Courses of Instruction; Letter B. Duties:

The Committee shall be concerned primarily with the formal and final approval of new courses of instruction, modifications to existing courses, the approval of special prerequisites of major subjects, the withdrawal or retention of courses, the credit valuation of courses, the classification of courses, and any other matters germane to courses of instruction.

COCOI members believe the proposed new language simplifies the committee's role and responsibility and brings the committee charge more in line with the UC Regents Standing Order 105.2.b which states that, "The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula."

The members of the COCOI committee request that Rules and Jurisdiction Committee review and approve the proposed bylaws. If you have any questions please contact me, or Academic Senate Analyst Artemio Cardenas at artemio.cardenas@ucsf.edu.

Sincerely,

Pam Bellefeuille
Chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction

Committee on Courses of Instruction

CURRENT

Chapter VI Faculties and Committees; Section III. Standing Committees for the San Francisco Division; Subsection 145. Committee on Courses of Instruction; Letter B. Duties

The Committee shall be concerned primarily with the coordination and review of individual courses of instruction. It shall make full use of appraisals and recommendations of appropriate committees of the Schools of the Division and advise them at its discretion on the following matters: The formal and final approval of new courses of instruction, desirable modifications in courses already approved, the approval of special prerequisites of major subjects, the withdrawal or retention of courses, the credit valuation of courses, the classification of courses, and any other matters germane to courses of instruction.

<http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-bylaws/bylaws.html#no145>

PROPOSED

Chapter VI Faculties and Committees; Section III. Standing Committees for the San Francisco Division; Subsection 145. Committee on Courses of Instruction; Letter B. Duties

The Committee shall be concerned primarily with the formal and final approval of new courses of instruction, modifications in existing courses, the approval of special prerequisites of major subjects, the withdrawal or retention of courses, the credit valuation of courses, the classification of courses, and any other matters germane to courses of instruction.

<http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-bylaws/bylaws.html#no145>

UCSF 3/1/2016 10:02 AM

Deleted: coordination and review of individual courses of instruction. It shall make full use of appraisals and recommendations of appropriate committees of the Schools of the Division and advise them at its discretion on the following matters: The

UCSF 3/1/2016 10:02 AM

Deleted: desirable

UCSF 3/1/2016 10:03 AM

Deleted: already approved

Proposed Revisions to Divisional Bylaw 145B

Justification

In fall 2016, members of the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI) approached Rules & Jurisdiction Committee members regarding interpretation of COCOI bylaw 145.B. which speaks to the committee's duties. As currently written, COCOI members determined that bylaw 145.B. didn't explicitly state that the committee has the authority to approve all course-related actions. Instead the bylaw states only that the committee serves an advisory role on course approvals and changes.

If the above interpretation was accurate, then the current UCSF bylaws for COCOI didn't fully enforce the UC Regents Standing Order 105.2.b which states: "The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula."

At the request of Committee on Courses of Instruction and pursuant to Division Bylaw 120(B)(5), the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) reviewed Divisional Bylaw 145.B. alongside UC Regents Standing Order 105.2.b. at its January 2016 meeting.

The Bylaw in question currently reads:

Chapter VI Faculties and Committees; Section III. Standing Committees for the San Francisco Division; Subsection 145. Committee on Courses of Instruction; Letter B. Duties

The Committee shall be concerned primarily with the coordination and review of individual courses of instruction. It shall make full use of appraisals and recommendations of appropriate committees of the Schools of the Division and advise them at its discretion on the following matters: The formal and final approval of new courses of instruction, desirable modifications in courses already approved, the approval of special prerequisites of major subjects, the withdrawal or retention of courses, the credit valuation of courses, the classification of courses, and any other matters germane to courses of instruction.

<http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-bylaws/bylaws.html#no145>

The Rules & Jurisdiction Committee members concurred that as currently written COCOI committee bylaws don't reflect committee practice, which is to approve all course-related actions. Members further supported revisions that would reflect committee practice and make the bylaws more consistent with the UC Regents Standing Order 105.

Upon a vote at the March 2016 RJC meeting, members approved the below COCOI bylaw revisions. (See next page)

Current Bylaw 145.B. Duties

The Committee shall be concerned primarily with the coordination and review of individual courses of instruction. It shall make full use of appraisals and recommendations of appropriate committees of the Schools of the Division and advise them at its discretion on the following matters: The formal and final approval of new courses of instruction, desirable modifications in courses already approved, the approval of special prerequisites of major subjects, the withdrawal or retention of courses, the credit valuation of courses, the classification of courses, and any other matters germane to courses of instruction.

Proposed Bylaw 145.B Duties

The Committee shall be concerned primarily with the ~~coordination and review of individual courses of instruction. It shall make full use of appraisals and recommendations of appropriate committees of the Schools of the Division and advise them at its discretion on the following matters:~~ The formal and final approval of new courses of instruction, ~~desirable~~ modifications in existing courses ~~already approved~~, the approval of special prerequisites of major subjects, the withdrawal or retention of courses, the credit valuation of courses, the classification of courses, and any other matters germane to courses of instruction.

March 5, 2016

Janet Myers, PhD, MPH, Chair
Committee on Research
UCSF Academic Senate Office
500 Parnassus Avenue, MUE 231
San Francisco, CA 94143

Re: Discussion of Divisional Senate Bylaw 135B: Duties: Committee on Research

Dear Chair Myers:

Pursuant to Division Bylaw 120(B)(5), the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) reviewed the Committee on Research (COR) Divisional *Senate Bylaw 135B Duties*. Members of RJC reviewed the bylaws with a focus on whether current language “was sufficient to cover involvement with the campus’s Research Allocation Program (RAP) or should it be made more explicit?”

This review was at the request of Committee on Research.

Bylaws in question read:

135. Committee on Research

B. Duties:

- 1. To advise the Chancellor and inform the Division of budgetary need for support of research and research travel in the Division. It shall have the responsibility of making recommendations to the Chancellor regarding policy governing allocation of research funds, and other matters pertaining to research in the Division. It shall consider such applications for research funds as may be made by members of the Division and such applications for research travel grants for the purpose of attending meetings of learned societies as may be made by qualified applicants. It shall transmit to the Chancellor its recommendations concerning such applications.*
- 2. To select a UCSF faculty member who has made a distinguished record in basic research, to deliver a lecture upon such topic as he or she sees fit. The member is to be designated the "Faculty Research Lecture-Basic Science" of the San Francisco Division. [Am 1 Sep 03, 18 Nov 04, 18 April 11]*
- 3. To select a UCSF faculty member who has made a distinguished record in clinical research, to deliver a lecture upon such topic as he or she sees fit. The member is to be designated the "Faculty Research Lecture-Clinical Science." [Am 1 Sep 03, 18 Nov 04, 18 April 11]*
- 4. To select a UCSF faculty member who has made a distinguished record in translational research, to deliver a lecture upon such topic as he or she sees fit. The member is to be designated the "Faculty Research Lecture-Translational Science." [Am 18 April 11]*

Following discussion, RJC determined that the current language in the Committee on Research’s bylaws already covers participation in RAP or other intramural agencies in the second sentence with 135.B.1, which ends: “...other matters pertaining to research in the Division.”

As such, RJC members recommend the current language be kept as is. If other Committee on Research revisions are proposed at a later date, members of the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee will review them at that time.

Sincerely,

Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

Marek Brzezinski, MD, PhD, Chair
Linda Angin, DDS
Dorothy Apollonio, PhD
Michele Bloomer, MD
Sheila Brear, BDS

Mark Seielstad, PhD
Katherine Yang, PharmD, MPH
Douglas Carlson, JD, Registrar, *ex officio*
Jae-Woo Lee, MD, Parliamentarian and UCRJ
Representative, *ex officio*

ACADEMIC SENATE DIVISION CHAIR'S PROPOSAL
FOR
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SPACE PLANNING &
SENATE CHAIR'S PLANNED COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

I. CHARTER

a. Background Considerations:

1. *General Expansion.* UCSF has grown rapidly in the last decade with the development of the Mission Bay campus site, including the recently opened UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay, the seeds of which were sown in the 1990's. UCSF's physical growth has been driven by its programmatic growth, fueled by its burgeoning research programs and funding, and clinical programs and revenues. Its programmatic success has attracted talented and ambitious faculty and staff, who in turn have attracted philanthropy interested in supporting exciting new programs. Its expansion has also been driven by the need to address its seismically compromised facilities. At the same time, UCSF is changing its approach to managing its space by seeking to optimize the use of space and the return on its investment in physical facilities. Therefore, UCSF developed a set of space governance policies, which aims to make space assignment and use more transparent and fair, and allows space to be reassigned if it is not used well. Further, UCSF is seeking to reduce its occupancy costs and the impacts on its population and neighbors by consolidating its many remote locations including some of its leased sites into fewer sites.
2. *Mission Hall.* The decision to expand and relocate children's, women's and cancer services of the UCSF Medical Center to Mission Bay was coupled with a decision to build separate academic workspace for the faculty and staff working in the Medical Center in what became Mission Hall. Many of the clinical programs moved to Mission Hall from Parnassus Heights, Mount Zion and Laurel Heights, as well as space being programmed-in for desktop research programs in global health, epidemiology and translational research. To accommodate those populations in Mission Hall's desktop environment within the parameters of the project budget, project schedule, and building envelope, while promoting efficient work in a consolidated location which could be flexibly managed over time, an open plan workplace design called Activity Based Workspace (ABW) was deployed. Once Mission Hall opened in October 2014, a number of deficiencies, in addition to the advantages, became apparent in the ABW environment as occupants moved in. One of the most prominent deficiencies was the lack of private offices, a concern that had been predicted by many faculty and staff when the design was initially announced. At the urging of the faculty, the Mission Hall Workplace Research Study was commissioned in 2014, and has produced preliminary results, which show poor utilization of the building, and occupant dissatisfaction and concerns with the building.
3. *Open Plan Workspace Environment.* Over the past 30 years, UCSF has been gradually moving away from a closed plan to an open plan environment. Closed plan environments are composed of enclosed suites of personal desktop workspace comprised of private offices and workstations (generally for administrative staff), and have varied in size, configuration, density and utilization across UCSF's buildings. The fixed walls of these suites with separated public corridors have limited the flexibility to accommodate programmatic changes, requiring expensive construction to reconfigure space. The open plan environment combines personal desktop workspace of private offices and workstations opening into common space, with support spaces such as focus

rooms, huddle rooms and conference rooms; in these various locations, focused work, meetings, phone calls, and confidential activity can occur. Town centers, with kitchens and gathering spaces have been incorporated into the design. Open plan environments require 20% less circulation space and are much more easily reconfigured when programmatic change is necessary.

4. *Multiple space planning projects underway.* UC San Francisco's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) was approved by the University of California Regents in late 2014. With this momentum, UCSF began to focus its attention on the **Parnassus** campus to address critical structural issues as one of the many phases of implementing the LRDP. The first objective is to seismically retrofit and renovate Clinical Sciences Building (CSB) by 2017 and UC Hall (UCH) by 2020. UCSF will construct a new building on the **Mission Bay East Campus**, located across Third Street from the Medical Center, on Mission Bay Block 33 (the block number in the City's Mission Bay Plan). This building will house desktop research and administrative programs, and possibly outpatient clinics, relocating from Parnassus, Laurel Heights and leased sites. Once the building occupant programs are finalized, site planning, programming and design will commence in early 2016. UCSF finalized an agreement and closed escrow for the long-term (99-year) ground lease of the **Laurel Heights** campus site to a private real estate investment partnership: Laurel Heights Partners LLC. In conjunction with the long-term ground lease, UCSF is renting back the Laurel Heights campus and will continue to occupy it for a minimum of five years. UCSF conducts research in support of the clinical programs at the **Priscilla Chan and Mark Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center (ZSFG)** in laboratory and desktop space, much of which is located in older brick buildings. UCSF is in the planning process to build a modern academic research building at ZSFG on what is currently the B/C surface parking lot. The facility, which has a projected completion date of 2019, will provide safer facilities for faculty and staff currently located in these seismically compromised buildings and also house employees from off-site leased space. Finally, a task force has been established to strategically rethink UCSF's plan on its institutional infrastructure for education at **Mt. Zion and Parnassus** over the next 15 years. Given the lack of space available at Mission Bay, both Parnassus and Mt. Zion will remain an integral part of the UCSF campus.
5. *Process (per space.ucsf.edu).* All construction projects at UCSF follow a decision making process that incorporates: 1) the building program, which are determined by campus and school leadership and departments that will occupy space; 2) the building size, which are determined by site entitlement, program and budget; 3) budget; and 4) providing a workplace to support all faculty and staff. In addition, all major construction projects and renovations include a decision process that involves feedback from: 1) Faculty Users Group/Advisory Committee; 2) the building Committee - This group comprises institutional leaders at Chancellor and Dean levels and provides recommendations to Chancellor's Executive Cabinet (CEC); and 3) the Chancellor, who makes final decisions after recommendations from the CEC.
6. *Role of the Academic Senate.* In Fall 2015, Senate Chair Ruth Greenblatt has successfully lobbied the UCSF Administration to place Senate representatives on the following space planning committees: the UCSF Campuswide Space Governance Committee, the UCSF Space Development Committee, the Mission Hall Task Force¹, the Mission Bay East Campus Phase 1 (Block 33), the Parnassus Clinical Sciences Building/UC Retrofit Occupancy Planning Committee,

¹ The Mission Hall Task Force concluded its work in January 2016.

the SFGH Research Building, the Child Teen Family Center/Department of Psychiatry Building Programming Committee, and the Parnassus- Mt Zion 2025 Task Force.

II. CHARGE

Justification for Committee: Given the large number of disparate space planning committees in operation at UCSF, as well as the rapid pace that the campus is expanding, a body is needed to coordinate Senate feedback to the overarching space committee at UCSF – the UCSF Campuswide Space Governance Committee – as well as to the smaller committees involved in the individual space planning efforts on campus, which are listed above.

- a. Reporting Requirements: The Chair of the Committee on Space Planning will report periodically to the Coordinating Committee, or equivalent body, as needed to update members on the activities of the different space planning committees at UCSF.
- b. Term of the Committee: The Committee on Space Planning shall remain in force until August 31, 2020. The Academic Senate Division Chair, in discussion with members of the Executive Committee, has the right to extend the life of the Committee annually beyond August 31, 2020.

III. MEMBERSHIP

- a. Chair: The Chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Space Planning shall also be the Senate's representative on the over-arching UCSF Campuswide Space Governance Committee.^{2,3}
- b. Membership on the Committee on Space Planning shall consist of the Senate representatives on the following space planning committees and have staggered one to two-year terms:
 - UCSF Campuswide Space Governance Committee
 - UCSF Space Development Committee
 - Mission Hall Task Force
 - Mission Bay East Campus Phase 1 (Block 33)
 - Parnassus Clinical Sciences Building/UC Retrofit Occupancy Planning Committee
 - SFGH Research Building
 - Child Teen Family Center/Department of Psychiatry Building Programming Committee
 - Parnassus- Mt Zion 2025 Task Force

² Srikantan "Sri" Nagarajan, as the Senate representative on the UCSF Campuswide Space Governance Committee, shall serve as Chair of the Senate Committee on Space Planning until August 31, 2016.

c. Proposed membership as of March 30, 2016:

First Name	Last Name	Degree	School	Committee
Sri	Nagarajan	PhD	Medicine	UCSF Campuswide Space Governance Committee*
David	Teitel	MD	Medicine	Mission Hall Task Force
Janet	Myers	PhD, MPH	Medicine	Mission Hall Task Force
Chuck	McCulloch	PhD	Medicine	Mission Bay East Campus Phase 1 (Block 33)
Steve	Hetts	MD	Medicine	Parnassus Clinical Sciences Building/UC Retrofit Occupancy Planning Committee
Fran	Aweeka	PharmD	Pharmacy	SFGH Research Building
Descartes	Li	MD	Medicine	Child Teen Family Center/Department of Psychiatry Building Programming Committee
Kimberly	Topp	PhD, PT	Medicine	Parnassus- Mt Zion 2025 Task Force
Chad	Christine	MD	Medicine	UCSF Space Development Committee
Paul	Volberding	MD	Medicine	UCSF Space Development Committee

185. Committee on Space Planning

- A. Membership: This committee shall consist of at least 9 members, including at least:**
1. One representative from each school.
 2. Members will be appointed for renewable three-year terms.
 3. One Senate representative from each of the following UCSF standing committees: the UCSF Campus Space Committee, the Campus Space Management Subcommittee, and Campus New Space Development Subcommittee.
 4. One Senate representative from each of the ad-hoc building programming subcommittees.
 5. One at-large member appointed by the Committee on Committees.
 6. The Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, the Chair of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning shall serve as ex-officio members.
 7. The Chair shall serve a renewable two-year term and be a member of the UCSF Campus Space Committee.
- B. Duties**
1. Set principals and goals to guide UCSF space planning efforts and initiatives, maintenance of existing infrastructure, and philanthropic campaigns.
 2. Consult with the administration and stakeholders over all space utilization policies, including setting criteria for the assessment of the value of space utilization, as well as underutilized space, which is subject to reallocation.
 3. Coordinate Senate efforts and input into UCSF space planning committee and subcommittees, including strategic planning, the development and planning of new buildings, and modifications to existing buildings and structures.
 4. Report quarterly to the Executive Council and annually to the Division on UCSF space planning, as well as related policies and initiatives.
 5. To consider and report upon such matters as may be referred to it by the President of the University, the Chancellor, the Division, any Faculty Council, or other committee of the Division. [En 26 Jul 16]

Justification

Expansion. UCSF has grown rapidly in the last decade with the development of the Mission Bay campus site, including the recently opened UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay, the seeds of which were sown in the 1990's. UCSF's physical growth has been driven by its programmatic growth, fueled by its burgeoning research programs and funding, and clinical programs and revenues. Its programmatic success has attracted talented and ambitious faculty and staff, who in turn have attracted philanthropy interested in supporting exciting new programs. Its expansion has also been driven by the need to address its seismically compromised facilities. At the same time, UCSF is changing its approach to managing its space by seeking to optimize the use of space and the return on its investment in physical facilities. Therefore, UCSF developed a set of space governance policies, which aims to make space assignment and use more transparent and fair, and allows space to be reassigned if it is not used well. Further, UCSF is seeking to reduce its occupancy costs and the impacts on its population and neighbors by consolidating its many remote locations including some of its leased sites into fewer sites.

At the current time, UCSF has a number of space planning projects underway. UC San Francisco's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) was approved by the University of California Regents in late 2014. With this momentum, UCSF began to focus its attention on the Parnassus campus to address critical structural issues as one of the many phases of implementing the LRDP. The first objective is to seismically retrofit and renovate Clinical Sciences Building (CSB) by 2017 and UC Hall (UCH) by 2020.

UCSF will construct a new building on the Mission Bay East Campus, located across Third Street from the Medical Center, on Mission Bay Block 33 (the block number in the City's Mission Bay Plan). This building will house desktop research and administrative programs, and possibly outpatient clinics, relocating from Parnassus, Laurel Heights and leased sites. Once the building occupant programs are finalized, site planning, programming and design will commence in early 2016. UCSF finalized an agreement and closed escrow for the long-term (99-year) ground lease of the Laurel Heights campus site to a private real estate investment partnership: Laurel Heights Partners LLC. In conjunction with the long-term ground lease, UCSF is renting back the Laurel Heights campus and will continue to occupy it for a minimum of five years. UCSF conducts research in support of the clinical programs at the Priscilla Chan and Mark Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center (ZSFG) in laboratory and desktop space, much of which is located in older brick buildings. UCSF is in the planning process to build a modern academic research building at ZSFG on what is currently the B/C surface parking lot. The facility, which has a projected completion date of 2019, will provide safer facilities for faculty and staff currently located in these seismically compromised buildings and also house employees from off-site leased space. Finally, a task force has been established to strategically rethink UCSF's plan on its institutional infrastructure for education at Mt. Zion and Parnassus over the next 15 years. Given the lack of space available at Mission Bay, both Parnassus and Mt. Zion will remain an integral part of the UCSF campus.

Open Plan Workspace Environment and Mission Hall. Over the past 30 years, UCSF has been gradually moving away from a closed plan to an open plan environment. Closed plan environments are composed of enclosed suites of personal desktop workspace comprised of private offices and workstations (generally for administrative staff), and have varied in size, configuration, density and utilization across UCSF's buildings. The fixed walls of these suites with separated public corridors have limited the flexibility to accommodate programmatic changes, requiring expensive construction to reconfigure space. The open plan environment combines personal desktop workspace of private offices and workstations opening into common space, with support spaces such as focus rooms, huddle rooms and conference rooms; in these various locations, focused work, meetings, phone calls, and confidential activity can occur. Town centers, with kitchens and gathering spaces have been incorporated into the design. Open plan environments require 20% less circulation space and are much more easily reconfigured when programmatic change is necessary.

The decision to expand and relocate children's, women's and cancer services of the UCSF Medical Center to Mission Bay was coupled with a decision to build separate academic workspace for the faculty and staff working in the Medical Center in what became Mission Hall. Many of the clinical programs moved to Mission Hall from Parnassus Heights, Mount Zion and Laurel Heights, as well as space being programmed-in for desktop research programs in global health, epidemiology and translational research. To accommodate those populations in Mission Hall's desktop environment within the parameters of the project budget, project schedule, and building envelope, while promoting efficient work in a consolidated location which could be flexibly managed over time, an open plan workplace design called Activity Based Workspace (ABW) was deployed. Once Mission Hall opened in October 2014, a number of deficiencies, in addition to the advantages, became apparent in the ABW

environment as occupants moved in. One of the most prominent deficiencies was the lack of private offices, a concern that had been predicted by many faculty and staff when the design was initially announced. At the urging of the faculty, the Mission Hall Workplace Research Study was commissioned in 2014, and has produced preliminary results, which show poor utilization of the building, and occupant dissatisfaction and concerns with the building.

Shared Governance and Process. The development of new space and oversight of existing space is subject to the [Space Governance and Principles policy](#), which is administered by the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. This policy contains the following principles:

1. General Space Accountability and Governance;
2. Fairness, consistency, transparency, economic sustainability, and strategic prioritization in the development of space;
3. Non permanence of space allocation, retention, and use; and
4. Operational cost responsibility for space

Per space.ucsf.edu, all construction projects at UCSF follow a decision making process that incorporates: 1) the building program, which are determined by campus and school leadership and departments that will occupy space; 2) the building size, which are determined by site entitlement, program and budget; 3) budget; and 4) providing a workplace to support all faculty and staff. Space governance is tiered by subcommittees with oversight on existing space and subcommittees responsible for the development of new space that provide input, consultation, and advice to the top-level Campus Space Committee, which is chaired by the Chancellor, and is comprised of institutional leaders at Chancellor and Dean levels (see Appendix 1). This group provides recommendations to Chancellor's Executive Cabinet (CEC). The Chancellor makes the final decisions on issues relating to space after recommendations are formally received from the CEC. For issues concerning existing space, the standing Campus Space Management Subcommittee¹ receives input from the different standing School space committees and the individual building governance committees, as well as the ad-hoc Space Management Working Group. All consultation on new space goes through the standing Campus New Space Development Subcommittee, which is informed by the ad-hoc building programming committees and the ad-hoc building working groups.² Finally, the Parnassus Heights/Mt. Zion 2025 Task Force (PH/MZ 2025), which is re-envisioning the space at Parnassus and Mt. Zion, report directly to the Chancellor's Campus Space Committee.

Role of the Academic Senate. The [Academic Planning and Budget](#) committee (APB) has historically been the principal Senate committee involved in space planning at UCSF. However, other committees have provided input as well. As early as 2007, the [Clinical Affairs Committee](#) (CAC) voiced their concerns about the need for faculty office space and education space in the new hospital. In 2012, the Senate formally expressed its misgivings over the lack of appropriate consultation on the activity-based workspace (ABW) plan in a [letter](#) to Bonnie Maler, Associate Dean of Space Strategy and Administration. As a follow-up to this letter, APB convened a Faculty Workgroup on Space the following year, which produced a [White Paper on Faculty Workspace at UCSF](#). This white paper made a number of

¹ Co-Chaired by EVC/P Lowenstein and Vice Dean Wintroub.

² Managed by Capital Programs or Real Estate Services.

recommendations on both the Mission Hall building, which is based on the ABW plan, as well as future buildings at UCSF. These recommendations included the funding of an academic study of the ABW, a Senate-led survey of all faculty members, and designing increased flexibility into Mission Hall. A survey on Mission Hall was completed in late 2015; APB is currently reviewing its findings. At the same time, EVC/P Lowenstein convened an Open Plan Workspace Governance Task Force, which was co-chaired by Senate Vice Chair David Teitel. This task force was charged with making recommendations for mitigation and improvements in Mission Hall, as well as developing principles and guidelines for programming, designing, governing, and occupying open plan workplace environments at UCSF. This Task Force produced its [final report](#) in April 2016, and the UCSF Space Committee accepted the report's principles for open plan design in future new buildings, along with its Mission Hall specific recommendations: 1) Establish a governance structure and communication program for Mission Hall; and 2) create a Mission Hall Rapid Improvement Fund. Also in Fall 2015, Senate Chair Ruth Greenblatt successfully lobbied the UCSF Administration to place Senate representatives on the following space planning and building programming committees: the UCSF Campuswide Space Governance Committee, the UCSF Space Development Committee (now called the "UCSF Space Committee"), the Mission Hall Task Force, the Mission Bay East Campus Phase 1 (Block 33), the Parnassus Clinical Sciences Building/UC Retrofit Occupancy Planning Committee, the SFGH Research Building, the Child Teen Family Center/Department of Psychiatry Building Programming Committee, and the PH/MZ 2025 Task Force.

Therefore, the new Standing Committee on Space Planning is primarily charged with setting principals and goals to guide UCSF space planning efforts and initiatives, as well as the maintenance of existing infrastructure. The committee will also coordinate input and Senate consultation to the Administration on all aspects of space planning (including regular reports to the Senate's Executive Council). This includes, but is not limited to, strategic planning, the development and planning of new buildings, and modifications to existing buildings and structures. It is also envisioned that this committee will have significant input on philanthropic campaigns, which are fundamental driver of capital and building development, as well as all space utilization policies.

In Response to Committee on Committee (CoC) Inquiry

Proposed Revisions to Committee on Academic Planning & Budget Bylaw 112

Justification

Committee on Committees approached the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee to approve some editorial changes to Committee on Academic Planning & Budget bylaw 112.A.2.

These changes were to correct titles of ex officio members. As currently authored, the titles aren't accurate.

At the request of Committee on Committees and pursuant to Division Bylaw 120(B)(5), the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee members reviewed and approved the below edits at their April 12, 2016 meeting:

CURRENT

112. Committee on Academic Planning & Budget

A. Membership:

2. The Vice Chair of the Division and the Vice Chancellors for Administration and Finance, University Advancement and Planning, and Academic Affairs shall serve as ex officio members. [Am 2 June 92, 1 Sep 03]

NEW

112. Committee on Academic Planning & Budget

A. Membership:

2. The Vice Chair of the Division and the Vice Chancellors for Administration and Finance, ~~University Advancement~~ and ~~Campus~~ Planning, and ~~the Vice Provost for~~ Academic Affairs shall serve as ex officio members. [Am 2 June 92, 1 Sep 03, 12 April 16]

In Response to Committee on Committee (CoC) Inquiry

Proposed Revisions to Faculty Welfare Committee Bylaw 160

Justification

Committee on Committees approached the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) to approve some editorial changes to Faculty Welfare Committee bylaw 160A.

These changes were to correct who the UCSF representative was to the Systemwide Senate's University Committee on Faculty Welfare. They are also intended to clarify the membership status of the UCSF representative.

- As authored they state that the UCSF Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair will serve as that representative. It has been the practice of the committee and the campus to have Senate Vice Chairs serve as the campuswide representative to the Systemwide Senate standing committees.
- Separately, this campus representative will serve as a member of the Systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare, not an ex officio member as the current bylaws state.

At the request of Committee on Committees and pursuant to Division Bylaw 120(B)(5), the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee members reviewed and approved the below edits at their April 12, 2016 meeting:

CURRENT

160. Committee on Faculty Welfare

A. Membership: This Committee shall consist of seven members, including one emeritus member. Its Chair shall be an ex officio member of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare. [Am 2 June 87]

NEW

160. Committee on Faculty Welfare

A. Membership: This Committee shall consist of seven members, including one emeritus member. Its Vice Chair shall be an ~~ex officio~~ member of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare. [Am 2 June 87, 12 April 16]

April 29, 2016

To: Rules and Jurisdiction Committee

From: Hope Rugo MD, Chair, Clinical Affairs Committee

Re: Review of amendments to SF Division bylaw 175, statement of purpose and effect of amendments

Dear Chair Brzezinski,

On April 28, 2016, the Clinical Affairs Committee (CAC) voted unanimously by electronic vote to amend its bylaws. The Committee requests a review of its bylaw amendments, Statement of Purpose and if implemented, the effect of these amendments to the Committee's charge and to the SF Division by the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee. There were no arguments opposing the bylaw amendments.

DRAFT

I. Statement of Purpose:

The purpose of these bylaw amendments is as follows:

1. To allow flexibility in CAC's membership.
2. To be responsive to the inclusion of clinical faculty in the Academic Senate's SF Division.
3. To re-align the Committee's ex-officio membership to better facilitate its advisory duties to the Academic Senate, the Chancellor and campus leadership.

II. Effect of proposed amendments:

1. Previously, CAC bylaws required a fixed number of faculty members across Ladder Rank, In-Residence, Clinical Professor, Health Sciences Clinical and Adjunct series. The amendments remove the fixed membership.
2. The amendments remove ex-officio membership from the Chair of the Graduate Council, the Vice Chancellor of Medical Affairs, and update references from UCSF Medical Center to UCSF Health.
3. The amendments expand ex-officio membership to the CEO of UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital Oakland, the CEO of the Bay Area Accountable Care Network and, recognize the Senate representative on the UC Regents Committee on Health Services as a permanent guest.

Realignment of the ex-officio members and recognition of the Senate representative better informs CAC's charge and strengthens its guidance with regard to the growth of UCSF's academic and clinical enterprise footprint.

Karla Goodbody, Committee Analyst
415.476.9683
karla.goodbody@ucsf.edu

Suggested Bylaws Change:

175. Committee on Clinical Affairs

A. Membership:

1. General: This Committee shall consist of at least eight ~~voting~~ **faculty** members and ~~five~~ **four** ~~non-voting~~ ex officio members. ~~Of 4~~ ~~The voting~~ **faculty** members, ~~at least four members will be chosen Academic Senate Faculty from the following Academic Senate faculty series: In-Residence, Ladder-rank, Clinical X, Health Sciences Clinical, and at least four will be Clinical Professor Series and/or Adjunct Series faculty.~~ Of these ~~Academic Senate and Clinical and/or Adjunct voting faculty~~ members, there will be at least one member from each of the four Schools. These ~~Academic Senate and Clinical and/or Adjunct voting faculty~~ members should **be engaged in some clinical activity, and** represent the various clinical entities operated by or affiliated with UCSF. ~~Unless otherwise restricted in these Bylaws, the Academic Senate and Clinical and/or Adjunct members will be voting members.~~ [Am 1 Sep 03, **2 Jun 16**]
2. Ex Officio: The Chief Executive Officers or their designees from ~~of the~~ UCSF ~~Medical Center Health~~, the Veterans' Affairs Medical Center, ~~and~~ San Francisco General Hospital, **UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital Oakland and the Bay Area Accountable Care Network** will be ~~non-voting~~ ex officio members. ~~The Chair or Vice Chair of the Graduate Council and the Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs will also be non-voting ex officio members. The systemwide Academic Senate representative to the UC Regents Committee on Health Services will be a permanent, non-voting guest.~~ A quorum shall consist of five ~~seven~~ voting members. [Am 1 Sep 03, **2 Jun 16**]

B. Duties:

1. To confer with and advise the Chancellor and Administrative Officers on policy and matters regarding clinical activities that relate to and affect the academic mission of the University
2. To report to the Academic Senate on clinical activities at UCSF that relate to and affect the mission of the University.
3. To conduct regularly scheduled reviews and report on the conditions of the various clinical entities operated by or affiliated with UCSF **Health**.
4. To maintain liaison with other Committees of the Division and other agencies of the Campus and University on matters relating to clinical activities. [En 17 June 99, **Am 2 Jun 16**]

PART VIII. COMMITTEES (General Provisions)

8.2 Standing Committees. Five Standing Committees exist in the School. Each may create subcommittees composed of members of the Faculty to address specific issues, be they on-going or short lived.

8.2.5. Assessment and Evaluation Committee. (Not less than five members, including but not limited to: a chair, one faculty member from each of the major Doctor of Pharmacy curriculum content areas, a staff member representing the Office of Education and Instructional Support, and the Associate Dean for Assessment and Quality Improvement). This committee is charged with formulating, refining, implementing and managing an overall assessment and evaluation plan for the professional degree program; identifying critical assessment needs, processes, tools and data sources; ensuring assessment and evaluation data of student, teaching, and program performance informs quality assurance and continuous quality improvement of the professional degree program; and defining the infrastructure and resources needed to manage the plan. The committee shall report to the faculty at each regular meeting.

STP - Optimizing Assessment and Accreditation for PharmD Program

Situation

- The School recently cleared probation but may continue to be scrutinized by ACPE for the next several years.
- Recognition of on-going assessment as means to improve quality in higher education continues to grow, as evidenced within the new accreditation standards to which the School must be in full compliance with starting July 1, 2016.
- Standard 18.2 states that a program must have a sufficient number of faculty and staff to effectively address program needs related to assessment activities. At this time, the School has
 - 0.4 faculty FTE for administrative oversight and management of the School's assessment plan and accreditation
 - No standing assessment committee within the School to represent the faculty's perspective and to ensure faculty are integrated into the decision-making processes that impact quality assurance and improvement for the PharmD curriculum and program
 - A staff support model for assessment and accreditation consisting of different individuals across different units providing varying levels of support towards collecting and communicating assessment- and accreditation-related data
 - For comparison, the UCSD PharmD program recently hired a full-time program coordinator to support assessment and to address accreditation-related risk areas related to standards 2016
- The School's current organizational structure and allocation of resources required to support the ongoing management of our PharmD assessment plan and accreditation-related tasks/activities are no longer adequate towards achieving continuous quality assurance and improvement of our PharmD curriculum and program.
 - As one example: Of the approximately 144 listed required assessment elements for accreditation under Appendix 3, the School currently lacks policies and procedures related to, and/or the actual resources to engage in ongoing data collection, analysis, and reporting for at least 54 (37.5%) listed elements. Gap areas include, but are not limited, to:
 - formalized assessment and reporting related to the admissions process and its outcomes (e.g., correlation analysis of admissions variables and academic performance)
 - data monitoring, analysis, and reporting of student performance on the Pharmacy Curriculum Outcomes Assessment (PCOA)
 - ongoing mapping of the curriculum and instructional methods for curricular quality assurance and improvement
 - assessment data supporting student preparedness for APPEs

Target & Statement of Purpose

- Optimize our organizational structure and resources in order to engage in effective and meaningful assessment of our PharmD program and to meet accreditation-related standards related to assessment.

Proposal

- Identify and allocate the resources needed to develop standard operating procedures for individual elements of the PharmD assessment plan.
 - Doing so will ensure i) longitudinal continuity in processes and ii) that the faculty and staff involved are working "at the top of their professional skills set".
- By June 1, 2016, OEIS to evaluate the need for a full time assessment-focused coordinator to support the PharmD and potentially other accredited School programs (eg, PGY1/2, CPE).
- **Replace the existing EPC Assessment Subcommittee with a standing Assessment Committee within the School** fully empowered to serve as the faculty voice in the decision-making process and ensure accountability for assessment-related decisions that impact the quality of our PharmD curriculum and program.
 - Applying lean principles, would propose a minimal membership [e.g., Chair = Associate Dean; Director of OEIS; one individual representing each of the 3 BRIDGES curricular areas (Core, Frontiers, Experiential)] meeting once to twice quarterly to review reports and develop and communicate action items to individuals and groups with deliverables and deadlines for "closing the loop".

Respectfully submitted by Mitra Assemi, PharmD, with input from BRIDGES DRIVE team (Tina Brock, Robin Corelli, Leslie Floren, Conan MacDougall, Sue Miller), on July 23, 2015

Approved in concept by Vice Dean and Dean in August 2015

Plan (per ELT meeting discussion 9/1/15)

- The Vice Dean will propose the addition of a standing assessment committee to Faculty Council in October 2015. If approved, this would require a change in the School's bylaws. – **Approved by Faculty Council 10/7/2015**
- Pending approval from Faculty Council, ELT will review and finalize language to amend the bylaws that describes the composition and charge of an assessment committee.
- Once bylaws are finalized and forwarded to Faculty Council, ELT will identify members to serve on the inaugural committee and determine committee-related logistics (e.g., meeting frequency, staff support for meeting scheduling/minutes) for the inaugural term.
- Under the leadership of the Director of OEIS and ELT, the current and future assessment support needs will be identified and evaluated to determine the appropriate resources required to support the assessment plan and activities.

From: Goodbody, Karla
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 12:46 PM
To: Cleaver, Alison
Cc: Finley, Patrick
Subject: Request for parliamentary rule re: Divison bylaw 35F

Dear Alison,

At the request of the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council, I am requesting the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee issue a parliamentary ruling on [Modification of Legislation](#) Division bylaw 35F, specifically addressing these issues:

1. Direction on whether the Council's draft bylaw amendment to its Educational Policy Committee (EPC) requires a full Senate review and approval, or if final approval rests with the faculty of the School of Pharmacy.
2. Guidance in determining the extent to which a faculty's modification of its curricula and educational policies "affects" the faculty of another school responsible for implementing and delivering portions of said curricula.

Context:

Council has drafted bylaw amendments to its EPC, a standing committee that includes representatives from the School of Pharmacy and one member from the School of Medicine(SOM). At issue is the extent to which the School of Medicine faculty that deliver portions of the PharmD curriculum are "affected" by the Council's bylaw amendments to warrant a full Senate review and approval, rather than final action on the amendments resting with the School of Pharmacy's Faculty.

In January 2016, the SOP Dean's office provided the names of 9 SOM faculty responsible for delivering a portion of the PharmD curricula. According to *Advance*, 7 of the faculty have 100% appointment to the SOM while 2 faculty have a 60% and 61% appointments to the SOM.

Legislation relevant to this ruling includes but is not limited to:

- I. **SOP Faculty Council bylaws:**
 - a) [2.5: Membership and Voting Eligibility](#)
 - b) [8.2.1: Educational Policy Committee](#)
- II. **SF Division bylaws:**
 - a) [7C&D: Areas of Responsibility](#)
 - b) [Modification of Legislation](#)

Thanks,
Karla

Karla Goodbody | Senate Analyst | 415.476.9683
UCSF Academic Senate
karla.goodbody@ucsf.edu
<http://senate.ucsf.edu>

Existing Bylaw

102. Committee on Committees

- A. This Committee shall consist of nine members; one from each School and the remaining to be elected At Large. Thus, for election purposes only, there shall be two designations of membership: 1) School, and 2) At Large.

Proposed Bylaw

102. Committee on Committees

- A. This Committee shall consist of nine members; one from each School and the remaining members to be elected At Large. ~~Thus, for election purposes only, there shall be two designations of membership: 1) School, 2) At Large.~~ **The nine members can be from any faculty series, but in total, Adjunct and HS Clinical members combined shall comprise no more than four of the seats. (Am 26 Jul 16)**

Justification

The [Standing Rule 1.0](#) of the UCSF Academic Senate states that “all full-time faculty members will be reviewed by their peers for academic actions and will participate fully in voting matters pertaining to the UCSF campus.” Standing Rule 1.0 further defines ‘peers’ as “All full-time faculty including Ladder Rank, In Residence, Clinical X, Health Sciences Clinical and Adjunct who are at or above the level of the proposed action.” In order to bring its bylaw in line with this standing rule, CoC proposes amendments to its Bylaw 102 to formally include faculty members from the Adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series. It is intended that Adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical professors will participate fully in the appointment of faculty to UCSF Senate standing committees with the exception of systemwide committee appointments when there is not a corresponding UC systemwide committee.

Existing Bylaw**180. Sustainability Committee**

A. ~~Membership: This committee shall consist of at least 9 members, including at least:~~

- ~~1. One representative from each school.~~
- ~~2. Ex-Officio – The UCSF Sustainability Manager.~~

B. ~~Duties~~

- ~~1. The chair or designate shall represent UCSF faculty in UC Systemwide sustainability issues.~~
- ~~2. Set goals, make and implement recommendations to reduce the environmental impact of UCSF, include sustainability in the curriculum, and increase awareness of the importance of sustainability at UCSF, focusing on activities under the purview of faculty.~~
- ~~3. Report annually to the Division on progress of UCSF toward achieving sustainability goals.~~
- ~~4. The chair or designate shall represent the Academic Senate on the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability.~~
- ~~5. Select the faculty recipient of the annual Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability Award.~~
- ~~6. To consider and report upon such matters as may be referred to it by the President of the University, the Chancellor, the Division, any Faculty Council, or other committee of the Division. [En 01 Sep 13]~~

Proposed Bylaw**180. Sustainability Committee (ABOLISHED 2016)**Justification

In December 2007, then-Division Chair David Gardner created a Sustainability Task Force to identify faculty-relevant issues and infrastructure operational issues at UCSF that have a significant environmental impact. In January 2009, the Academic Senate submitted to Chancellor Bishop the Task Force's recommendations for improving environmental sustainability at UCSF. At that time, the Academic Senate felt that continued faculty efforts were needed to help implement sustainability recommendations and to identify opportunities for faculty to enhance sustainability at UCSF, which culminated into a standing Committee on Sustainability (COS) in 2013.

Three years later, UCSF has its own Sustainability Office, which owes its existence to one of the recommendations from the initial Sustainability Task Force. While the COS has successfully facilitated the Green Challenge, the Climate Champion award, and the Curriculum Workshop and Networking Event, it has failed to develop its own faculty-led initiatives. Indeed, many initiatives that the COS could be engaged with have instead been taken over by UCSF's Sustainability Office. There has also been a general failure to facilitate shared governance in the area of sustainability by the COS. To cite one example, even though the Sustainability Office produces an annual report to the Administration on UCSF's sustainability efforts, to date the COS has had no input into this report. Even more concerning is the apparent lack of interest in serving on the COS by faculty members, as COS meetings are only sparsely attended by appointed members. Indeed, over the past couple of years, the Committee on Committees (CoC) has struggled to not only find regular members to serve on the COS, but also Chairs and even Vice Chairs. One long-standing issue is the committee's initial 'activist' nature, which advocated for certain fossil fuel divestments. However, these members have since rotated off the

committee. Although the committee's activist approach is in some cases welcome, it does not always translate well into local, pragmatic and implementable sustainability initiatives for the UCSF campus.

At its May 5, 2016 meeting, the Coordinating Committee considered a proposal from COS Chair Torsten Wittmann to abolish the COS for the reasons stated. Coordinating Committee members subsequently approved the following: 1) Elimination of the existing COS; 2) create an ad-hoc sustainability committee that would draw its membership from existing COS; and 3) appoint a Senate faculty to member the UCSF Advisory Committee on Sustainability. The ad-hoc Committee on Sustainability would meet twice a year to advance sustainability issues on the UCSF campus.

DRAFT

Background:

Establishment of Sustainability Task Force and Creation of Sustainability Committee

In December 2007, then-Division Chair David Gardner created a Sustainability Task Force to identify faculty-relevant issues and infrastructure operational issues at UCSF that have a significant environmental impact. In January 2009, the Academic Senate submitted to Chancellor Bishop the Task Force’s recommendations for improving environmental sustainability at UCSF.¹ Chancellor Bishop later appointed a Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Sustainability (CACS). The Sustainability Task Force did not meet after submitting recommendations to Chancellor Bishop. However, members of the Academic Senate felt that continued faculty efforts were needed to help implement sustainability recommendations and to identify and respond to additional opportunities for faculty to enhance sustainability at UCSF. Between 2011 and 2013 members of the faculty advocated for the creation of a standing committee on Sustainability. In 2013, the UCSF Academic Senate established a standing committee on Sustainability.

Sustainability Committee Accomplishments

Academic Year	Primary Focus Points for the Year
2012-2013 (Task Force)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding sustainability into UCSF curriculum • Development of guidelines for sustainability for Committee on Academic Personnel • Increasing clinical efficiencies and cost efficiencies • Making Task Force into permanent standing committee • Resolution on use of non-therapeutic antibiotics in meat/poultry through UCSF food services
2013-2014 (Committee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Leadership Council and Carbon Neutrality Initiative • Fossil Fuel Divestment • Sustainable Food • Sustainability in Education
2014-2015 (Committee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UCSF Green Challenge: Dynamic Digital Energy Dashboard • Carbon Neutrality Initiative:

¹ Sustainability Task Force Recommendations

1. Create a sufficiently-funded central Sustainability Office and website to propose, support, track and publicize sustainability efforts at UCSF.
2. Encourage campus leadership to shift the culture at UCSF toward sustainability, including development of a brief, web-based educational module that covers behaviors to improve sustainability practices at UCSF.
3. Support faculty efforts to improve sustainability in all their individual activities, including an Academic Senate policy encouraging faculty to reduce business travel.
4. Encourage and support innovations to improve sustainability in all buildings and facilities occupied by UCSF personnel, such as UCSF Medical Center, SFGH and leased space.
5. Support the inclusion of sustainability into the curriculum at UCSF

2015-2016 (Committee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UCSF Green Challenge: Dynamic Digital Energy Dashboard • Carbon Neutrality Initiative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Curriculum Workshop and Networking Event ○ Faculty Climate Action Champion Program ○ Student Fellowship
--------------------------	--

Sustainability Committee Governance Structure and Bylaws

<p>Membership: This committee shall consist of at least 9 members, including at least:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One representative from each school 2. Ex-Officio – The UCSF Sustainability Manager
<p>Duties</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The chair or designate shall represent UCSF faculty in UC Systemwide sustainability issues. 2. Set goals, make and implement recommendations to reduce the environmental impact of UCSF, include sustainability in the curriculum, and increase awareness of the importance of sustainability at UCSF, focusing on activities under the purview of faculty. 3. Report annually to the Division on progress of UCSF toward achieving sustainability goals. 4. The chair or designate shall represent the Academic Senate on the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability. 5. Select the faculty recipient of the annual Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability Award. 6. To consider and report upon such matters as may be referred to it by the President of the University, the Chancellor, the Division, any Faculty Council, or other committee of the Division.

Issues:

1. Committee on Committees found limited interest among members of the faculty in serving on the Sustainability Committee
2. The UCSF Advisory Committee on Sustainability² fulfills many of the duties of the Sustainability Committee
3. The Office of Sustainability provides an annual report on the process of local sustainability efforts

Proposal:

Reorganize the governance structure such that the UCSF Academic Senate has a subcommittee on sustainability as opposed to a standing committee.

² Charge of UACS

1. Examine UCSF's effect on the environment from a comprehensive perspective;
2. Evaluate existing UCSF policies, procedures and/or programs that affect the environment;
3. Serve as a coordinating body for groups of individuals concerned with sustainability issues at UCSF; and
4. Recommend changes that will increase sustainability at UCSF.