

UCSF Senate Executive Council Report

November 2016



ITEM ONE. Academic Council. The UC Regents are requesting an assessment of Professional Schools Supplemental Tuition, and a revision of the policy governing these. On a positive note, the policy can cover multiple years, vs the current single year approval. The supplemental tuition must be related to costs of education, and note determined by decreases in State support. The assessment is to include some consideration of comparators. A personal note is that comparing UC Professional School tuition to other state schools, without considering the extent to which the state offsets cost of education may be problematic. We are asked to comment on the proposed policy and request for review. The final policy is due in January, for presentation to the Regents in March.



ITEM TWO. Division Meeting: Affiliations. The report of the Affiliations Task Force to the Division went well, with good interaction between the panel and the audience. The written report, which is excellent, is posted on the Senate website. Apparently UCSF has several options for writing in specifics regarding standard of care into a final agreement with any affiliate. Interestingly, I attended a summit of Women's Health leaders (internal medicine) right after the Division meeting, and several attendees commented on affiliations with religious hospitals that their institution had; in summary they said that these are problematic even when various fixes are applied. Often patients have to be scuttled back and forth between sections of hospitals or facilities that have differing policies. UCSF will now conduct a follow-up process to update rules that govern affiliation agreements. Also the Chancellor reported that 85% of donor funds raised by UCSF in recent years went to support people and not brick and mortar, he is planning to send to the Senate some information regarding this.



ITEM THREE. The Space Committee; it is the ultimate frontier. AP&B met on October 25th and then reported back on the 26th a request that the Division not include formation of a Space Committee in the consent calendar. This request was agreed to and then no time was available at the Division meeting for new business. They note overlap in responsibilities between APB and Space; and now would like R&J to weigh in on this. Additionally, APB gets regular updates on space from campus administrators. Historically, the UCSF Division had a Space Committee, and when this work was quieter, Space was rolled in as an AP&B subgroup. Originally we proposed splitting Space out again, perhaps for a few years, because of the level of space planning activity occurring at UCSF. Additionally, Administration had not deferred to AP&B for faculty input into space planning when the 2012 UCSF Space Policy was formulated and in planning Mission Hall. Faculty representation was included in the 2012 planning, but the reps were not chosen by the senate, and all were bench researchers. The Senate was informed after the 2012 policy was finalized, and after Mission Hall was planned. Thus, the UCSF Division had

taken steps to advocate for much more active and representative faculty input into Space Planning at UCSF, including assigning Senate reps to each of the campus' many space committees, including operations, planning oversight, and committees for specific buildings. The Chair of AP&B was placed on the top campus space planning committee, and other committee chairs participated in the other committees. In an effort to coordinate the space reps, and to share insights, we proposed once again splitting off a Space Committee. There is no reason that AP&B members could not participate on this committee. Also, having a Space Committee would facilitate recruitment of new members who are specifically interested in space, and leave AP&B with capacity for the numerous other budget-related UCSF issues. However, the increase in size of the Senate rep pool, reporting directly to the Executive Committee, and better coordination of senate reps was proposed since the effort devoted to space by AP&B varied with interest of the chair, and extent to which other budgetary matters required her or his attention.



ITEM FOUR. Faculty Retention. Joel Dimsdale is interested in data on attrition of faculty, and any examples of faculty who were lured away from the UCs, historically his interest has been focused on clinicians. Please send information you may have to me or Kathy Yang chair of the Clinical Affairs Committee.