

Daniel H. Lowenstein
Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost

August 20, 2018

RE: Senate Comments on the RASP Report/Senate Space Task Force Reports

Dear Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost,

The Senate has reviewed the report from the UCSF Research & Administrative Space Policy (RASP) Working Group, and has a number of comments, which are outlined below (and detailed in the enclosed letters from the Senate's Space Committee and Academic Planning and Budget). On the whole, the Senate applauds RASP's work and report. In making our comments on the RASP report, the Senate is also transmitting the reports from two of our task forces related to Space – the *Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force* and the *Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force*. We feel that the work undertaken by these task forces, and their subsequent principles and recommendations, fill an important gap that will inform the development of a holistic space policy at UCSF. RASP has tasked the Academic Senate with defining both the scientific and educational impacts resulting from the utilization of productive research space. We believe that the principles laid out by the two other task forces holds the potential to inform the development of a holistic space policy that encompasses the research, teaching, and clinical missions of the University.

With respect to the RASP report, the Senate endorses many of its recommendations, especially its recommendation for the use of a dashboard for econometric evaluation of research productivity. We also appreciate RASP's division of dry and wet space in the identification of the metrics for this dashboard. However, in order to make such a dashboard truly comprehensive, the Senate advocates for the use of both quantitative econometric indices and qualitative academic impact metrics in a holistic assessment of research space utilization. Such qualitative metrics may define broad and varied impacts, on scientific knowledge, on diagnosis and treatment, on UCSF's national and international reputation, on teaching and mentoring, and on the University and its local community. The Senate hopes to partner with the University describing and implementing these qualitative metrics, as we feel that they are vital for an accurate of assessment of the productivity of research space.

The Senate also appreciates the fact that metrics will be used at the level of units, Departments, and control points, and not at the level of individual faculty members. That said, econometric indices and academic impact metrics may be collected by control point administrators, with input from individual faculty members to determine the most appropriate data types and data sources.

The revised space policy should also clearly define the process and procedure by which space may be requested and/or reallocated, and establish context for variance in productivity assessments. In addition, it may be wise to include some pilot testing of the "context" used with respect to variances in productivity.

As stated above, RASP's work represents a significant step forward towards the development of quantitative metrics to better measure research space, and ultimately allocate and audit it. By design, the RASP report does not address either educational space or space for non-direct patient care activities of clinicians and their staff. The Senate observes that historically, campus space allocation has focused on the research aspect of the mission, and UCSF Health space allocation has focused on direct patient care. However, space policies related to the other aspects central to UCSF's mission (education, administration/leadership, and service) have received less attention. For this reason, the Senate charged the two above-mentioned task forces to develop principals and key recommendations to space for clinicians and education space.

Both sets of principals related to space for non-direct patient care activities and educational space are very closely-aligned. For the former, the Senate espouses the following in allocating administrative space to clinicians: transparency, fairness, consistency, economic sustainability, strategic prioritization to align with all UCSF missions (patient care, research, education, administration/leadership, and service), and enabling faculty and staff success. In espousing these principles, the *Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force* urges UCSF leaders to seek input about space design, assignment, oversight, and governance from representative clinical faculty and staff who perform non-direct patient care activities (e.g., include as members on space development, management and building governance committees). Emerging from these principles is the key recommendation that every UCSF faculty member have one private assigned office at UCSF for non-direct patient care activities with hotel space at other locations if a clinician works at multiple locations. While 75 sf would be the minimum private office size for conducting non-patient care activities for technical and senior professional work, 90 to 100 sf is the standard private office size and would be more conducive to enabling faculty success and morale. However, a private office should not be misconstrued as a single room dedicated to only one person for their exclusive use. Rather, a private office refers to access to a room separated from the open office environment that ensures privacy for confidential work, sensitive discussions, and quiet reflection. It can be shared by one or more members of the faculty, but should meet the needs of those faculty members.

Likewise, the *Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force* recommends that all four components of the academic enterprise (education, research, clinical care, and administration) be considered when assigning existing educational space and creating new space, and include appropriate input from educators throughout the entire process of design, assignment, building, furnishing, oversight, and management. Education space assignments across educational programs should consider the needs of all programs involved, and space shared across the professional schools should promote interdisciplinary educational and clinical experiences. Education space design should also be responsive, sensitive, and adaptable to evolving advances in education and pedagogy, especially with respect to technology, by assessing and mapping the potential educational activities as part of the initial design of such space. Two recommendations that we would like to highlight concern the governance and scheduling of educational space. First, UCSF educators should be included in the membership of all UCSF space design, assignment, oversight, and utilization/management committees. These "Education Space Liaisons" will consist of educator faculty members and learners. Second, the Senate proposes developing and instituting a unified, seamless and transparent education space reservation/real-time use/cancellation system that crosses the campus and UCSF Health.

The Senate appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on not only the RASP recommendations but also on broader space policy, including education space and space for clinicians. I invite you to read the enclosed reports from both of these special task forces, which we hope will inform the development of a future space policy at UCSF. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,



David Teitel, MD, 2017-19 Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Encl. (5)

CC: Paul Jenny, Senior Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration
Sharmila Majumdar, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
Srikantan S. Nagarajan, Chair Academic Senate Committee on Space
Russell C. Pieper, Chair, Academic Senate Academic Planning & Budget
Arianne Teherani, Chair, Academic Senate Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force
Louise Walter, Chair, Academic Senate Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force

August 6, 2018

David Teitel, MD
Chair, Academic Senate
UCSF

RE: Research Space Productivity Metrics - Recommendations

Dear Dr. Teitel,

The UCSF Academic Senate Space Committee (SPC) thanks the Research and Administration Space (RASP) Work Group for its devotion to careful diligence review, data synthesis, and development of useful metrics, as reflected in its final report. SPC very much appreciates the opportunity to have engaged in interactive discussions through our representatives to RASP during the deliberation process.

SPC fully endorses the RASP report, especially its recommendation for the use of a dashboard for econometric evaluation of research productivity. SPC understands that the RASP work product would be used at the level of units, departments, and control points, but not at the level of individual faculty members. SPC appreciates the expressed need to separate evaluation of wet and dry lab spaces and the recognition that UCSF's reputation as a first-rate research institution stems from its portfolio of diverse research activities. Embracement of actionable policies that emerge from comprehensive analysis of space utilization will help UCSF to sustain growth well into the future.

SPC enthusiastically welcomes the RASP recommendation that in addition to econometric indices of space utilization, academic impact metrics in mission critical areas should be considered by directors, chairs, and administrators of control points. Recognition of academic impact, specific to individual disciplines, would provide other important information about research space utilization not captured by econometric indices, such as synergies with the critical areas of teaching, mentoring, and clinical care.

SPC recommends the adoption of a comprehensive dashboard that features use of both quantitative econometric evaluations and qualitative academic impact metrics in a holistic assessment of research space utilization. The two components of research space productivity assessment and data sources to gauge academic impact are featured below.

| Research Space Utilization Dashboard | |
|--|---|
| Econometric indices of space utilization and sustainability | Academic impact metrics in mission critical areas |
| ICR / ASF | Impact of research and creative activity (number of publications, number of citations, h-indices, page ranks, article downloads, number of patents, number of books). |
| Expenditures / ASF | Impact of translational science on diagnostics and treatment (number of active protocols, etc.). |
| % ASF "PI Pending" | Impact on UCSF reputation (national or international leadership). Impact on team science (degree of collaborations between scientists). |
| Rooms "PI Pending" > 2 years | Impact on teaching and mentoring in research spaces. |
| ASF / Occupant | Impact on university, community, and professional service. |
| ICR – indirect cost recovery. ASF – assigned square feet. PI – principal investigator. | |

A Space Governance Policy that adopts the Research Space Dashboard for uniform data collection across all Schools will enhance space utilization transparency and inform decision-making in space stewardship. Once data are collected over several years, meaningful longitudinal and cross-sectional analyses will be possible. In turn, those insights may shape research space allocation, research portfolio management, campus planning, among others governance decisions. SPC is pleased to provide recommendations to operationalize the Dashboard, addressing econometric indices of space utilization and sustainability, and academic impact metrics in mission critical areas.

- Econometric indices may be collected by control point administrators, with input from individual faculty members to reconcile differences in measurements.
- Academic impact metrics may be collected by control point administrators, with input from individual faculty members to determine the most appropriate data types and data sources, and to reconcile differences in assessments.
- Data capture can be facilitated by taking advantage of existing reporting systems, such as UCSF Profiles and other publically available data sources. The table below highlights candidate data types and data sources.
- The frequency of data capture for econometric indices and academic impact metrics should be annual, if at all feasible.
- Control points should propose weightings for the two evaluation components that most accurately reflect research productivity to enable comparisons within and across Schools.
- The administration may wish to consider a one-year pilot to perfect processes for implementation of the Dashboard.
- The Academic Senate has access to faculty members who specialize in mixed quantitative and qualitative data analytics to assist the administration in the creation of summary composite measure(s) of space productivity.

Data Sources

| Academic Impact | Data Type | Data Source |
|---|---|--|
| Impact of research and creative activity | Publications | PubMed Web of Science |
| | Journal Impact | Journal Citation Reports Bibliometric Report |
| | Citation-based analyses and meta-analysis citations | Microsoft Academic Search Cochrane Collaboration |
| Impact of translational science on diagnostics and treatment | Technology licensing agreements | UCOP Office of Technology Transfer Office of Sponsored Research – Industry Contracts Division |
| | Material Transfer Agreements | US Patent and Trademark Office |
| | Patents | UCOP Office of Technology Transfer |
| Impact on UCSF reputation | News citations | University Relations |
| | Program ranking | U.S. News |
| | Awards and honors | UCSF Profiles |
| Impact on team science | Publications | PubMed Web of Science Surveys, interviews, attestations |
| | co-authorship network analyses | |
| | Subject matter experts' assessment of team science productivity | |
| Impact on teaching and mentoring in research spaces | External Program Review | Graduate Division Registrar Senate Office of Academic Affairs |
| | Courses offered | |
| | Students and trainees | |
| | Campus-wide teaching and mentorship awards | |
| Impact on university, community, and professional service | University service | Advance |
| | Community service | |
| | Professional service | |

In summary, SPC offers the following recommendations:

- The revised Space Governance Policy (Campus Administrative Policy 600-24) adopts a Research Space Dashboard that deploys both quantitative and qualitative metrics, enabling transparency, and analyses accessible to all stakeholders (e.g., control points, UCSF Space Committee, and UCSF Space Management Subcommittee).
- The revised Space Governance Policy should communicate how Dashboard metrics will be used in decision-making on actions that impact research space allocation, reassignment, augmentation, and contraction.
- The relative weightings of quantitative and qualitative metrics for specific research programs should be agreed upon by control point administrators and their constituent faculty members to promote best practices in internal control, and campus diversity and inclusion.
- The stewardship review of Chairs and administrators should include space stewardship evaluation, using Dashboard metrics to ascertain managerial effectiveness and fairness.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Srikantan".

Srikantan S. Nagarajan, PhD
Chair, Committee on Space
UCSF Academic Senate
2017-2018

July 17, 2018

David Teitel, MD
Chair, Academic Senate
UCSF

RE: RASP Recommendations

Dear Dr. Teitel,

The Academic Planning and Budget Committee applauds the work of the Research and Administrative Space Work Group (RASP) on the proposed metrics for evaluating campus space utilization and productivity. We appreciate the extensive time and energy dedicated by campus leaders to improving space utilization and the space governance structure at UCSF.

We would like to express our support for the comments provided by the Academic Senate's Space Committee concerning the use of non-economic scientific and academic productivity metrics in space evaluation considerations. In addition to the financial metrics proposed by RASP, we fully support the inclusion and consideration of non-economic scientific and academic productivity metrics in the revised UC Space Governance Policy. We also agree that the revised policy should clearly define the process and procedure by which space may be requested and/or reallocated, and establish context for variance in productivity assessments. In addition, it may be wise to include some pilot testing of the "context" used with respect to variances in productivity.

That said, we would add the following two suggestions to the Space Committee's comments and recommendations:

- The revised UC Space Governance Policy should include a framework for the relative weighting of metrics; and
- The policy should stipulate that detailed data relating to individual PIs should not be utilized for other purposes (i.e., promotion decisions).

Thank you for the opportunity to review the RASP recommendations.

Sincerely,



Russ Pieper, PhD
Chair, Academic Planning and Budget
UCSF Academic Senate



Report of Principles and Policies Underpinning Non-Direct Patient Care Activities

Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force

Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force

July 2018

Table of Contents

- Acknowledgements..... 3**
- I. Overview..... 4**
 - Introduction..... 4
 - Process 4
- II. Background and Concerns..... 5**
 - Non-Direct Patient Care Activities of Clinicians and Staff 5
 - Review of Existing UCSF Space Policies 5
 - Criteria for Minimum Office Space 6
 - Academic Space Town Hall Feedback from Faculty 7
- III. Recommendations 8**
 - Principles Underpinning Allocation of Space for Non-Direct Patient Care Activities 8
 - Policies that the Administration Would Use for Space Assignment, Oversight, and Governance..... 8
- IV. Conclusions 10**

Acknowledgements

This report reflects the collective expertise, experiences, and contributions of the task force's work, compiled by:

Task Force:

Louise Walter, MD, Chair
Professor and Chief
Department of Medicine, Division of Geriatrics
UCSF School of Medicine

Elsbeth Kalendarian, DDS, MPH, PhD
Professor and Department Chair
Department of Preventive and Restorative
Dental Science
UCSF School of Dentistry

Janel Long-Boyle, PharmD, PhD
Associate Professor
Department of Clinical Pharmacy
UCSF School of Pharmacy

Mary Lynch, RN, MPH, MS, FAAN
Clinical Professor
Department of Family Health Care Nursing
UCSF School of Nursing

Anita Moon-Grady, MD
Professor of Clinical Pediatrics
Department of Pediatrics
UCSF School of Medicine

Hope Rugo, MD
Professor
Department of Medicine
UCSF School of Medicine

Bradley Sharpe, MD
Professor
Department of Medicine
UCSF School of Medicine

Bani Tamraz, PharmD, PhD
Assistant Professor
Department of Clinical Pharmacy
UCSF School of Pharmacy

Senate Staff:

Todd Giedt
Executive Director, UCSF Academic Senate

Kenneth Laslavic, JD
Senior Analyst, UCSF Academic Senate

The Task Force wishes to acknowledge members of the UCSF faculty and administration, whose expertise informed its work and this report.

Faculty:

David Teitel, MD
Professor
Department of Pediatrics
UCSF School of Medicine

Vineeta Singh, MD
Professor
Department of Neurology
UCSF School of Medicine

Arianne Teherani, PhD
Professor
Department of Medicine
UCSF School of Medicine

Administration:

Dan Lowenstein, MD
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
UCSF

Lori Yamauchi
Associate Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
UCSF

Chris Shaffer
University Librarian
UCSF

I. Overview

Introduction

The mission of UCSF is to advance health worldwide through excellence in Education, Research, and Patient Care. Historically, campus space allocation has focused on the Research aspect of the mission statement and UCSF Health space allocation has focused on direct Patient Care. However, space policies related to the other aspects central to UCSF's mission (Education, Administrative/Leadership, and Service) have received less attention. Space decision-making should consider all of UCSF's missions.

Process

At the request of the UCSF Academic Senate Space Committee, the Academic Senate Committee on Committees established an Academic Space for Clinicians' Non-Clinical Activities Policy Task Force (abbreviated as Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force) in January 2018. Committee members were appointed in February and met at least monthly March – June 2018. Membership included at least one faculty member from each School who conducts clinical work and incorporated diversity in academic series, ranks and campuses. Broad ideas and opinions were obtained from invited speakers (Dan Lowenstein, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost; Lori Yamauchi, Associate Vice Chancellor Campus Planning; Vineeta Singh, Professor and Member of Senate Space Committee) and an Academic Senate Space Town Hall on May 15, 2018. The chair also met collaboratively with David Teitel, Chair of the UCSF Academic Senate; Arianne Teherani, Chair of the Education Space Policy Task Force; and Chris Shaffer, University Librarian.

The Task Force was charged with development and recommending:

1. **Principles** underpinning the allocation of space for non-direct patient care activities of clinicians and their staff.
2. **Policies** that the administration would use for:
 - Space assignment during space planning;
 - Oversight; and
 - Governance during space utilization/management of assigned space.

II. Background and Concerns

Non-Direct Patient Care Activities of Clinicians and Staff

The Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force determined that all UCSF clinicians and their staff conduct a broad range of non-direct patient care activities that are an integral part of who we are at UCSF (e.g., educators, leaders, mentors, collaborators, public servants). All faculty, regardless of whether their primary focus is Research, Education, Patient Care or Administration, engage in these activities that advance both their careers and UCSF missions.

Clinicians' indirect-cost generating research and direct patient care activities are the focus of other space committees. Therefore, the Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force did not focus on those activities. Rather, we focused on other non-direct patient care activities by clinicians that have generally not been incorporated into space decision-making, such as patient care coordination and clinical administration, education, mentorship, quality improvement, and scholarly projects that do not generate indirect costs as well as local and national service activities:

- Examples of Patient Care Coordination and Clinical Administrative Activities: Telephone calls with patients and families; Team meetings; Completion of clinical forms and other documentation; Responding to Inbox/MyChart Messages; Clinical program leadership/administration (e.g., budget, strategic planning, resource allocation, HR activities).
- Examples of Education Activities: Precepting; Confidential trainee feedback and coaching; Preparation of lectures/curricula; Writing/Publishing; Residency and Fellowship program leadership/administration (e.g., interviewing, evaluations, program administration); Simulation experiences involving patient/family scenarios.
- Examples of Mentorship Activities: Red-inking manuscripts; Ad-hoc and structured advising/mentoring for trainees and junior faculty.
- Examples of Quality Improvement and Scholarly Projects: Data collection and evaluation; Writing; Quality improvement program leadership/administration (physician champions are often clinicians).
- Examples of Local and National Service: Journal editorial boards; Chairing local and national committees; Board memberships for local and national non-profit healthcare organizations.

All these activities are desired and expected for clinical faculty advancement and promotion at UCSF, with varying weights of importance placed on activities depending on each clinical faculty member's track/series. *Space policies should account for the needs of clinical faculty who are expected to do a variety of non-clinical activities, whether they identify primarily as a researcher, clinician, or educator.*

Review of Existing UCSF Space Policies

- **Campus Administrative Policy 600-24**: UCSF's policy on space governance and principles was published in 2014 as "Campus Administrative Policy 600-24." This policy indicates that space should be allocated, used, and managed with a view towards supporting all aspects of UCSF's mission (Educational, Research, Clinical Care, and

Administrative). The policy lists several principles underpinning space decision-making at UCSF: Fairness, Consistency, Transparency, Economic Sustainability, Strategic Prioritization (i.e., alignment with overall UCSF Vision, Mission and Strategic Goals and priorities), and Non-Permanence of Space (i.e., space is not designated in perpetuity). Metrics for space accountability included: economic criteria for Research (i.e., indirect costs; total expenditures relative to assignable square feet (asf)); density criteria for new administrative space (i.e., 150 sf per person); classroom hour usage for Education (i.e., time, distribution); clinical productivity criteria for direct Patient Care (i.e., agreed upon standard such as wRVUs, patient satisfaction).

- **Space Utilization Policies of UCSF Schools:** UCSF Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy have space utilization policies, whereas the Schools of Nursing and Dentistry have established space practices that have not been codified as policy. The School of Medicine (SOM) Space Governance Policy 2010 (revised 2/2017) and the School of Pharmacy (SOP) 2016 Space Utilization Guidelines (revised 5/18/17) are similar. Both policies indicate space requests are reviewed on individual merit and strategic priorities (e.g., recruitment of department chairs, funded recruitments, funded programs, campus research core facilities, etc.). Also, each requesting unit's current space utilization is reviewed based on eight criteria for Research space (alignment with School priorities; Department goals; collaborative transdisciplinary multi-site research; translational research; transformative research; capacity to contribute to operational costs; in-kind contributions to research community—space, instrumentation, and staff; and extramural funding—direct and indirect cost expenditures per asf) as well as density standards for Administrative space set by Campus Administrative Policy 600-24. Principles include transparency, fairness, and consistency. Both SOM and SOP space utilization policies focus primarily on Research space.

None of these space policies include any metrics of success for the numerous non-direct patient care activities listed above that are critical to UCSF's overall mission and to faculty and staff success. Also, none of these policies consider the economic costs of faculty and staff burnout, unhappiness, and attrition. The focus of these policies is accountability of space. None of the policies include metrics or discussion about the responsibility of UCSF to provide space necessary for faculty and staff to be successful. *An additional principle that should underpin decision-making for non-direct patient care activities is Enable Faculty and Staff Success.*

Criteria for Minimum Office Space

Dr. Lowenstein asked our task force to review criteria for minimum office size. We reviewed Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and California OSHA (Cal/OSHA) regulations, which do not discuss minimum requirements for dimensions of an office or cubical. In reviewing standard U.S. office sizes for professionals, 75 sf would be the minimum private office size for conducting non-patient care activities and is similar to the standard office size for clerical work. For technical and senior professional work, 90 to 100 sf is the standard private office size and may be more conducive to enabling faculty success and morale.

Academic Space Town Hall Feedback from Faculty

- There are multiple UCSF space committees and multiple efforts occurring to develop space policies and principles but no central location to examine updates or voice concerns/approval. There should be one central place (e.g., website) that provides findings and recommendations from each space committee and allows faculty and staff to provide input.
- Space decisions are not transparent and it remains unclear who makes space decisions at UCSF, the basis upon which space decisions are made or if there is a consistent application process for space.
- It is important to understand the heterogeneity of the UCSF faculty. Every faculty member contributes to multiple missions, which makes each faculty member's space needs unique. Space decisions should consider what faculty need for success. Success likely cannot be captured by quantitative metrics alone but will require qualitative assessments as well.
- Faculty prefer shared offices with a door over individual cubicles. There also is general agreement with 1) having a standard office size; 2) having one private assigned office at UCSF with hotel space at other locations; 3) hotel spaces (e.g., focus rooms) do not substitute for having a private office space; and 4) faculty use space at varying times during the week such that a shared office can be used by multiple faculty as private space if there is a system for requesting/using space on an individual basis.
- As careers evolve so does the need for space and privacy (i.e., natural progression towards needing more space and privacy with increasing seniority as leadership, mentorship and service activities grow).
- It is critical that sufficient space be provided to support staff.
- Draft space proposals should be presented at Works-In-Progress sessions for feedback.

III. Recommendations

Principles Underpinning Allocation of Space for Non-Direct Patient Care Activities

The same principles that guide Research and direct Patient Care space should guide Non-Direct Patient Care space for clinicians: transparency, fairness, consistency, economic sustainability, and strategic prioritization. We also suggest an additional guiding principle: enable faculty and staff success with regards to advancement/promotion, retention and resiliency.

- Transparency
- Fairness
- Consistency
- Economic Sustainability (including costs of faculty/staff attrition)
- Strategic Prioritization to Align with All UCSF Missions (Patient Care, Research, Education, Administration/Leadership, and Service)
- Enable Faculty and Staff Success

To incorporate these principles into space decision-making, UCSF leaders should seek input about space design, assignment, oversight, and governance from representative clinical faculty and staff who perform non-direct patient care activities (e.g., include as members on space development and management committees).

Policies that the Administration Would Use for Space Assignment, Oversight, and Governance

Space assignment, oversight, and governance should include a combination of quantitative metrics and qualitative assessments/holistic review that reflect the principles above. Having a holistic review process acknowledges that one-size-fits-all quantitative metrics do not capture the heterogeneous roles of clinical faculty or holistically measure success. In addition, these space policies and metrics should be reviewed and updated at least every 3 years.

Quantitative metrics:

- The ultimate goal should be for every UCSF faculty member to have one private assigned office at UCSF for non-direct patient care activities with hotel space at other locations if a clinician works at multiple locations. A private office is defined by acoustic and visual privacy and allows for personalized workspace.
- Metrics for prioritizing private office space should reflect that there is a natural progression towards needing more space and privacy with increasing seniority as leadership, mentorship, and service activities grow (i.e., quantitative metrics should include seniority level and leadership roles). Space assignment is not permanent and priority for private office space declines after retirement (e.g., emeritus and recall faculty).

Holistic review:

- The ultimate goal is for every UCSF faculty member and staff to successfully engage in non-direct patient care activities that advance their careers, overall well-being, and missions of UCSF.
- Metrics for prioritizing private office space should include a holistic review of faculty success in advancing non-direct patient care imperatives and the need for privacy to

successfully accomplish these activities. Also, interviews should be conducted to ask whether space was a contributing factor to clinical faculty leaving UCSF (e.g., exit interview data) or to failed faculty searches.

- Space assignment should consider whether there are strategic neighborhoods in which proximity of several faculty and staff to each other maximizes success in advancing non-direct patient care activities.

IV. Conclusions

All UCSF clinical faculty, regardless of whether their primary focus is Research, Education, Patient Care, or Administration, engage in non-direct patient care activities (e.g., care coordination, education, leadership, mentorship, administration, quality improvement, service) which advance both their careers and UCSF missions. These activities are desired and expected for faculty advancement/promotion at UCSF and all faculty share a need for dedicated space in which to successfully accomplish these non-direct patient care imperatives.

In addition to space accountability, UCSF has a responsibility to provide space that enables faculty and staff success in performing non-direct patient care activities. Therefore, in addition to the guiding principles listed in current UCSF space policies (transparency, fairness, consistency, economic sustainability, and strategic prioritization), we suggest adding the guiding principle: Enable Faculty and Staff Success.

To fully incorporate these guiding principles into space decision-making, representative clinical faculty and staff who perform non-direct patient care activities should be included on space development and management committees. Also, there needs to be greater transparency about who makes space decisions, the application process for space, and the basis upon which space decisions are made.

The ultimate goal should be for every UCSF faculty member to have one private assigned office at UCSF for non-direct patient care activities with hotel space at other locations if a clinician works at multiple locations. Space assignment, oversight, and governance should include a combination of quantitative metrics and holistic review that assess faculty and staff success in advancing non-direct patient care imperatives as well as the need for privacy to successfully accomplish these activities.

August 6, 2018

David Teitel, MD
Chair, Academic Senate
UCSF

RE: Recommendations of Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force and the Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force

Dear Dr. Teitel,

The UCSF Academic Senate's Committee on Space (SPC) thanks the Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force and the Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force for their recommendations of principles underpinning the allocation of space and policies for space design, assignment, oversight, and governance.

SPC endorses the principles and policies recommendations within each task force report. As the administration considers all recommendations, SPC respectfully offers clarifying comments to provide context for the following specific recommendation by the Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force:

“...that every UCSF faculty member have one private assigned office at UCSF for non-direct patient care activities with hotel space at other locations if a clinician works at multiple locations. A private office is defined by acoustic and visual privacy and allows for personalized workspace.”

The term private office in this context should not be misconstrued as a single room dedicated to only one person for their exclusive use. Rather, a private office refers to access to a room separated from the open office environment that ensures privacy for confidential work, sensitive discussions, and quiet reflection. It can be shared by one or more members of the faculty. In addition, the recommendation to build private offices is practically applicable to UCSF managed facilities, not UCSF affiliates. Access to a private office at a particular campus should be prioritized in favor of UCSF faculty who work primarily at that campus, and access to hotel space should be prioritized to UCSF faculty who work primarily at a UCSF managed facility.

SPC recognizes that UCSF is constrained by the amount of space it may develop and declining state funds to support infrastructure, ultimately limiting the University's ability to provide single offices greater than 75 square feet. SPC agrees with the Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force recommendation that 90 to 100 square foot offices may be more conducive to enabling faculty success and morale, but remains fully cognizant of the many needs for space the University must consider in its commitment to office space size for faculty.

SPC looks forward to the opportunity to review draft revisions to a Campuswide Space Governance Policy, which provides consistent guidance for implementation procedures determined by each of the four Schools. As of the drafting of this letter, only the Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy have written procedures for space governance. SPC understands that the Schools of Nursing and Dentistry will need to develop written procedures. While the details of local practices may vary depending on the size and type of space within a particular school, all procedures should adhere to campus policy to the extent possible.

SPC notes that any space policy should reflect the reality that UCSF faculty fulfill multiple concurrent roles that support the University's mission of patient care, education, research, and service. Individual faculty members will have different emphasis among the four mission pillars. Faculty needs for non-research space to best carry out the University's mission are embodied in the recommendations of the Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force and the Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Srikantan".

Srikantan S. Nagarajan, PhD
Chair, Committee on Space
UCSF Academic Senate
2017-2018



Report of Principles and Policies for Educator and Education Space

Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force

Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force

July 2018

Table of Contents

- Acknowledgements..... 3**
- I. Overview..... 4**
 - Introduction..... 4
 - Process 4
- II. Background and Concerns..... 5**
- III. Recommendations 6**
 - Principles 6
 - Policies 7
- IV. Conclusions 10**

Acknowledgements

This report reflects the collective expertise, experiences, and contributions of the task force's work, compiled by:

Task Force:

Arianne Teherani, PhD, Chair
Professor
Department of Medicine
UCSF School of Medicine

Timothy Berger, MD
Professor
Department of Dermatology
UCSF School of Medicine

Sara Hughes, MA, EdD
Professor
Department of Preventive and Restorative
Dental Sciences
UCSF School of Dentistry

Barbara Koenig, PhD
Professor and Director
UCSF Program in Bioethics
UCSF School of Nursing

Dana Rohde, PhD
Professor
Department of Anatomy
UCSF School of Medicine

Lowell Tong, MD
Professor
Department of Psychiatry
UCSF School of Medicine

Candy Tsourounis, PharmD
Professor
Department of Clinical Pharmacy
UCSF School of Pharmacy

Senate Staff:

Todd Giedt
Executive Director, UCSF Academic Senate

Kenneth Laslavic, JD
Senior Analyst, UCSF Academic Senate

The Task Force wishes to acknowledge members of the UCSF faculty and administration, whose expertise informed its work and this report.

Faculty:

David Teitel, MD
Professor
Department of Pediatrics
UCSF School of Medicine

Louise Walter, MD
Professor and Chief
Department of Medicine, Division of Geriatrics
UCSF School of Medicine

Sandriijn Van Schaik, MD
Professor
Department of Pediatrics
UCSF School of Medicine

Administration:

Lori Yamauchi
Associate Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
UCSF

Chris Shaffer
University Librarian
UCSF

I. Overview

Introduction

Members of the Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force recognize the vital role of space to establishing a world-class health sciences institution and excellence in education.

Process

At the request of the UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Space, the Academic Senate Committee on Committees established an Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force in January 2018. Committee members were appointed in February and held five meetings between April and June 2018 to discuss principles and policies on educator and education space. An initial draft of principles was presented at the Academic Senate Committee on Space on April 4, 2018 and the Town Hall on Space on May 15, 2018. A subsequent iteration of the report with principles and policies was shared with the Academic Senate Executive Council, July 19, 2018. The report incorporates feedback from the Town Hall on Space and discussions with key stakeholders including David Teitel, Chair of the UCSF Academic Senate; Louise Walter, Chair of the Academic Space for Clinicians Policy Task Force; Chris Shaffer, University Librarian; and Sandrijn Van Schaik, MD, Director of the Kanbar Simulation Center.

The Task Force was charged with developing and recommending:

1. **Principles** underpinning the allocation of space for education purposes including teaching space and work space for teachers and their staff.
2. **Policies** that the administration would use for:
 - Space design, from earliest stages such as Building Programming and the Basis of Design, to later stages such as the Furnishings, Fixtures, and Equipment phase;
 - Space assignment during space planning;
 - Oversight; and
 - Governance during space utilization/management of assigned space.

II. Background and Concerns

The ensuing principles and policies apply to design, assignment, oversight, and governance for *education space* (e.g. classroom, laboratory, simulation, auditorium, conference rooms, and multi-use clinical space) and *educator space* (e.g. faculty offices, faculty hotel spaces for educators who travel between and spend significant multiple sites to teach or mentor). The principles and policies outlined in this document apply to *learners in educational programs* within all health sciences schools (dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy), the graduate division, post graduate programs (e.g. residencies, fellowships), and specialized training programs (e.g. self-supporting masters programs). *Educators* are faculty engaged in education (e.g. educational curriculum or program development, leadership, research, and teaching and/or mentoring) in any of the educational programs listed above. While the scope of this report does not explicitly focus on education administrative staff, their workspace needs are relevant to the education enterprise and are included in certain portions of this report.

III. Recommendations

Principles

Overarching Principles

1. As an academic health sciences center, all four parts of the academic enterprise (education, research, clinical care, and administration) will be taken into account when considering the assignment of space.
2. Newly built and renovated education space will include participation and input from educators throughout the entire process of design, assignment, building, furnishing, oversight, and management.
3. There must be ample and flexible education space for learners including classroom, laboratory, simulation, surgical skills laboratory, auditorium, and multi-use clinical learning space.
4. There must be ample educator space for faculty educators including faculty offices, faculty hotel office and other work spaces for educators who travel between and spend significant time amongst multiple sites to teach or mentor.
5. Educator and education space assignment should allow for reasonable physical proximity, communication, and community with educators' administrative staff, learners, and other educators.
6. Education space assignment, oversight, and governance will incorporate environmental sustainability.
7. Equity and inclusion are core and fundamental values to the design, assignment, and oversight of education and educator space.

Strategic Principles

1. Education space assignment for shared space across educational programs will consider the needs of all programs, involve collaboration on resource sharing and physical structure, and follow shared discussion and governance process for space utilization, timeline coordination, and decision making.
2. Education space designed to be shared across the professional schools should promote interdisciplinary educational and clinical experiences.
3. Space will be technology enriched with predictable and functional amenities and tools (e.g., teleconferencing hardware compatible with standard UCSF software such as Zoom, Wi-fi, smart boards) and technical support staff who guarantee availability and efficiency.

Qualities of Space to Optimize Education

1. In the design of new buildings or renovations of existing buildings, each project must incorporate the needs of faculty educators including space for teaching, workplace learning, and simulation.
2. Education space design should be responsive and adaptable to evolving advances in education, assess and map the potential educational activities as part of initial design, foster a sense of cohesiveness among educators and learners, and be adaptable to the needs of the individual educational programs as well as interprofessional education.
3. Education space will support learner needs for concentration and privacy/confidentiality.
4. Oversight and governance of space allocation and metrics for education space will address the needs of specialized training programs (e.g., self-supporting masters programs, non-

ACGME post-residency fellowship), which may not fit the standard school-based model of space negotiation, rent, and utilization.

Individual Educator Space

1. Educator space will be designed to meet needs for focused work as well as collaborative work; visual and auditory privacy needs; and confidentiality concerns such as HIPAA and FERPA.
2. Oversight and governance of space allocation, including metrics, will take account of how educator faculty's active use of the assigned academic workstation may vary because of clinical, teaching, research, or administrative work at other sites and include available dynamic workspace at all sites which faculty who are mobile can utilize.
3. Educator space design must account for the mobility of faculty including diverse work flows (i.e. how people operate and move through their space in the course of fulfilling their work responsibilities). This includes touchdown space at all sites with electrical charging, reliable UCSF Wi-Fi/ethernet ports, and temporary secure storage in addition to available private space for meetings, and quiet work and group space for collaborative work.

Policies

The Educator and Education Space policies below propose strategies of managing educator and education space in all phases of the space planning process. While the guiding principles articulated earlier underpin the design, assignment, oversight, and governance of education and educator space, the policies propose methods to enact these principles.

1. Educator and education spaces will be purposefully built into existing and future buildings on all UCSF campuses where educational activities are expected.
2. When designing new buildings or significant renovations at any UCSF campus or UCSF health sites, UCSF leadership will:
 - a. Include educator and education spaces
 - b. Consider flexibility in the use of those spaces in design
 - c. Regularly maintain and update instructional technology and services
3. Each campus site will have suitable hotel work spaces (offices and workstations) for use by faculty and their education staff who spend significant time at campus sites other than where their primary academic office is located. These spaces will include:
 - a. Reliable Wi-Fi/ethernet ports
 - b. Portable charging stations
 - c. Teleconferencing
 - d. Secure space and storage
 - e. Private space for meetings
 - f. Private space for quiet work
 - g. Common break area with facilities for food storage and consumption
4. Proximal simulation facilities maximize important practice time, which has been demonstrated to enhance patient outcomes. Since simulation education is often most effective if it occurs in or close to the workplace, facilities for simulation need to be

incorporated into the space design across campus sites where clinical education takes place. This is particularly important for those clinical environments for which simulation is an essential preparatory tool, for example, all inpatient environments in which learners acquire teamwork and resuscitation skills as well as surgery, anesthesia, and emergency medicine.

5. UCSF educators will be included in the membership on all UCSF space design, assignment, oversight, and utilization/management committees. The educators serving on the various space committees (heretofore referred to as “Education Space Liaisons”) and will consist of educator faculty members and learners. Educator faculty members who serve as Education Space Liaisons will be those who spend a significant portion of their time in education in the health sciences schools (dentistry, medicine, nursing, and pharmacy), the graduate division, the post graduate programs, and specialized training programs; and will include representation from education from a variety faculty tracks and ranks.

Education Space Liaisons will represent and communicate about current and projected school, program, and departmental educational needs at a quarterly (or more frequently when needed) Education Space Liaisons meeting. Decisions or questions from the Education Space Liaisons meeting will be reported to the UCSF Academic Senate Space Committee and the (campus) Space Committee.

Education Space Liaisons will:

- a. Represent educational priorities across all campuses and schools (applicable phase: all).
- b. Seek input on the space needs of learners and educators within the school, program, and department they represent that will be housed in the new building/renovated facility (applicable phase: all).
- c. Liaise with colleagues and learners to ensure that the ongoing design meets their school, program, and department’s educational needs (applicable phase: design).
- d. Play a leadership role in space design for new building/renovated facilities and provide input on design (applicable phase: design including furniture, fixtures, and equipment).
- e. Consider space assignment based on educational priorities of all UCSF educational programs (applicable phase: assignment).
- f. Contribute to creating a defined process and transparent objective criteria for space assignments and reassignments, with early engagement of relevant stakeholders (applicable phase: design, assignment).
- g. Assess and forecast present and future need for educator and education space every five years to respond to educational science and technological advances (applicable phase: all).
- h. Audit educator and education space based on need and use and adjust process and objectives based on changes at the UCSF and the external educational environment including advances in education science (applicable phase: assignment, oversight, utilization/management).
- i. Contribute to creating process and rules to resolve competing conflicts when there are more needs than education and educator space (applicable phase: all).
- j. Review space assignment and utilization/management annually through a formal evaluation process to determine whether space assignments are optimal (applicable phase: all). This responsibility will involve the Education Space Liaisons jointly:

- Design of an evaluation system to measure and monitor ongoing utilization of space and satisfaction with the oversight processes. This will include but not be limited to the review of annual data on the use/cancellation of education and educator space including hotel-based space.
 - Review the performance of the department/school education and educator space by work environment to ensure that space is being used as prescribed. This review will focus on:
 - Current utilization including the extent to which the space use is aligned with the mission and goals of the unit as well as institutional priorities.
 - A system to match real needs with actual reservations in order to eliminate reserved but unused space.
 - Plans for future utilization and any anticipated or planned change.
6. Develop and implement a singular seamless transparent educator and education space reservation/real-time use/cancellations system that crosses campus and UCSF Health. The reservation system will provide detailed information on the capacity (e.g. teleconferencing, audio) of each space. The spaces will be secure and use of the space will be monitored through electronic individual access to the space. In addition, the reservation system will collect and report on data for the evaluation system to the UCSF Educator and Education Space Committee to make decisions about ongoing utilization of space and satisfaction of the oversight processes. Data from the reservation system in conjunction with decisions by the UCSF Educator and Education Space Committee will be used for ongoing curricular planning including:
- a. Coordination of dates throughout the year to ‘broaden/flatten’ demand, reduce peak competition periods.
 - b. Develop cross-school sections of courses to maximize space utilization and to promote interprofessional education.

IV. Conclusions

Educator and Education Space Policy Task Force developed principles and policies that apply to design, assignment, oversight, and governance for *education space* (e.g. classroom, laboratory, simulation, auditorium, multi-use clinical space) and *educator space* (e.g. faculty offices, faculty hotel office spaces for educators who travel to and spend significant other sites to teach or mentor). The principles and policies outlined in this document apply to *learners in educational programs* within all health sciences schools (dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, and physical therapy), the graduate division, post graduate programs (e.g. residencies, fellowships), and specialized training programs (e.g. self-supporting masters programs). *Educators* are faculty engaged in education (e.g. educational curriculum or program development, leadership, research, and teaching and/or mentoring) in any of the educational programs listed above.

The principles developed addressed overarching priorities for education and space, strategic values for aligning and sharing resources across the institution, the qualities of space that will optimize education, and priorities around educator space. The principles propose methods by which the principles described will be enacted in practice. These policies address advance education space planning, engage educators in every step of space planning from design to ongoing management, and propose the development of a singular seamless transparent educator and education space reservation system.

The ultimate goal of the taskforce UCSF was to ensure that UCSF is on the cutting edge of health sciences education globally and aims to recruit and retain faculty members with a passion for education to a world class institution where education is a top priority.