**Academic Senate Committee on Space (ASCOS)   
Srikantan Nagarajan, PhD, Chair**

**DRAFT Minutes**

**Wednesday, February 2, 2022  
3:05 – 4:30 p.m.   
Zoom videoconference**

Chair Nagarajan called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m. via Zoom. A quorum was present.

1. **Review and Approval of the December 1 Meeting Minutes**

**ACTION:** Members approved the December 1 minutes.

1. **Chair’s Report** *– Srikantan Nagarajan* 
   1. **UCSF Space Committee**

The UCSF Space Committee is working on a plan for the building at 2001 The Embarcadero. The School of Nursing has training and simulation space there, and a block of space is available for a set of groups. The Faculty Space Working Group has been created to handle difficult issues that administrators are unable to resolve. The Task Force was asked to contact the Committee on Committees to place a Senate member on both the Working Group and ASCOS.

* 1. **Meeting on Space Metrics**

Sri attended a joint meeting with administrators and members of the Senate Academic Planning and Budget Committee about equity in the allocation of resources, including space. The goal of this meeting was to understand the data that are available for assessing resource allocation equity. The data in the Archibus system have some inaccuracies, meaning that any analyses using those data will be confounded. This meeting serves as the start of a longer conversation, and additional faculty input will be required as the conversation progresses.

* 1. **Update from the Education Space Programming Task** **Force** – *Arianne Teherani*

The Task Force is working on creating a draft report identifying key issues and articulating priorities for education space on Parnassus campus. **ACTION**: ASOCS analyst Liz Greenwood will reach out to the Chairs to obtain a draft to circulate with this committee.

1. **Building Funding and Campus Development** –*Michael Clune and Erin Hickey, UDAR*
   1. **Background**

Michael Clune and Erin Hickey from the UCSF Office of University Development and Alumni Relations (UDAR) discussed funding for buildings and renovations on the Parnassus campus. Prior to the meeting, members received a document with answers to specific questions ([attachment 1](https://senateserviceportal.ucsf.edu/v3/meetings/2552/files/2022_02_02_Capital_Planning_and_Philanthropy_Questions.docx)) and links to UCSF’s [10-year Capital Plan](https://financesecure.ucsf.edu/uses) and [Core Financial Plan](https://financesecure.ucsf.edu/funds-flows). Members are encouraged to review these plans, which are accessible via MyAccess on campus or by VPN. Members can also contact M. Clune via email with further questions.

* 1. **Discussion**: M. Clune, E. Hickey, and committee members engaged in an open discussion of building funding and renovations. In that discussion, the following points were raised:
     1. A committee member noted that the Weill Building was constructed not because of need but because a substantial donation was provided for its construction. The member asked about leadership’s commitment to the Parnassus revitalization and the possibility that a large donation could disrupt it.
        1. Mission Bay evolved from inside-out growth to opportunistic growth. Based on the lessons from Mission Bay, the administration is trying to identify the growth needs for Parnassus, and the efforts into the PRAB are evidence of this changed behavior. However, opportunistic growth may still occur. Conversations with the Provost and the various committees suggest that leadership is committed to need-based growth, but the commitment to avoid pursuing opportunistic growth if a donation presents itself may not be as strong.
        2. Parnassus faculty groups have been consistently vocal about the campus’s needs. Resources have been committed to identify scopes, timelines, and a funding plan for revitalization. However, it is impossible to predict what would happen if a large donation were received.
        3. Needs and vision tend to resonate with donors. Funds for buildings are the most difficult to raise, as donors tend to prefer to support workers and the community. Showing donors what they can help faculty deliver is very helpful in fundraising.
     2. A member asked about leadership’s commitment to the discovery themes for Parnassus campus given that some funding will have to come from donors. These themes are resonating with the external community, which will increase commitment.

* + 1. A member asked how leased buildings fit into the overall financial picture. In the run-up to Mission Bay, UCSF needed to lease space. However, now that Mission Bay is fully developed, this type of space is being reduced. For leased buildings, if UCSF’s facilities unit is covering the facilities and the Chancellor is covering debt, then the on-campus facilities and administrative (F&A) rate is used.
    2. A member noted that faculty may be unaware of the difficulty of raising money for buildings because big donation announcements almost always relate to capital projects. The member asked how this perception mismatch can be addressed.
       1. Although large donations do tend to support capital, the most recent campaign supported people and programs with the exception of one large gift. Capital was a larger focus when building Mission Bay, and the need for funding for capital projects is greater now that the Parnassus campus improvements are underway.
       2. The Parnassus campus offers an opportunity to blend gifts. Donors who are interested in a specific area can support both people and capital in that area. Most donations come from the community, grateful patients, and a few strong institutional donors who will play a major role in Parnassus fundraising.
    3. A member asked about recognition for donors. Recognition is important for a handful of donors and is part of UDAR’s program. Mission Bay had many donors rather than a single anchor donor, which changed the standard for recognition and led to more signage. For Parnassus, UDAR will identify creative ways to recognize donors.

* + 1. A member asked about equity in financial planning.
       1. The administration recognizes that investments in Mission Bay came at the expense of investments in Parnassus, as new buildings do not generate F&A until they are built. Now, the Parnassus campus is becoming the focus.
       2. There are cross-subsidies and F&A spillovers across buildings and departments. The administration focuses on prioritizing needs and then shifting funds to cover them. For example, the F&A model is designed such that dry lab research subsidizes wet lab research, as both are charged the same F&A rate even though wet lab space is more expensive. A committee member noted that prioritizing wet lab space in this way creates some equity issues.
       3. It was noted that building new wet lab space is less expensive than renovating existing space to meet current wet lab quality standards. Certain spaces cannot be renovated (e.g., floor-to-floor heights in the Clinical Sciences building are too low according to current standards but are impossible to change).
    2. A member asked about the plans to renovate the HSIR towers on Parnassus campus.
       1. Two projects are underway to upgrade life safety systems and seismic issues in the HSIR towers, although construction has not yet begun. Although this work is less visible, these systems are very important, and the administration has expressed its commitment to these projects.
       2. Although placing some of the CoLabs in the HSIR towers was under consideration, they will be placed in the PRAB building instead. This placement will support the creation of research arteries enabling researchers to collaborate.
       3. Broader renovations to the HSIR towers will be more feasible once researchers have been moved into the PRAB. Sufficient contiguous space is needed to effectively carry out renovations without disrupting researchers with ongoing construction. The timing and cost of these projects must be determined before a funding plan can be developed. It is also necessary to ensure that the renovations are affordable before including them in the capital plan. These renovations, unlike the life safety and seismic projects, are not part of the current funding plan. However, more serious discussions about committing to these renovations will take place over the next 6-18 months.
    3. Members noted that the revitalization seems incomplete without a commitment to renovations. The PRAB’s value is severely undercut if it creates feeling of inequity among some faculty because their space has not been renovated. A member argued that it would be better to set more modest goals for the PRAB if needed to ensure that existing buildings can be renovated. It is important that faculty in other buildings feel like they are part of the same campus as faculty in the PRAB.
    4. A member argued that building CoLabs across multiple spaces rather than concentrating them in the new PRAB building may be better for the overall community. The CoLabs will take up much of the building’s space, marginalizing the other tenants, and they will serve their purpose better if they are located in spaces throughout campus. Contiguous space offers some benefits, but researchers will be able to move between spaces easily enough if effective building-to-building transit is developed.
    5. A member asked about fundraising for renovations. UDAR does not raise many funds for renovations. Often, renovations are funded through other financial planning models, and gifts that do support renovations are typically led by a relationship between an individual faculty member and donor. Parnassus fundraising is still in early stages, so a new process for raising funds for renovations may evolve.
    6. A member asked how discovery themes may change the fundraising strategy, as smaller donations focus on individual faculty or programs rather than interdisciplinary programs. Donors generally want to support interesting work and scientific advancements and are not focused on the organizational structure. Talking about the discovery themes with donors helps them focus on how people are partnering together rather than on individuals. A new discovery theme will be featured at each board meeting to obtain feedback on framing the theme for donors.
    7. A member asked if the growing importance of conservation to donors could help increase donor support for renovations. It was noted that very environmentally conscious donors prefer to invest in conservation more directly.
    8. A member asked how ASCOS and faculty more broadly can serve as allies in prioritizing renovations. Faculty are encouraged to share their thoughts with leadership (e.g., Mike Clune, Alicia Murasaki, the Deans of the Schools, the Vice Chancellor, and the Provost). The Provost is very supportive of these renovations.
    9. A member noted that the University of California may try to float a $2 billion bond and asked whether some of that money could be used for renovations. For that specific bond, it is too early to tell. However, any funds that are obtained can free up money for renovations even if they are applied to other parts of the capital plan.
    10. In terms of other state funding, the UC system is requesting $1.5 million from the governor for seismic and deferred energy efficiency projects. Legislation has been proposed to create a $5 billion fund for housing for universities and community colleges. The hospital systems are to trying to obtain additional funding for seismic renovations. However, voters are interested in projects to increase undergraduate enrollment, which the other UC campuses can capitalize on more easily.
  1. **Action**: The committee will write a letter urging leadership to make a stronger commitment to renovations on the Parnassus campus by directly incorporating them in the financial plan.

1. **Systemwide Reviews**

The following items are currently under Systemwide Review. As these items are not germane to the business of the committee, the committee does not intend to submit comments for any of these items.

* 1. [Systemwide Review of Recommendations for Department Political Statements](https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/underreview/rh-systemwide-senate-review-academic-freedom-dept-political-statements.pdf)
  2. [Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3](https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/underreview/rh-systemwide-senate-review-revision-sr-424.pdf) (Creation of an A-G Ethnic Studies Requirement for Freshman)

1. **Executive Session**
2. **Old Business**

None.

1. **New Business**

Members expressed interest in learning about the interaction between the UCSF campus and UCSF Health in terms of space development. Representatives from space planning within the Health Sciences organization will be invited to a future meeting to discuss UCSF Health’s space planning process.

1. **Adjournment**

Chair Nagarajan adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Academic Senate Staff:

Liz Greenwood // liz.greenwood@ucsf.edu