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**DRAFT Minutes**

**Welcome & Introductions**

Members introduced themselves and briefly spoke about their respective specialties and senate service experience. Analyst McRae advised the committee that the Senate Office would be shuffling certain committee staffing assignments this year to accommodate for newly hired analysts and as a result, Ken Laslavic would be taking over APB in the coming months. However, Kirstin will still serve as the back-up analyst when necessary.

**Chair's Report**

1. Priorities for 2021-2022

Chair Grandis advised members of her goals and objectives for APB in the coming year including collecting more DEI focused data around research space allocation. Members acknowledged the advisory role that APB holds as a senate committee but spoke about the influence that the committee can have when it acts proactively. Jill Hollenbach suggested APB could explore ways it might provide additional support for faculty (especially soft money faculty) including sponsoring chancellor’s fund projects. Joel Kramer commented that he hoped to continue APBs focus on learning more about indirect cost recovery policies. Suzaynn Schick suggested the need for some type of appeals process for faculty facing space reductions. Linda Franck also suggested revisiting the UC PATH implementation. Duan Xu noted the intersection of APB and recruitment/retention of faculty. Mijung Park hoped APB could further explore policies related to how RMS charge departments/schools based on faculty. Chair Grandis commented that while APB might not be able to ‘solve’ a lot of these problem, it could certainly work to help clarify and demystify them. For example, APB could help to simplify/communicate the process around what happens to indirect cost secured on grants. Mike Clune agreed that this was something he hoped to work on this year.

Additionally, Chair Grandis hoped APB could work more collaboratively with other groups/committees on campus this year who are working on these same issues (ex: COR, Space, etc). Ken shared that ICR was a key topic for the Committee on Research as well and suggested this was a topic in which the two committees could work together. Chair Grandis hoped such a collaboration could help APB/COR to represent and amplify the concerns of faculty who feel they are paying a tax on ICR.

* **ACTION:** *APB will work collaboratively with COR to set up a joint meeting to collaborate with Mike on development an accessible presentation/document on ICR*

Next, on the subject of the Health Science Compensation Plan, Jill confirmed that the systemwide Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and the Health Care Task Force, which operates under UCFW, were planning to conduct a review of the Health Science Compensation Plan (HSCP). Steve Hetts advised members that while he had served as a member of the Health Care Task Force’s subcommittee, members of that group had put together a helpful resource document that breaks down aspects of the HSCP. Steve offered to share a copy of the document with APB members to look over to consider whether this was a topic that APB might be interested in. Jill pointed out that UCSF is the only UC campus that is entirely on the HSCP and as such, UCSF should have a strong Senate voice on this issue, whether it be led by APB or CFW. Chair Grandis shared that she and Lindsay Hampson (CFW Chair) planned to meet each month following their respective committee meetings to review what each group was working on and identify possible crossover issues. She agreed to discuss this with Chair Hampson when they next meet. Members further suggested identifying the relevant points of contact in the administration for this topic. (e.g., VPAA Brian Alldredge & Deans of Academic Affairs for each school). Jill also shared her concerns around faculty salary equity and particularly the inequity resulting from the 5% rule.

**Campus Planning Updates**

Alicia Murasaki joined to provide a general overview of campus planning and talk about the information contained in the quarterly space update [(attachment 2)](https://senateserviceportal.ucsf.edu/v3/meetings/2685/files/202109_Academic_Senate_Quarterly_update_.pdf)

She began with an overview of some of the major entities at UCSF working on space—the UCSF Space Committee operates at the campus level and makes overarching policy recommendations for the campus; the Capacity Committee, led by Sheila Anthrum, operates as a counterpart committee within the health system by focusing on clinical spaces and those spaces that help to drive UCSF’s clinical enterprise; and the Senate Space Committee represents faculty concerns related to space. Additionally, a new Faculty Space Review group is in the works, which will focus on qualitative-driven metrics for space utilization. However, these committees do not replace the school-level space committees. Historically, Alicia explained that space is typically allocated to the deans, who then allocate it to chairs, who then distribute it amongst individuals. Alicia acknowledged the continued challenges brought on by this system and discussed some of the new strategies that are being employed to improve the process. For example, UCSF has started communicating with other campuses like UCSD who have utilized Faculty Space Review groups in the past. Through these communications, UCSF hopes to identify and strategize new ways of approaching space issues.

Looking at gender disparities in space allocation, Chair Grandis shared that while serving on the SOM space committee, she had looked at the indirect cost recovery dollar per square foot and observed that female investigators had about half the space as their male counterparts at UCSF. Alicia acknowledged that a smaller task force in the SOM has been formed to analyze this subset data more closely and study if/how it reflects larger patterns within SOM/UCSF.

Members discussed some of their own experiences and challenges in obtaining/retaining necessary research & lab space since joining UCSF. For example, Suzaynn shared her experience with trying to negotiate space for research while simultaneously dealing with the constant building maintenance/upkeep required for her current space, all of which cause critical research disruptions.

In terms of previous work on this area, Ken advised the committee on some of the Senate’s past efforts on this subject, including several past task force reports and recommended metrics for measuring space productivity, which were provided to UCSF administration for consideration. Subsequently the Parnassus Heights Planning Groups related to research and education both acknowledged the reports and claimed to incorporate the principles.

Alicia thanked committee members for their candor and for sharing some of their personal experiences related to space allocation. She acknowledged the slow and complex process involved in trying to address these issues but reaffirmed her willingness and commitment to continue these important discussions. In terms of prioritizing issues for the upcoming year, members acknowledged that there are several interested committees/groups working to address space issues and APB did not need to necessarily lead the fight to stay involved in those discussion.

**UCPB Update**

Vice Chair Marc Steurer provided a summary update from the July UCPB meeting and shared the following notes with the committee. [(attachment 3)](https://senateserviceportal.ucsf.edu/v3/meetings/2685/files/UCPB_Notes_July_6.docx)