Seeking Metrics

January 13, 2022

Attendees:

**Campus admin**

Alicia Murasaki, Assistance Vice Chancellor of Campus Planning and Campus Architect

Kyle Smith – associate director of space analytics, his team manages archibus

Jerome Sak – director of financial planning, functional ow er of ICR benchmarking system

**School of Medicine admin**

Dave Morgan, Vice Dean of Research, School of Medicine

Maye Chrisman, Finance and Administration, School of Medicine

Olivia Herbert (shared data on endowed chair in School of Medicine)

**Senate**

Sri Nagarajan, Senate Space Committee Chair

Jennifer Grandis, Senate APB Committee Chair

Deanna Kroetz

Summary: Representatives from campus space planning, the School of Medicine, and the Academic Senate met on January 13, 2022 to discuss space equity, data limitations, methodologies for analysis, and improvements to quality and metrics. The systems that produce space data from Archibus and financial data from BMR are not set up to support the collection of demographic data and analysis of equitable distribution of space. There are inaccuracies in the data. Research programs vary greatly, making it difficult to get a homogenous data set and sufficient sample size. The Basic Science recruitment process is standardized. However, the School of Medicine is still refining their data in an effort to support a conversation with leadership about where inequities arise and how to handle divisions across populations. The group agreed to meet again.

1. Goals for today’s meeting
	1. What are the data and how confident we are in the data?
	2. What are the institutional structures in place to address institutional equity and space? – left for next meeting
2. What are the data
	1. Distributed model
	2. 31,000 individual rooms
	3. Collection efforts are driven by reporting requirements of the office of the presidents
		* 1. Primary function
			2. Square footage
			3. Assignment of usage
	4. Personnel management and trying to track who is in what space
	5. What do we NOT track in archibus (as some of the questions are about ethnicity) – we do track to the best of our ability the name and the employee ID.
	6. Jerome then takes the space data and “marries” it with the research data – cannot match specific space with specific dollars, so we do it at the PI level,
		* 1. Adds demographic data on top of that and share it
			2. How do you aggregate it into the department level?
3. How Confident Are We in the Data?
	1. Maye Chrisman – School of Medicine
		1. *Preface: “*Sharing some thinking of how to get from a “rough cut” (handful of limited data) and, recognizing that the data has its flaws and we could work till the end of time to fix the flaws and that is not our goal, and we need to fix the most obvious flaws so we don’t draw the wrong conclusions… We are trying to be pragmatics when we get there are there are initial conclusions we could try.”
		2. When we looked at the initial cut of the analysis, what needs to be addressed in order for us to draw conclusions
			1. Space allocation analyst suggestion 2021-10-14\* (ask for document)
			2. Start by focusing on bench space to draw reasonable conclusions – its “more homogeneous (recognizing it isn’t perfectly homogeneous because some bench space areas happen to include common space areas and others do not)
			3. Example of data issue – some of the research space may not be personally assigned researcher X, but it is associated with the researchers who brings the dollars and belongs to someone else… This is an example of a number of issues that skew the data in a number of ways that does not help us.
		3. Should we include non-sponsored funding such as gifts and endowments?
		4. Trying to get a few examples to get to a floor
	2. Dave Morgan noted: So many inaccuracies in our space metrics. Some people don’t have their name attached to space in archibus. It all comes down to the local administrator going into archibus and changing things which does not always happen accurately.
		1. And beyond that – Dave’s own analysis suggested that archibus should not be the most confident
		2. Should we be talking about square footage or lab benches
		3. In the end… there are many factors
	3. Jenny – yes – there are many problems – because there is not a harmonious approach to space assignment – all kinds of factors collide to create a profound inequity. There is no mechanism at UCSF.
		1. What if we had a pilot study? Any faculty member with independently assigned space – and start at a certain time – and since we all have to put down assigned space when we do resources and environmental page for the NIH – or we could look at those – if we define the cohort to say these people are a part of the same process and the amount of space assigned to them matters for their productivity.
	4. Maye – the basic science recruitment process in the basic science department is standardized.
		1. In basic science everyone is ladder rank and searched nationally. Everyone is given precisely the same start up, “down to the dollar,” and the same starter lab Dave Morgan is fairly confident
		2. Even the best labs don’t get more than 16 benches.
		3. Some people have exceptional needs. Dan Wagner in obgyn needed a fish room, or some person needs a fancy microscope that costs 500,000. So, inequities add up. Often due to research field. It diversifies rapidly.
	5. Olivia: In assessing inequity, the SOM is looking for good data first. Hope is to get the data to a place that is helpful. Currently, the raw data is not helpful. Their hope is to refine the analysis to it is directionally correct and so they can get buy in to talk about it to use it as a catalyst to a conversation.
		1. What are the points where this happens?
		2. When are their divisions in a population?
	6. Alicia – These are all lagging indicators.
		1. The analysis is basically 2 years old
		2. When leadership asks questions – “what about this person who is a Howard Hughes investigator?” --- and when looked at it that way, the data changes… and the more filters you put on it, the N gets smaller.
		3. At that point the differences don’t get that big
		4. Archibus was not built to do this.
		5. We are also relying on reporting on gender which at UCSF HR is a volunteering self-reporting
		6. Race ethnicity and gender are all now self-reported and we think we only have 80%
	7. Sri appreciates the conversation about focusing on just wet lab benches which is a small subset on the campus while we have a very large dry lab research footprint on the campus.
	8. Should we do a survey??
4. Next Steps
5. Will have a second meeting
6. Do we have the right people in this conversation? --- for the time being, yes.
7. What is the right amount of time to collect data and process it before we come together again?
8. What data do we want to gather?
9. Sri would like to see what Jerome is talking about.
	1. Alicia- Jerome’s data is the presentation given to the space committee. The UCSF Uber Space Committee.