Notes from the HSFC Planning and Budget Committee meeting of 4/12/05

Attendees: Igor Grant, David Segal, Jerrold Olefsky, and Casey Sandack

The Committee asked Dr. Olefsky and Mr. Sandack to join it in order to develop a better understanding of processes associated with longer-term facilities development, as well as the process of allocation. The overall purpose of this dialogue was to determine ways in which faculty might improve their ability to provide input to these processes through the Faculty Council.

A. General issues regarding development of new facilities

Dr. Olefsky and Mr. Sandack explained that after the Clinical Investigation Institute building (CII) there is no large-scale project immediately on the horizon. Part of the problem is financing. Even if the School of Medicine is able to secure financing the University of California systemwide is close to its debt ceiling. This means that units cannot borrow money even if they have the capacity to repay it. It is not known when or how this debt ceiling will be lifted.

The second source of capital improvement dollars (beyond the SOM itself borrowing funds) is via State bond issues, in which University requests typically are packaged with the K through 12 school requests. However, State capital improvement funds typically go to the general campus, linked to increases in enrollment, thus, the School of Medicine typically does not benefit. One recent exception was the new School of Pharmacy building which did receive State capital improvement monies.

Another factor that SOM must consider is that we are already highly leveraged in regard to committing NIH indirect dollars to facilities. Garamendi and similar mechanisms work well when the NIH is generous, but we are entering a period of retrenchment and therefore must be cautious.

In regard to the process whereby a building is planned and developed, and more specifically how Faculty are involved, Dr. Olefsky described the CII as an example of a process. The idea of the building came through a strategic planning process that initially began under Dean Alksne, and was moved forward by Dean Holmes through a series of consultations involving Chairs, administrators, Faculty and other stakeholders. Thereafter, plans for a building and a Director of the CII were shared and discussed at the Executive Committee of the School of Medicine. Once the leadership and concepts were approved, the leader of the CII (in this case Dr. Firestein) has undertaken a process of consultation with various possible stakeholders.

The next step, yet to be implemented for CII, will be the establishment of a Building Advisory Committee (BAC). The BAC is a Faculty-Administration committee appointed by the Chancellor on recommendation from the Vice Chancellor Health Sciences and in consultation with the Academic Senate.
We discussed that here is one place where input from Faculty Council could be useful. In other words, the Vice Chancellor could forward SOM Faculty names based on consultations with Health Sciences Faculty Council.

**Action item:**

The Planning and Budget Committee recommends that Faculty Council request that Vice Chancellor Holmes consult with Faculty Council (perhaps through the Nominating Committee) when developing a slate of candidates for BACs.

**B. Space allocation process**

Dr. Olefsky described the allocation of space process. There are several types of space that can become available. 1) There is space from new construction (e.g., Leichtag building). 2) Backfill space develops when investigators move to new space (e.g., from BSB to Leichtag). 3) Space may become available when Faculty move to another institution, retire, or lose their need for space or funding for it in the long-term.

In regard to space generated by new construction such as for Leichtag, Dr. Olefsky explained that the process involves sending out an RFA to Department Chairs who are supposed to consult with their Faculties. The RFA may have guidelines (e.g., in the case of Leichtag, this is a laboratory building, and therefore proposals should involve wet lab research). Responses to the RFA are supposed to be submitted by Department Chairs to the Vice Chancellor, who then asks the Research Space Committee, convened by Dr. Olefsky, and consisting of approximately a dozen Faculty, to review such proposals. Committee recommendations are then forwarded to the Vice Chancellor. A BAC may be convened subsequently to flesh out the specifics of design and use.

A similar process is utilized for backfill space. In terms of space released by a Faculty member who moves or retires, or otherwise does not require the space any longer, such space is normally retained by the original Department for a period of time (up to two years) to permit that Department to make recruitments. If the Department does not require the space, or is unable to effect a recruitment in a timely way, the space reverts to the Vice Chancellor for reassignment. In this case, the Research Space Committee reviews requests on hand and makes space recommendations to the Vice Chancellor.

It was discussed that one way to enhance transparency of the process and secure more general Faculty involvement would be for Dr. Olefsky to seek the advice of the Faculty Council in terms of replacing departing Research Space Committee members. Currently, the process involves discussions within the Space Committee and recommendations to Dr. Olefsky. A modest modification of this procedure would involve seeking advice from the Faculty Council, with the proviso that Dr. Olefsky may request Faculty with certain kinds of research backgrounds or knowledge, may request that
nominees be from specific Departments in order to achieve Departmental balance, or may be from a pool of Faculty who are in a specific geographic site (e.g., Hillcrest).

**Action item:**

The Committee on Planning and Budget recommends that Faculty Council request that the Vice Chancellor’s designee for space planning, Dr. Olefsky, notify FC when vacancies arise on the Space Committee, and request recommendations for replacement, with specific guidelines and provisos in mind, as noted above.

Dr. Olefsky described the process of regular review of space by the Research Space Committee. Every Department is reviewed once every two years. The Committee requests the Chair to provide an overview of his/her Department’s research space. A committee member is assigned to do an in-depth study. The entire Space Committee then evaluates the Department's utilization of space. If under utilization is noted (this does not occur very often) the Department is given feedback and a warning in terms of length of time in which corrective action should be taken.

The Planning and Budget Committee discussed how Faculty can request space in general. Dr. Olefsky indicated the process was that the Faculty member consults with his/her Departmental Chair, who if agreeable, sends a request from the Department to the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor then tasks the Research Space Committee to evaluate the request and determine if the request can be accommodated.

It was noted that Dr. Olefsky has jurisdiction over research space. Teaching space is under Dr. Bailey and Dr. Savoia, and clinical space under Mr. Jackiewicz and Mr. Liekweg.

The Committee thanked Dr. Olefsky and Mr. Sandack for their extremely informative presentation.

**Future action item:**

The Committee will at a future date request a similar overview for facilities planning, development, and space allocation from Mr. Jackiewicz and Mr. Liekweg in regard to clinical space, and from Drs. Bailey and Savoia in regard to teaching space.

Respectfully submitted,

Igor Grant, M.D.
Chair, Planning and Budget Committee