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Executive Summary – Background

- **Task Force charge:** Develop a holistic program for research space at Parnassus

- **Approach:** Make recommendations that outline:
  - Research themes and programs for Parnassus over the next 5-10 years
  - Prioritization for programs with critical needs before the RAB opens

- **Process:** Sought to be inclusive and community-minded by:
  - Taking into account lessons learned from Mission Bay
  - Leveraging research listservs and building on data gathered by the Research Space Working Group
  - Hosting a public town hall to get input from the broader research community
Executive Summary – Recommendations

1. **Organize programs at Parnassus into four different “Discovery Zones”** located around a central common “Integrative Science Hub.”

2. **Approach next level of programming by taking investigator identity into account** and locating investigators where they might best share services, equipment, and resources.

3. **Establish clear and transparent process for space allocation** that addresses programmatic concerns.

4. **Give equal priority to funds for renovation and new construction** and establish a system for rating space quality and improving substandard space.

5. **Address urgent research needs**, and capitalize on current and emerging vacancies.
Recommendation #1 – Discovery Zones

- Create a thriving biomedical research community at Parnassus through the creation of four interconnected Discovery Zones.

- Developing these research neighborhoods across the entire campus would leverage the diversity of investigators and laboratories that encompass a broad spectrum of scientific programs, themes and disciplines at Parnassus.
Key Principles of Discovery Zones

The organizing approach of the Discovery Zones:

1. **Seeks to maintain a strong sense of connection and community among all investigators on the Parnassus campus.** Doing so requires a campus that is open and accessible, both physically and culturally.

2. **Integrates research themes across all zones,** resulting in multidisciplinary research communities that provide fertile ground for cross-talk and collaboration.

3. **Provides much needed space for clinical research units** (CRUs, a specialized space infrastructure for human contact research).

4. **Locates at least one reasonably large and impactful research program – or anchor program – in each Zone** to form a nucleus of great science around which adjacent neighborhoods will develop and succeed.
Discovery Zones: Key Considerations

- Important to **avoid the formation of research silos**

- Larger scientific programs and Co-Labs should occupy **two or more Discovery Zones**

- Diverse communities within larger anchor programs should be organized across multiple Discovery Zones based on investigator disciplines and identities, as delineated in Recommendation #2 of this Task Force.
Discovery Zones: Potential Program Distribution

**Discovery Zone 1 (RAB) - 150K ASF**
- ImmunoX (I)
- Center for Innovative Medicine (clinical research units)
- CoLabs (I)
- Diabetes and Metabolism (I)
- Cell and Cancer Biology (II)
- iMicro/Microbiome

**Discovery Zone 2 (MSB & Moffitt) - 150K ASF**
- Organ and Disease Biology (I) (Musculoskeletal, Craniofacial, rheumatology and autoimmune disease, neuroscience)
- Clinical Research Units
- CoLabs (II)
- Data Science and Digital Health Research
- Diagnostic and Functional Imaging

**Discovery Zone 3 (HSE/HSW) - 230K ASF**
- Cell and Cancer Biology (I)
- ImmunoX (II)
- Organ and Disease Biology (II) (lung, liver, bowel, kidney, reproductive science)
- Aging
- Human and Population Genetics
- Therapeutic Science and Bioengineering
- Clinical Pharmacology & Pharmacogenetics

**Discovery Zone 4 (Dolby) - 45K ASF**
- Regenerative Medicine and Developmental Biology
- Diabetes and Metabolism (II)
Integrative Science Hub:

- Provides centralized space for communication and collaboration
- Should be easily accessible from all four discovery zones and connected on multiple building levels
- Could be housed in existing or re-purposed space
Recommendation #2 – Consider Scientific Identity

- Consider different aspects of an investigator’s scientific “identity” in the next level of programming
- Co-locate investigators who are scientifically aligned in order to maximize scientific synergies
- Facilitate access to relevant shared services, equipment, and resources
Rationale

**Allows investigators and programs to be connected by science as well as shared tools, resources, and instruments**

**Most likely to maximize programmatic interactions and foster research synergies that do not currently exist**

**Popular with researchers at Parnassus based on results of Research Space Working Group and recent Town Hall poll data**
How do PH investigator identities inform research programming?

PH Investigator Identity Data
- RSWG Listserv Outreach
- PH-based Investigators
- Program-Affiliated Faculty

Gephi Program Analysis
- Investigator - Node
- Affiliation - Edge

*Pilot Data*
How do PH investigator identities inform research programming?

**Preliminary Analysis Supports:**
- Identity-based programming
- 4 Discovery Zones
- Existing & emerging programs
- Integrated clinical research

*Pilot Data*
Potential Challenges

1. **Campus-wide buy-in required** given historical practices of space assignment.

2. **Campus commitment both to build the RAB and to rejuvenate existing PH research spaces** is essential, including release space to accommodate increasing telework. The RAB alone is inadequate to meet the pent-up demand at PH for quality research space.

3. **Focused additional data are needed** to achieve overall task force recommendations based on discovery zones, etc. (see Report Appendix)

4. **Additional challenges related to feasibility** (e.g., number of moves) and programmatic priorities.
Recommendation #3 – Space Allocation

- **Establish a clear and transparent process for space allocation** that integrates programmatic organization of space with departmental assignments.

- **Organize space based on research programs.** Currently space is allocated to departments and ORUs (control points). Organizing by program requires integration between space allocation and programmatic affiliation.

- **Create a clear policy mechanism that accounts for departmental priorities for space (recruitment, retention, etc.)** without compromising neighborhood programmatic organization or leaving valuable space unoccupied.

- Policy should encourage flexible, collaborative, and consensus-driven decision-making for space allocation for the greater good of UCSF.
Recommendation #4 – Renovating Space

- **Give equal priority to funds for renovation and new construction.**
  - Explore creation of campus-wide renovation fund and clear process for identifying renovation needs and priorities that improve efficiency of space and distribution of renovation dollars.

- **Establish a system for rating space quality and improving substandard space.**
  - Space rating could include current quality ratings based on real estate standard practice and evaluating suitability of space for specific program functionality.
Rationale

We recognize the reality that capital improvements are heavily dependent on philanthropy and therefore will be disproportionately distributed (both between new and old space, and between thematic and more generic space). However:

- The current system, in which UCSF pays for construction and furnishing of new space, while departments/ORUs are typically expected to pay for renovation and furnishing of existing space, is seriously inequitable.

- When a department does pay for renovation of a space, that department rightfully feels an ownership stake and this makes it even harder to reallocate space based on needs outside of the department.

- We need a strong sense of community within each building/zone and a local group that has the resources to maintain these zones.
Recommendation #5 – Urgent Needs

- **Identify and plan for sufficient space for CoLabs.** This should include expanding the microscopy center (BIDC) and the new mass spectrometry facility (QMAC).

- **Foster high profile programs** that have already been launched, such as the Benioff Center for Microbiome Medicine (BCMM).

- **Plan for world-class patient-focused research space at Parnassus.** This involves recognizing that clinical research has just as fundamental a need for updated, efficient, and specialized space as basic research.

- **Capitalize on opportunities that exist now** due to administrative space vacancies.

Both new construction (RAB) and renovation or re-use of existing space will be required to meet these urgent needs.
Considerations for the Next Phase

Assemble a task force to implement the recommendations of this Task Force, with the following charge:

- Specify programs and identify “anchor programs” for each Discovery Zone
- Strategically accelerate opportunities for renovation in Discovery Zones 2 and 3
- Advise Space Committee on space assignment, management and renovation policies

Build roster of individuals deeply committed to a holistic vision for revitalizing the Parnassus Heights campus and research community

- Ensure continuity by including current members of this task force in next phase
- Include early, midcareer and established investigators
- Ensure membership from diverse scientific disciplines, including clinical sciences
Next Steps

- **Utilize and respect the large amount of high quality data** collected by the Research Space Working Group.

- **Leverage organized research programs to ensure community and connectivity**, and to enhance democratization of the programming process.

- **Preserve existing, well-functioning neighborhoods** while providing flexibility for individual groups to align elsewhere as appropriate.

- **Relocate groups holding suboptimal space that could be renovated**, so that liberated space can be improved and reprogrammed as early as practicable.

- **Get started!**
Appendix Documents

- Access Parnassus Heights Investigator Identity Data and other documents at https://ucsf.box.com/s/f2mj64l0yrch7u0dljv1cx5as3hqb0ge