

Q2 Please enter any comments you want to make. The Faculty Association should support the affiliation.

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	<p>Having worked at St. Mary's for 25 years I have been very reassured that all reproductive services are made available to our patients. Men and women. Never have I been in a situation where I felt that my values or the care we provide in our clinic were compromised. It is true that we currently do not have GYN or OB services available on site, thus we refer our patients to UCSF / MB/MZ or ZSFG. We refer patients for in-vitro fertilization, OB care, IUD placements and we write prescriptions for OCP's which patients can fill in outside pharmacies and at planned parenthood if they are uninsured. We provide onsite family counseling, write prescriptions for PREP and teach our residents in primary and specialty care of our HIV patients. We have cared for this population since the early 80's when our HIV clinic was founded by one of our primary care physicians during the height of the AIDS epidemic. Our care extends to LGBTQ+ patients as well as the urban underserved and working poor. I am a non-denominational physician and our nursing and physician staff includes members of all or no religions, who are straight or members of LGBTQ+. Let me be clear, I have never been asked to sign an oath asking to follow religious directives. I would never work at any institution that would require me to follow a religious doctrine of any kind. Nor have I never witnessed anyone restrict access to any reproductive service, or gender assignment services we do not provide. In fact, we go through great efforts to facilitate timely referrals for any specialty services. It is very important to make it clear that not having a service available on site does not equal restricting services. I am very proud about the all inclusive and non-judgmental care we provide here at St. Mary's and would invite anyone who has questions and concerns to visit our Sr. Mary Philippa Clinic. Since I am also on staff at UCSF, I see the collaboration between Dignity Health and UCSF as a critical opportunity to provide access for our patients to services we do not have available on site, while we share the responsibility to care for a large underserved and underinsured population and play an important role as part of the safety net in the City of San Francisco. Thank you for the opportunity to complete this survey.</p>	5/18/2019 10:22 PM
2	<p>Only if the residents and students are not held to religious beliefs for which they oppose. They can choose not to participate, but should not be forced in any way notwithstanding providing appropriate care to all.</p>	5/18/2019 6:05 PM
3	<p>UCSF needs to expand its presence in the Bay Area to remain competitive with Stanford and to give faculty additional clinical opportunities.</p>	5/17/2019 10:45 PM
4	<p>At some point practicality overrides ideology rooted in vague and unsupported concerns. We are at capacity and need to expand our services to provide access exactly to those patients which Dignity does not.</p>	5/16/2019 10:31 PM
5	<p>N/a</p>	5/16/2019 8:07 PM
6	<p>Restrictions on reproductive education are concerning. Perhaps if there was a disclosure to patients about this so they could make a choice to go elsewhere? Despite this, a collaboration may be able to do the most good for the most people and . . . I hope do no harm.</p>	5/16/2019 3:51 PM
7	<p>While opinion on specific issues (reproductive, end of life, etc) may differ, Dignity Health does have the same overall goal as UCSF -- take care of the population. Service lines that may cause conflict can be delivered at other campuses. It is good for students and residents to see these differences, observe and respect cultural and religious differences.</p>	5/16/2019 2:58 PM
8	<p>Although Dignity is affiliated with the Catholic church and, as such, do not provide the full range of services, especially in women's health, than the rest of the UCSF system, their pledge to allow counseling and referrals may actually increase accessibility to these services in the population that present for care at Dignity.</p>	5/16/2019 1:39 PM
9	<p>While the concerns regarding the partnership with Dignity Health are reasonable, in my view, the increased access to care and the fact that there has been no evidence to date that patient care has actually been compromised by the partnership outweigh those concerns. Of course, should evidence arise in the future that the partnership is compromising patient care, then this should be revisited.</p>	5/16/2019 12:24 PM

10	While I don't agree with limitations on care offered to a patient, I think the efforts being made to ensure access to all care outside of Dignity Health as needed are appropriate. We cannot look at this as an all or none issue - if we need to expand capacity this is a way to potentially provide high quality access to care for more patients. Those who would get care at Dignity Health without a UC affiliation may not even be offered the full range of reproductive health/end of life services at all. Furthermore, residents/students benefit from being exposed to different care environments and settings with varied resources; it's important to learn what the range of public/private sector opportunities are for practice.	5/16/2019 11:08 AM
11	I agree with the PRO comments presented. Regarding the CON comments, UC strongly claims that it respects diversity. Is UC doing so in this instance? Patients would have easy access to services not offered by DH at other UC facilities and learners would have the opportunity to practice respect for the Catholic culture while at DH.	5/16/2019 10:12 AM
12	Although I don't personally support the decision not to offer contraceptive services, I don't think that it is wrong to have a hospital in the network. If anything, I assume this gives us the opportunity to provide easier access to those who otherwise may not have had it.	5/16/2019 8:18 AM
13	'Church' and 'state' should be separate, but partnerships are fine.	5/16/2019 7:07 AM
14	Strongly support. Affiliation is critical to UCSF's development and ability to provide care to the people of San Francisco and Northern CA.	5/16/2019 5:47 AM
15	We should not politicize health care and as healthcare professionals serve everyone.	5/16/2019 12:11 AM
16	Given the choice between engaging with Dignity and potentially changing their norms, and isolating them, I believe that engagement is the smarter long game.	5/15/2019 10:50 PM
17	Strongly support	5/15/2019 10:39 PM
18	I appreciate the extremely thoughtful comments that were made at the regents meeting in LA-- which led me to my ultimate position. There is no question that some fundamental values of dignity and of UCSF are not aligned; But the question really is to consider ALL of our values and decide how to navigate when some are in conflict, and what is our responsibility as a public institution in this situation. Specifically--we are responsible for thinking about the care of ALL Californians, and have a role to play in improving care for all. Since not all Californian's get their care at UC, and in fact, dignity is the largest provider of care--to improve care for all do we disengage with Dignity because it doesn't share all of our values, or do we engage because we want to take any opportunity to optimize the care for all those who are going to Dignity for care? If do not move forward with this because our values are not aligned, then the logical next steps is to ALSO end all the service arrangements/affiliations we already have with Dignity. What are the implications of this? There are certainly areas of care where patients will suffer if this happens--including the many publicly insured patients that Dignity cares for. I have been disappointed that the consequences of disengaging have not been thoroughly discussed so that we know what we are actually talking about--and instead, the focus on the "anti" side has been limited to focusing on all the reasons not to and no recognition that there are ANY consequences to the alternative.	5/15/2019 10:24 PM
19	Providing better care for the underserved is a very tangible good, which, in my opinion, outweighs the tacit approval and political compromise.	5/15/2019 9:45 PM
20	I would be comfortable hearing more from the supporters of the affiliation. Those that oppose are speaking loudly which is fine and their right but we need to make sure that reasons for affiliation are heard as well. The statements made by UCSF as adequate but I am not sure that they are reaching as many people as those who oppose. I know many that have only heard "one side of the story"	5/15/2019 8:43 PM
21	While I understand and support the principles stated in the oppositions side, I believe this collaboration will expand, not limit, the full scope of the care patients and learners will get.	5/15/2019 7:36 PM
22	Catholic principles do not clash with our mission to provide the fullest range of evidence-based care. The debate about end-of-life issues, reproductive health, pregnancy termination, etc is not merely a problem of applying (or not) "evidence-based medicine". Rather they highlight anthropological, philosophical and religious beliefs. Affiliating with Dignity Health does not translate into UCSF endorsing their values. It is a beneficial/strategic partnership that can happen (for the sake of our patients and the better care we would like to deliver) in the full respect of each institution's identity. It would be a big mistake to torpedo this possible agreement.	5/15/2019 6:55 PM
23	Access to and availability of healthcare for all in California is the mission and purpose of UC	5/15/2019 6:43 PM

24	Faculty should make clear that UCSF offers services that not all Dignity Health sites or providers offer; nonetheless, the Dignity partnership is overall good for patients in the Bay Area.	5/15/2019 6:39 PM
25	The affiliation will allow more access to care for vulnerable patients. Though Dignity Health provides some of their care of their religious beliefs which it should be respected by other including UCSF faculty, I don't think it'll influence totally on the trainees especially if their training will be at other locations with not the same practices plus trainees will have the opportunity of choosing how they want to practice medical care after a diverse practices exposure.	5/15/2019 6:29 PM
26	More good will come from this than bad, but there are troubling aspects to doing it.	5/15/2019 6:01 PM
27	I don't think we should limit our care for political reasons. That sort of dogmatic approach is what is wrong with our country at large right now. Students and Residents are adults and can make up their own minds. The only reason I would oppose it is that we keep adding more to faculty's plate with fewer resources and it is getting ridiculous.	5/15/2019 4:56 PM
28	Dignity is particularly sensitive to those in need. I agree with some of the moral principles and values espoused by the Dignity Health system. In many respects I believe they may be superior to our own.	5/15/2019 4:41 PM
29	I think that the medical center administration has made a strong case that this affiliation can strengthen patient care. I believe in working across faith differences when it is possible without compromising care.	5/15/2019 4:09 PM
30	I support the affiliation, but I would want to have freedom to practice clause in there to avoid confusing the missions of our institutions. Especially on issues of reproductive health, birth control, pregnancy termination, end of life care, and research such as stem cells, I believe that it is crucial UCSF continue to forge ahead without being held back by religious preference.	5/15/2019 4:07 PM
31	It's important to expand the enterprise - space is too limited and building is too expensive.	5/15/2019 3:48 PM
32	Life is never perfect	5/15/2019 3:44 PM
33	This is in the best interests of advancing patient care throughout the city. Understand the concerns, but there is a clear upside to improve access to and quality of care.	5/15/2019 3:38 PM
34	So important not only to make these patients welcome, but for faculty and staff to become very comfortable with the diversity	5/15/2019 3:22 PM
35	I support the affiliation as long as UCSF Faculty are not constrained by Dignity Health and are able to practice by UCSF core values at all times.	5/15/2019 3:10 PM
36	The educational benefits of students and residents to community care that more reflects the actual "non-bubble" real care country wide is valuable education even if it is limited is scope of those items mentioned. And an affiliation would potentially improve the care of those served in the hospital and relieve the wait times for patients.	5/15/2019 3:10 PM
37	For current patients of Dignity, the affiliation with UCSF may provide a source of alternative care. Us vs. them is not becoming of faculty.	5/15/2019 3:04 PM
38	We need to grow locally and this is the best way to do it. Why isn't this being framed and seen as a positive? We aren't compromising our values --- we are spreading them. What better way to spread UCSF values and ensure more patients have access to care that we see as valuable and just? Providers aren't restricted to providing guidance that matches there values, they just need to refer back to the main campus.	5/15/2019 2:58 PM
39	It is in all our interests to help UCSF remain viable. I think the affiliation with Dignity health makes a great deal of sense and should be encouraged. We should also remain vigilant as the affiliation proceeds that sufficient attention is paid to some of the issues that have been raised. But that is not a reason to reject the affiliation out right	5/15/2019 2:47 PM
40	UCSF cannot force its views on others. And it should not sever a potential for growth and collaboration because of politics. Expansion is in the best interest of the population, improving patient care. This is one of the missions and the reason I enjoy working at UCSF.	5/15/2019 2:35 PM
41	Our capacity and crowding issues have seriously compromised our ability to offer care at a level we can be proud of. Through partnership, UCSF can improve on our care as well as the care provided by our affiliate. The affiliation does not require that we limit the scope of our practice in any way at UCSF. A great number of patients and providers will benefit. I see this partnership as an opportunity to amplify our mission, not to diminish it.	5/15/2019 2:21 PM
42	We need to work together.	5/15/2019 2:16 PM

43	We need to plan for growth if UCSF is going to survive.	5/15/2019 2:12 PM
44	This is an essential step in rationalizing health care delivery in SF. UC values are protected and teaching and care options enriched.	5/15/2019 2:10 PM
45	The arguments against appear more hypothetical than the arguments for. Also, part of trainee education should be real world, as in working with these organizations and thoughts. Rather than ignoring the issue.	5/15/2019 2:09 PM
46	This affiliation is CRITICAL for the care of UCSF patients. We have patients spending countless hours boarding in the UCSF ED and experiencing innumerable adverse events - when they could be optimally cared for at St. Mary's by UCSF providers.	5/15/2019 2:08 PM
47	While I'm a strong supporter of reproductive rights, this is a complex issue and Dignity also takes care of large numbers of Medicaid and uninsured patients, has a wonderful transgender health program, and does lots of HIV care. Disconnecting from them will harm vulnerable populations more than help.	5/15/2019 2:06 PM
48	The world is a big, diverse place. UCSF should not fear exposing its students/residents to this diversity.	5/15/2019 2:06 PM
49	100^%	5/15/2019 2:05 PM
50	The number of people who can be helped through this affiliation seems to outweigh the objections that I have heard voiced to date.	5/15/2019 2:05 PM
51	We need increased capacity for inpatients!!	5/15/2019 2:04 PM
52	Engagement with the community is our mission.	5/15/2019 2:01 PM
53	Perfect can be the enemy of good	5/15/2019 2:01 PM
54	The way the argument is currently written does not take the patients into account. Our first responsibility is to them. I think the affiliation will give patients at Dignity Health the resource to seek UCSF services not offered at Dignity Health. The students should learn that life is gray and that what we teach them is not what everyone believes in. They should be allowed to make up their own views based on experience at different institutions. Finally, if the opposite was true and this was a catholic university, would we want our patients not to have access to better services because of the university's views? As long as Dignity Health allows UCSF faculty to practice freely, then I see no problems with cooperating.	5/15/2019 2:01 PM
55	This affiliation supports Access for our patients and trainees. If we maintain open referral pathways for specialty care, I believe UCSF can affiliate and stay true to our Mission.	5/15/2019 2:00 PM
56	It is not our role to tell the university what business decisions they should/should not be making. Stay in your lane.	5/15/2019 2:00 PM
57	Our mission is to serve all. We are being asked to help to increase our ability to serve more patients in conjunction with Dignity but without limiting the medical care in anyway. Providers will have the ability to continue to share all alternative treatments with patients ensuring patients are fully informed of all options and patients will have access to the care they select based on this information. Neither care nor access is being limited but in-fact expanded. Dignity is respecting our values and ensuring we can practice according to them without compromising them.	5/15/2019 1:59 PM
58	This is a good opportunity for UCSF to collaborate with Dignity Health to improve healthcare to the community that we serve as an institution.	5/15/2019 1:58 PM
59	Broad access to care to under-served communities should be UCSF no 1 priority. Reproductive Health services are supported and provided by UCSF and are not the central benefit of this association. We need to help as many people as possible be well and get better. I regret Dignity Health stance deeply, but access to care esp emergency care supersedes this stance in my view.	5/15/2019 1:57 PM
60	Increasing volume is key to all our shared missions. Support for cardiology/ CT surgery, to get our reputation up to number 1 in the US, should be a high priority and this among many other initiatives should help.	5/15/2019 1:54 PM
61	The capacity issue at UCSF supersedes these questions about Dignity. Patients are being turned away from UCSF in large numbers due to this lack of capacity.	5/15/2019 1:52 PM
62	More people we can help	5/15/2019 1:52 PM

63	This affiliation has nothing but positive possibilities for both as an outcome. I can only think that FEAR is the only reason why one would not support this affiliation, as there are only perceived concerns and nothing to actually be concerned about. ALL patients will benefit from this affiliation.	5/15/2019 1:51 PM
64	As long as patients are allowed to be counseled on alternative resources available for reproductive and end-of-life care.	5/15/2019 1:49 PM
65	Even if there were concerns due to the religious restrictions, at this point it seems that the harm done by our lack of access/limited resources at UC facilities is greater than any potential harm from the restrictions. It makes sense to affiliate and increase patient access.	5/15/2019 1:48 PM
66	The decision to place students and residents at a Dignity faculty is independent of the clinical arrangement. This is a separate decision for the faculty and education leadership to make. In my opinion, educational issues should not be a major factor in evaluating this expanded affiliation. On the other hand, our clinical success funds other parts our mission, including our educational programs.	5/15/2019 1:48 PM
67	Scorched-earth "you're with us 100%, or you're not worth working with in any regard, not even on what we agree are common priorities" is not the way forward.	5/15/2019 1:46 PM
68	Although there is value to the concerns that the association between Dignity Health and UCSF implies a level of acceptance for the Catholic principles, I believe this can be mitigated by UCSF making public statements disavowing this and ensuring the Dignity Health understands and accepts that UCSF will make and continue to make such statements. Further I believe the affiliation will allow access to UCSF care for a larger populations. The concern about limited education during rotations can be addressed and the affiliation can be discussed in ethics classes.	5/15/2019 1:46 PM
69	The affiliation is a problem solving strategy for UCSF Health to increase the local market share - allowing UCSF Health to gain foothold of available spaces to conduct and expand patient care at Dignity Health without eliminating any services that UCSF provides to all patients. The partnership creates a win-win situation in the big picture.	5/15/2019 1:44 PM
70	Framed in the way you have here (I think profit motive noticeably went unmentioned), I think inclusion, bringing into the fold, and acceptance of alternative viewpoints that may not be our own is the more mature response that is more likely to pay long term dividends. A reasonable 'middle path' could be to establish contingencies upon the affiliation such that Dignity expand services to a core population in order to address those exclusionary practices seen as most egregious.	5/15/2019 1:43 PM
71	Opposing this rather than supporting the affiliation can be more discriminatory in that we could be excluding an opportunity to extend our care to a diverse catchment, when affiliating can just assure we can reach those who go to Dignity Health specifically for the chance of getting quality medical care.	5/15/2019 1:42 PM
72	I support inclusion and access to care. This affiliation accomplishes both.	5/15/2019 1:41 PM
73	The benefits of the agreement certainly outweigh these concerns which have been in addressed in the suggested language to allow UCSF to practice and deal with patients without any limitations from the religious background. As this is certainly not my field of expertise, I don't have many patients that this will affect my practice. I feel it would be an opportunity lost to provide more access and have a pop-off valve place to be able to continue to care for patients when UCSF doesn't have the physical capacity to accommodate all the patients who want or need to be here.	5/15/2019 1:38 PM
74	Although the restrictions on abortion, IVF, and sterilization are concerning, the active engagement of UCSF with Dignity offers the best opportunity for improving access to these services and the overall goal of improving access for patients in San Francisco generally. Given the option, UCSF and UC should choose to engage with partners rather than disengage as the better mechanism to make positive change	5/15/2019 1:38 PM
75	If the impediments for not joining Dignity Health are due to its Catholic principles, then I would argue that UCSF is supporting the principles of other communities but singling out the Catholic principles. I find this reasoning unacceptable since we should serve patients and institutions irrespective of their religious preferences. Religion and sexuality are private matters that we should respect and not meddle with in deciding whether to take care of patients.	5/15/2019 1:38 PM
76	Took her in the hospital system is in a crisis mode. We cannot stay with the current operation that we have. We are compromising care. If we need to stay in the forefront of delivering exceptional medical care, we need to expand and continue our growth	5/15/2019 1:37 PM

77	I am a lefty non-Catholic physician, but I attended medical school at Georgetown, so I have some personal experience with Catholic medical systems. We need to provide greater access to healthcare for our patients and ensure the viability of UCSF Health. Just as we do not offer all services at all of our locations, we may find that certain services are not offered at, say, St. Mary's. However, as long as we are committed to providing equal access to a full range of services to all of our patients, I think we can partner with Dignity and support our shared values, while providing a uniquely UCSF level of care at UCSF to fill in the missing pieces that the Catholic hospital does not offer. I think there is more in common than not, and focusing on our differences seems to be a divisive stance.	5/15/2019 1:35 PM
78	The UCSF affiliation will enhance dialog around religion and religious health care issues.	5/15/2019 1:33 PM
79	In a way, UCSF already provide its imprimatur to the VA through its faculty, yet federal law prohibits any abortions at those facilities.	5/15/2019 1:33 PM
80	Although I do not agree with the practices and limitations provided at Dignity Health, I think this is an opportunity for UCSF to engage and promote change. By having trainees rotate through their system, we can encourage an environment of inquiry and evidence based medicine. If we oppose the affiliation and avoid engagement, we may miss an opportunity to promote our UCSF Values.	5/15/2019 1:31 PM
81	One issue you didn't raise. This is NOT the first time UCSF or the other UC Health campuses have been working with Dignity. Some of the successful partnering has been going on for more than a decade, especially around the other UC Health campuses.	5/15/2019 1:31 PM
82	The faculty should to enable better and broader care at dignity. Easier to do as a partner	5/15/2019 1:31 PM
83	This will, in fact, expand care to patients as opposed to curtail it.	5/15/2019 1:29 PM
84	I believe in tolerance for all viewpoints.	5/15/2019 1:26 PM
85	The FA should support the affiliation *if* Dignity health is willing to affirm in the strongest legal terms that UCSF providers are not only allowed to discuss reproductive and end of life options not offered at that facility with patients, but also (1) post signs saying so, (2) offer up to date printed lists of services and locations where patients can receive the services, and (3) allow providers the time and resources to make "warm hand offs."	5/11/2019 7:38 AM
86	Students can be informed of the religious based limitations and the alternative options can be offered to patients.	5/8/2019 3:58 PM
87	As indicated they provide excellent services that are needed and there is no oath to accept or abide by catholic doctrine.	5/8/2019 11:39 AM
88	I am reluctantly voting to support. I am holding my nose. I very much disagree with the position the Catholic Church takes on the treatment of women and LGBTQ persons carrying over to the health care that Dignity health provides.	5/7/2019 6:00 PM
89	The upside of providing optimal care to patients make the merger worth while the students are sufficiently savvy to appreciate the problems working in a restrictive environment but they will have to deal with these problems when leaving into practice.	5/7/2019 5:12 PM
90	On balance this will improve health care for many individuals. It is not an approval of the Dignity/Catholic philosophy as multiple alternatives are available.	5/7/2019 4:58 PM
91	Women's health, while important, is a single issue. Dignity is the state's largest provider of care for the underserved, which trumps the women's health issue. If we don't proceed with affiliation, it will limit our ability to meet our mission to serve the people of the Bay Area and beyond.	5/7/2019 4:46 PM