



**COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET
Patricia Robertson, MD**

June 16, 2007

J. Michael Bishop, MD
Chancellor and University Professor
S-126, Box 0402

RE: APB Review and Priority Ranking of FY 2007-08 Budget Issues

Dear Chancellor Bishop:

During the 2007-08 academic year, the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) heard presentations and discussed at length various projects and initiatives seeking campus funding. On June 7, 2007, the Committee met to review the items listed on the *Summary of FY 2007-08 Budget Issues* prepared by the Office of Budget and Resource Management. During its evaluation of priorities, the Committee paid close attention to three main principles: (1) proposals should be reasonable in expectation and consistent with the requirements set forth by the Executive Budget Committee, (2) proposals should be thoroughly planned with detailed investigation and assumption of accountability, and, perhaps most importantly, (3) proposals should be consistent with the values and goals which are expected to be set forth in the soon-to-be-released Strategic Plan.

After careful deliberation, Committee members individually ranked the priority level of each proposal on a scale of one to five (1=Low and 5=High). These evaluations were averaged to produce an overall recommendation of the Committee. In evaluating these proposals, three clear strata appeared. Items which are the most significant priorities for the faculty are those items which directly relate to the quality of academic life of UCSF are essential to the present and future success of the University and are directly related to the goals of the Strategic Plan. **The top priority items for faculty are the Classroom Improvement Initiative, Academic Information Systems and Campus Transportation.**

The second-tier items are those which the Committee considered to be important, but also had reservations regarding appropriateness of funding source or accountability. The Committee recommends support of these proposals, but with enough qualifications to reduce their priority level below the first-tier proposals which the Committee considered absolutely essential. **Proposals supported by the Committee, but ranked slightly lower in priority, are the Science and Health Education Partnership (SEP) and the Administrative Information Systems.**

One item fell in the third tier, which is not supported by the Committee. The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget considers the proposal regarding Campus Core Research Facilities to be incomplete and premature. As such, the Committee does not recommend funding for this proposal.

The A-21/CAS Relief is an important funding item, now in its third and last year as a new model. The Committee supports as much ICR as is possible to the department and the principal investigator. However, this model needs to be re-examined with the input of the Academic Senate to be sure that "off campus breaks" are

appropriate in all situations with an increased return of ICR. Also, there needs to be more transparency in the actual rate and amount of ICR to the department and to the principal investigator.

Details regarding the assessment of each item by the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget are here presented:

Item 1: Campus Transportation Plan

APB rating: 4.71

The Committee makes an important distinction between funding for parking projects versus shuttle/ transportation concerns.

The Committee maintains that such a vital infrastructure as the shuttle system (the horizontal elevator of the multi-site UCSF campus) should be included in the University budget and should not rely on discretionary funds. The Committee would like to request a supplement to the proposal to cover the cost of the shuttle from BART to Mission Bay which has been replaced by light rail but requires students, staff and faculty to pay out-of-pocket.

Minimizing parking rates is important for recruitment of faculty and staff. Comparisons to the other University of California campuses document that UCSF has one of the highest per-month charges for parking. For recruitment purposes, competitive parking rates cannot be derived by comparing to other commercial parking facilities in the area, as UCSF is competing for talent against other universities with better benefits, not against the community.

Item 2: Science and Health Education Partnership (SEP)

APB rating: 4.25

The Committee believes the Science and Health Education Partnership is an important program that is consistent with the educational and community involvement aspects of the strategic plan. This program is also core to the mission of the University of California (particularly as seen by the legislature) to educate California citizens, their communities, and their educators. Funding this program would not only benefit the community, but may also be politically advantageous to the University. It is hoped that with continued support, this program will ultimately receive UCOP, state funding, and additional grants for its support.

At the same time, the Committee recognizes an accountability issue that has been raised in the past and recommends that if funding for SEP is continued, the program should design an instrument to measure the effectiveness and success of the program. Assessment should include longitudinal studies so long term outcomes can be documented. Our Committee also recommends that all UCSF schools become involved in the program (not just the School of Medicine). Finally, to better avoid redundancy it is important to ensure that SEP is evaluated in connection with all of the community projects going on at UCSF.

Item 3: Academic Information Technology (OAAIS)

APB rating: 4.92

Item 4: Administrative Information Technology(OAAIS)

APB rating: 4.50

Faculty recognize the need for these proposals, but question why such an essential infrastructure as information technology must request discretionary funds, rather than receive funding completely through the University budget. During the discussion of these items, there was a mention of possible stratification of information services with differential charge-backs to faculty depending on the service. The consensus of the Committee on this potential stratification was to emphasize again that information technology is essential to all faculty at UCSF, and should be provided by central funding. This is a core, essential resource to the mission of the University and should be given top priority.

It was noted that the campus currently utilizes an obsolete, inefficient, and ineffective faculty database, and much of the academic administrative affairs is conducted solely via paper forms (The School of Medicine continues to use carbon paper.). Faculty management, faculty operations, and the processes for academic advancement would greatly benefit from the expansion of administrative information technology, and the design and implementation of such electronic systems is of high importance to the faculty.

Training in how to use these systems should not only consist of informational in-person trainings, but also include on-line programs so that members of the faculty can proceed with the training at their own pace.

Item 5: Campus Core Research Facilities (CCRFs)

APB rating: 1.33

The Committee is not convinced that campus faculty members are eager for this initiative. The Committee believes that this proposal represents a large expense not for facilities, but for a re-organization of administration. This proposal also seems designed to suit particular interests, and did not investigate the needs of the campus-wide faculty. The Committee believes that the CCRF initiative has not done sufficient investigation of the opinions of the faculty currently using core research facilities, nor of faculty who might also benefit to determine which cores should be selected for the future. The Committee recommends a needs assessment before any formal or permanent funding, as well as a users' assessment of current faculty, staff, post-docs, and graduate students. With any future proposal, a fiscal impact statement should accompany it, as during our presentation, it was mentioned that most of the cores operate at a deficit at UCSF, as well as a projection of the volume that is likely to be involved.

Additionally, the Committee notes that a search for a Vice Chancellor of Research is underway, and the Committee recommends that such an initiative should wait until that position is filled. During the presentation of this proposal to APB, it was reported that this organization would form a steering committee including Academic Senate faculty. The Committee recommends that if this proposal moves forward, the steering committee should be formed first, and the budget request should follow.

In summary, the Committee believes that this request is not data-driven and that this request is premature.

Item 6: Classroom Improvement Initiative

APB rating: 4.92

The Committee maintains that this is a sorely-needed initiative to bring campus teaching facilities up to a necessary baseline. Our Committee believes that this initiative represents a reasonable, one-year proposal and hopes that the future budget for classroom maintenance will be increased to maintain basic classroom quality.

During its review, faculty expressed many concerns regarding sub-standard and embarrassing classroom conditions on the Parnassus campus (and other sites). Inferior teaching facilities impact everything from the quality of the education and the efficiency of teaching, to the recruitment of both students and of faculty. This past year, teaching faculty on the Committee have noted rodents in the classrooms, damaged furniture, no chairs for students, inadequate equipment, damaged ceiling tiles, and peeling paint in the classrooms. The faculty believes that this modest \$1M proposal desperately needs funding and that it is not likely to find funding from any other source.

Item 7: A-21/CAS Relief

APB rating: None

As mentioned earlier, the Committee recognizes that this is an important model in its last year, but that the model needs to be re-examined for the break it gives the off-campus research projects with input from the Academic Senate. Members of the faculty support as much ICR back to the department and the principal

investigator as possible. The Committee would like to know what the rate of return of the indirect costs to the departments and to principal investigators have been in the past 2 years under this model.


Summary of Recommendations: Proposals in Order of APB Priority Ranking

Rank	Proposal	Rating
1	Item 6: Classroom Improvement Initiative	4.92
2	Item 3: Academic Information Technology (OAAIS)	4.92
3	Item 1: Campus Transportation Plan	4.71
4	Item 4: Administrative Information Technology (OAAIS)	4.50
5	Item 2: Science and Health Education Partnership	4.25
6	Item 5: Campus Core Research Facilities (CCRFs)	1.33
7	Item 7: A-21/CAS Relief	None

The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget appreciates the opportunity to review and make recommendations regarding the FY 2007-08 Budget Issues, and we enthusiastically present these comments for your consideration.

We respectfully request a timely response to this letter once the funding decisions have been made. This will allow the Committee to discuss them in detail at their first meeting in September of 2007.

Yours sincerely,



Patricia Robertson, MD
Professor and Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
UCSF Academic Senate

cc: Deborah Greenspan, UCSF Academic Senate Chair
Steve Barclay, Senior Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance
Members of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget