ACADEMIC PLANNING & BUDGET

Stanton Glantz, Chair

MINUTES
Meeting of October 18, 2001

PRESENT: Chair S. Glantz, A. Kahn, J. Norbeck, J. Showstack


The meeting of the Academic Budget & Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Glantz on October 18, 2001 at 3:40 p.m. in Room S 318. A quorum was not present. The Minutes of the meeting of September 19, 2001 were not approved due to lack of a quorum and were continued to the next meeting for consideration and approval.

Chair’s Report/Announcements

- Vice Chair J. Norbeck will attend the Executive Budget Committee on November 8, 2001 from 10-noon for Dr. Glantz

- Chair Glantz met with Regis Kelly, the newly appointed Executive Vice Chancellor for Research and looks forward to a productive relationship the Committee and the Vice Chancellor.

- **Task Force on the 5th School** - Chair Glantz indicated that at the request of Dan Bikle, Chair of the Senate that representatives from the Schools of Dentistry and Pharmacy would be added to the joint APB and Graduate Council Task Force on the 5th School. John Featherstone will represent the School of Dentistry and C. Anthony Hunt will be asked to represent the School of Pharmacy.

- **Shared Governance Working Group** – Chair Glantz announced that a Shared Governance Working Group had been formed consisting of all five Deans, Vice Chancellor Dorothy Bainton and the following Senate faculty: Dan Bikle, Larry Pitts, Marty Bogetz, Sandra Weiss, B. Joseph Guglielmo and Arnold Kahn to address and find ways to implement the recommendations of the Clinician Scientist Task Force Report. An initial meeting was held and Dr. Glantz indicated that he had been asked by Chair Bikle to participate in a Task Force of the working group that will be chaired by Martin Bogetz to specifically address issues around faculty recruitment, retention and promotions.

Old Business

- **Update on Restructure Proposal** - Chair Glantz reported that Dean Bertolami has communicated through Senate Chair Bikle, a level of “conditional” support for the version of the restructure proposal that was formally transmitted to him in August 2001. Following a meeting with all of the Deans in August 2001, Dean Bertolami had been asked by outgoing Chair Larry Pitts to formally review the proposal on behalf of all of the Deans and provide feedback to the APB Committee about
any proposed changes or concerns. Chair Glantz relayed that Dean Bertolami indicated support as long as the budget interactions between Deans are first run through their Faculty Councils and that Dean Bertolami has agreed to provide a more complete response by the end November 2001 to the Committee. Chair Glantz reiterated the desire for the APB Committee’s timeline for review of the Campus Budget to be synchronized with that of the Campus Budget Office.

Long Range Planning Involvement - The Committee reviewed all of the subcommittees associated with the LRDP and following a discussion about each of the subcommittees determined that there should be representation on all ten of the subcommittees by either a member of APB or other designated faculty. J. Norbeck noted that both she and Z. Werb are currently members of the Academic Planning subcommittee.

Proposed Budget Cuts/Contingency Planning - In anticipation of proposed funding reductions to the University from the State, and at the request of the Office of the President, the campus has been asked to consider a range of potential budget cuts. In anticipation of the preparation of these budget documents, the Budget Office prepared a confidential draft, for discussion purposes only, called the 2002/03 and 2003/04 UCSF Financial Contingency Planning.

The Senate was asked to participate in this review, with comments back to Vice Chancellor Barclay no later than the end of October. Chair Glantz indicated that a special meeting of the APB Committee would be held on either October 25 or 26 (the exact date to be determined depending on the availability of committee members) and instructed the Senate Office to coordinate this meeting as quickly as possible.

Chair Glantz indicated that the Budget Office was looking to APB for suggestions or processes to help plan for potential budget cuts by evaluating such decisions as whether funding reductions should be targeted, should occur across the board or by program. The Committee has been asked to help identify criteria that the Budget Office would use for example, if targeted cuts were recommended. Chair Glantz further explained that the discussion of budget cuts/funding reduction was complicated because there are many UCSF programs and or support services that exist that are mandated legally or by policy or that exist as a condition of funding either from State or Federal agencies.

After lengthy discussion, Committee members expressed concerns about wanting to have a better picture of the tradeoffs and potential magnitude of reductions, changes or elimination of programs so that the Committee would be better able to better evaluate various scenarios and other issues related to proposed cuts.

Chair Glantz indicated that the purpose of the special meeting of APB was to evaluate choices and identify a process for how best to make recommendations. Chair Glantz requested that the Senate Office communicate with Vice Chancellor Barclay to request that the following information be provided to the Committee prior to, or at the special meeting of APB to help assist with its evaluation and recommendations:

- Exact level of funding support provided to UCSF by the State
- Identify the percentage of funding for Administration vs. Academic Program Support
- Identify the total number of FTE funded with State dollars
- Identify any legal or policy mandated programs so that the Committee would be able to better evaluate criteria for any budget reduction recommendations
- Identify how much of the total State funding to the campus is the return of indirect costs?
- Determine if any other UC campuses had obtained information that they could share with us related to criteria for maintaining certain programs or whether there were legal or other policy mandates which would prohibit enacting cuts, reduction or elimination.
- Review the status of Mission Bay and identify the potential impact of Mission Bay build out on proposed funding reductions from the State
The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
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