During the 2005-06 academic year, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) met as a Committee 11 times. The Committee, for the fourth year, actively participated in the review, evaluation and comment on the proposed uses of Chancellor Discretionary Funds for 2006-07. In addition, members of APB served on various UCSF committees and participated on Senate Task Forces related to program or other reviews involving more than one Senate Committee:

- Executive Budget Committee
- Academic Senate Task Force Reviewing the Draft Campus Five-Year Perspectives for New Academic Programs 2006-2011
- SFGH Subcommittee to the Chancellor’s Committee on the LRDP Amendment
- Task Force Reviewing the Creation of a New ORU: The Institute for Human Genetics
- Task Force Reviewing the Final Report on Library Space Planning

The Committee benefited from a variety of informational presentations pertaining to campus budget and planning issues given throughout the year. These presentations included:

1. Overview on the UC/UCSF Budget Process, by Eric Vermillion, Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance.
2. Continuing Education Regarding Graduate Student Fees and Return to Aid Funding, Administration Perspective by Ashish Sahni, Director of Administration, Finance, and Analysis; Student Academic Affairs.
3. Graduate Student Fees and Return to Aid Funding, Student Financial Perspective by Carrie Steere-Salazar, Director of Student Financial Services.
4. Graduate Student Fees and Return to Aid Funding, Admissions Perspective by Cindy Watchmaker, Assistant Dean, Director of Student Affairs, School of Pharmacy.
5. Basic Orientation to UCRS by Steve Barclay, Senior Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance
6. Update Regarding Changes to the UC Retirement and Benefit Plans by Ken Drasner, Chair of Committee on Faculty Welfare.
7. Ongoing Planning and Budget Concerns of the Library by Karen Butter, University Librarian, and Tom Newman, Vice-Chair of the Committee on Library (Appendix 1).
9. Update on Campus Planning and Construction, Parnassus and Mission Bay, by Lori Yamauchi, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Campus Planning (Appendix 2).
10. Risk Management Services Presentation: General Liability, Employment Liability, Property/Casualty, Travel, Contracting, and Risk Assessment and Mitigation by Bruce Flynn, Interim Director, UCSF Risk Management Service (Appendix 3).
11. Risk Management Services Presentation: Hospital and Professional Risk by Ginger Fleming, Director of Risk Management for the UCSF Clinical Enterprise and Neal Cohen, MD, Chair of the Risk Management Committee (Appendix 4).
12. White Papers Regarding Scholarly Communication by Larry Pitts, Chair, Systemwide Senate Special Committee on Scholarly Communications (SCSC). These white papers and the supporting documents for the work of the SCSC are online at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/scsc/reports.html.
13. Presentation from the Committee on Clinical Skills and Simulation Centers by Ronald Arenson, Chair, Committee on Clinical Skills and Simulation Centers (Appendix 5).
14. Presentation regarding International and Global Health Programs of the School of Nursing by William Holzemer, Associate Dean for International Programs and Director of the World Health Organization (WHO) Collaborating Center.
15. Presentation regarding the Quality Improvement Project (QIP) by Jonathan Showstack, Academic Information Technology Coordinator, Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor (Appendix 6).
16. Presentation regarding Campus Core Research Facilities by Keith Yamamoto, Executive Vice Dean, School of Medicine (Appendix 7).
17. Presentation A-21/CAS Relief and Return to Aid Funding Distribution by Angela Hawkins, Executive Director, Office Budget and Resource Management (Appendix 8).
18. Presentation regarding Global Health Sciences’ Request to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds by Charles Smukler, Senior Program Consultant, Global Health Sciences (Appendix 9).
19. Presentation regarding the proposed programs of the Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems (OAAIS) and its request to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds FY 2006-07 (Appendix 10).
20. Presentation regarding the University-Community Partnership Program and its request to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds FY 2006-07 by Barbara French, Associate Vice Chancellor, University Advancement and Planning (Appendix 11).

Issues reviewed and acted on by the Committee included:

1. Ranking and Suggestion of Fundraising Priorities for the Campus.
2. Suggested Priorities for the Strategic Plan.
3. Identification of APB Delegate to the WASC Accreditation Committee.
4. Request for Support for a Funding Request to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds from the Office of the Academic Senate for Faculty Compensation for Academic Senate Service.
5. Request for Support for a Funding Request to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds from the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Quality of Faculty Life, Subcommittee on Faculty Wellbeing, for Health Fitness Facilities at SFGH and VA Campuses.
6. Request for Support for a Permanent Increase to the Library Annual Budget Requested by the Academic Senate Committee on Library
7. Request for Support for a Funding Request to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds from the Committee on Courses of Instruction for APB Support for the Implementation of an Online Course Preparation, Review, and Approval System at UCSF.
Systemwide Issues

Norman Oppenheimer served as the UCSF APB representative to the systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). Stanton Glantz, former member of UCSF APB served as the Chair of UCPB, and occasionally communicated with UCSF APB regarding issues at the systemwide level. The following issues were of particular interest to APB.

1. Graduate Student Fees and Return to Aid Funding.
3. Review and Comment of the White Papers Regarding Scholarly Communication from the Systemwide Special Committee on Scholarly Communications (SCSC).

Graduate Student Fees and Return to Aid Funding

The University of California Office of the President (UCOP) continues to address the issue of graduate student fees and the allocation formulas for Return to Aid funding. To better understand these issues at the local level, APB invited three presentations on the topic:

1. Graduate Student Fees and Return to Aid Funding, Administration Perspective, presentation by Ashish Sahni, Director of Administration, Finance, and Analysis; Student Academic Affairs.
2. Graduate Student Fees and Return to Aid Funding, Student Financial Perspective, presentation by Carrie Steere-Salazar, Director of Student Financial Services; and
3. Graduate Student Fees and Return to Aid Funding, Admissions Perspective, presentation by Cindy Watchmaker, Assistant Dean, Director of Student Affairs, School of Pharmacy.

Stan Glanz reported to the Committee that UCPB expects to readdress this issue in 2006-07.

Proposed Changes to the UC Defined Benefit Plan and Defined Contribution Plan

The Office of the President continues to explore necessary changes to the UC Defined Benefit and Defined Contribution Plans. UCPB is reviewing and responding to various proposals from UCOP. APB has been monitoring these proposals via N. Oppenheimer, its representative to UCPB, and via the reports from UCOP. UCOP budget presentations are online at http://budget.ucop.edu/pres.html.

Review and Comment of the White Papers Regarding Scholarly Communication from the Systemwide Special Committee on Scholarly Communications (SCSC).

Larry Pitts, Chair of the Systemwide Senate Special Committee on Scholarly Communications (SCSC), addressed the Committee on March 16, 2006 and gave a history and overview of the White Papers Regarding Scholarly Communication which was sent from Systemwide back to the campuses for
comment. These white papers and the supporting documents for the work of the SCSC are online at 
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/scsc/reports.html.

The committee discussed these proposals, and Dr. Pitts was able to elucidate that these white papers 
represent the starting point for systemwide on this issues, and additional concrete concerns will be 
worked out during a later implementation phase. During the conversation regarding copyright, B. 
Seaman pointed out that federal employees such as faculty working at the V.A. are prohibited from 
assigning copyright for materials generated at the V.A. Many faculty expressed ignorance that they did 
not have to relinquish copyright for publication and it would be a significant benefit for the faculty to 
have a Systemwide UC policies and paperwork for retention of copyright for submissions. One aim of 
these new proposed policies to create a new culture as to copyright at UC to the benefit of all faculty, 
both new and established.

Also discussed was the issue of copyright for creative works independent of the career with the 
University, for example works of fiction. However, at all levels of the assignation of license or limited 
copyright to the regents for publication in open-access venues, faculty members may opt-out. All of 
these proposed policies were designed to cut the costs ahead related to scholarly publication in the future 
and to the benefit of individual faculty members in terms of copyright.

Overall, the Committee recognized a faculty need for education regarding copyright, the various forms of 
copyright, assignation of limited copyright or license, and what may be individually retained concerning 
personally creative works, teaching materials, textbook contributions, and materials for Web sites.

The Committee drafted a response (March 17, 2006) to Academic Senate Division Chair Greenspan to be 
included in the Divisional response to the Academic Council [Appendix 12].

UCSF Academic Planning & Budget Issues

The Committee worked on several issues at the Division level.

Ranking and Suggestion of Fundraising Priorities for the Campus

The Committee was requested by Chair Greenspan to prioritize fundraising needs identified by the Senate 
Executive Committee, and to include other fundraising priorities deemed necessary by APB. The priorities 
identified by the Executive Committee were: Graduate Student Fellowships which originated with APB), an 
increase in Endowed Chairs, adequate funding to support operations and/or maintenance at all UCSF 
campus facilities, subsidizing the cost of child care, and funding to support an Academy of Master 
Clinicians.

The Committee discussed each of the following items at length and after a vote, prioritized these as follows:

1. Graduate Student Fellowships.
2. Increase in Endowed Chairs and increase in FTEs for the academic mission.
3. Funding to support clinical education, including funding for an Academy of Master Clinicians, clinical 
education FTEs, and other school-specific needs.
4. Subsidizing the cost of child care and expansion of facilities and slots to a capacity such that the wait list will be less than 50 children.
5. Expansion the Academy of Medical Educators to all four schools and continued financial support.*
6. Adequate funding to support operations and/or maintenance at all UCSF campus facilities.

(*This priority was added by AP&B. The vote for these rankings was inclusive of the Faculty Council representatives from all four schools.)

| Suggested Priorities for the Strategic Plan |

During the February 9, 2006 meeting, Academic Senate Vice Chair David Gardner solicited ideas for priorities which should be addressed in the UCSF strategic plan.

Ideas voiced by Committee members included the consideration of the following:

- Increased enrollment to meet workforce needs for the State of California.
- Consideration of the addition of three schools: Health Care Administration, Healthcare Business and Technology, Global Health.
- Increasing faculty financial and other support to accommodate the cost of living in the Bay Area.
- Increasing faculty financial and other support to assist and retain current faculty and to assist recruitment so that there will be sufficient faculty to teach the increasing enrollment.
- Co-investment in faculty housing.
- Re-locating the entire campus to Mission Bay even if it means buying additional property there.
- Modernization of accounting technology.
- Increasing administrative support to faculty.
- Establishment of an education center with technical support and small group spaces.
- Re-direction of the Children’s Hospital planned move to Mission Bay back to Parnassus as the Intensive Care Nursery and the Labor and Delivery will remain at Parnassus.
- Movement of the four schools to Mission Bay to make room for an expanded hospital on Parnassus.
- Integration of the students from all four schools during the students’ educational process to expose them to the health care “team” concept.

| Identification of APB Delegate to the WASC Accreditation Committee |

Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Sally Marshall explained the nature of the Committee which will be working on the Western Association of Colleges and Universities (WASC) accreditation renewal. Harold Bernstein volunteered to serve as the representative from APB.

| Request for Support for a Funding Request to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds from the Office of the Academic Senate for Faculty Compensation for Academic Senate Service |
Tamara Maimon, Director of the Office of the Academic Senate, addressed the Committee on April 20, 2006 and reported that the compensation for Academic Senate Service approved last year was done so as a one-time funding and that the Senate Office is seeking to secure this funding as a permanent allocation to its budget. T. Maimon has included funding for faculty support for Academic Senate service in the Academic Senate Office’s budget for next year and in the four-year budget projections. T. Maimon requested the support of APB for the inclusion of compensation for Academic Senate service as a permanent allocation to the budget of the Office of the Academic Senate.

The Committee unanimously voted to support this request, and sent a communication expressing its support to Academic Senate Chair Deborah Greenspan (Appendix 13).

Request for Support for a Funding Request to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds from the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Quality of Faculty Life, Subcommittee on Faculty Wellbeing, for Health Fitness Facilities at SFGH and VA Campuses

Stuart Eisendrath, Member, Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Quality of Faculty Life and Chair, Subcommittee on Faculty Wellbeing, addressed the Committee on April 20, 2006. He discussed the successful experience of creating a fitness center at the Mount Zion campus and reported that his subcommittee had been pursuing creating similar facilities at the VA and SFGH using a similar model. The Subcommittee on Faculty Wellbeing sought the support of APB for their request to the Chancellor for $40,000 for both facilities, $20,000 each. SFGH and the VA campus administrators have agreed to supply the space, and the equipment will be provided by Millberry Fitness Center at minimal costs. In this model, the centers would not be staffed and would be administrated by the respective sites. It is hoped that these sites will eventually fall under the purview of the Millberry Fitness Center.

The Committee sent a Communication to Academic Senate Chair Deborah Greenspan expressing the support of APB for this project. The Communication from the Faculty Wellbeing Subcommittee of the Chancellor’s Council on Faculty Life and the Communication to Academic Senate Chair Greenspan from the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget are attached to this Annual Report as Appendix 14.

Request for Support for a Permanent Increase to the Library Annual Budget Requested by the Academic Senate Committee on Library

University Librarian Karen Butter addressed the Committee on April 20, 2006 and provided a summary of Library budget issues and a description of inflationary issues for journal subscriptions and electronic resources. Last year APB supported a request from the Library for additional emergency funds. Tom Newman, Chair of the Committee on Library (COL), sent a communication (April 14, 2006) to APB requesting Academic Senate support for the $150,000 permanent augmentation to the Library annual budget to cover the cost of inflation for digital materials and to purchase a limited number of new journals and databases for the fiscal year 2006-2007.

The Committee unanimously voted to support the request for $150,000 permanent augmentation to the Library annual budget and sent a communication expressing its support to Academic Senate Chair
Deborah Greenspan. The Communication from the Committee on Library and the Communication expressing the support of APB are included in Appendix 15.

Review for Support for a Funding Request to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds from the Committee on Courses of Instruction for APB Support for the Implementation of an Online Course Preparation, Review, and Approval System at UCSF.

Eileen Grady, Chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI) addressed the Committee on June 1, 2006 and gave a report regarding the Communication from the Committee on Courses of Instruction Requesting Academic Senate Support for the Implementation of an Online Course Preparation, Review, and Approval System at UCSF. E. Grady summarized some of the issues supporting the importance of developing an online course system for UCSF and referred to screenshots from the online course system of UC Santa Barbara. E. Grady walked the Committee through the UCSF process of course proposal, review, and approval and the problems inherent to the system. An online system would stop faculty at the appropriate stages if errors appear in their form work. Currently, the Office of the Academic Senate and the Registrar’s Office share the responsibility for this activity, but as the Office of the Academic Senate is responsible for the COCOI, the workload in this process is disproportionate to the Office of the Senate.

Courses are also required to undergo a five-year review, which would be greatly facilitated by an electronic system. A cogent online course system would also alleviate some of the difficulties of the non-integrated systems of the Office of the Academic Senate and the Registrar’s Office. Additionally, an online course system would be helpful for UCSF in particular as it is such a geographically distributed campus.

The implementation of such a system would come at a savings for the campus, and any such system would be an invaluable benefit to faculty, staff, and students.

Jonathan Showstack, Academic Information Technology Coordinator in the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor, and Ex-Officio Member of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, expressed his support for this project and recommended a projected budget in the amount of $200,000 for the first phase beginning in 2006-07 for project assessment and initial development.

The Committee unanimously supported the funding for such a project and sent a Communication expressing the support of this Committee to Chair Greenspan for ultimate submission to the Chancellor.

The Communication from COCOI and the Communication from APB expressing its support are attached to this Annual Report as Appendix 16.

The PDF of the screenshots of the UCSB system is 36 pages long and not included in this appendix. This document is available from the Office of the Academic Senate.

Review of Projects Requesting Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds for FY 2006-07

Steve Barclay, Senior Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, provided to the Executive Budget Committee (EBC) and APB a matrix of projects requesting Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds. The
Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, as representatives of the Academic Senate, provided comment and opinion of priority to requests to the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds. Chair Robinson asked for additional information and informational presentations regarding items on the matrix not previously presented to the Committee. Ultimately, APB heard presentations or were presented with support materials for 11 of the 13 items.

As requested, the Committee provided a rating of 1 to 5 (1=low and 5=high) for each line item and provided comment as necessary.

The projects requesting Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds are listed on the matrix included in Appendix 17 and were ranked by APB as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Issue</th>
<th>APB Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Health Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administrative Systems Advisor Committee Strategic Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic Information Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrative Information Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Library</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Academic Senate Service Support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty Fitness Facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Online Course Preparation, Review and Approval System</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. University-Community Partnership Program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A-21/CAS Relief</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mission Bay Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. State Utilities and OMP Funding Shortfall</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Campus Core Research Facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These ratings with relevant comments were compiled by Chair Robertson into a Communication sent to Academic Senate Chair Deborah Greenspan for submission to Chancellor Bishop [Appendix 18].

**Issues for the 2006-2007 Academic Year**

1. Continuing monitoring of proposed changes to the UC Defined Benefit and Defined Contribution Plans.
2. Review of Faculty Compensation Issues.
5. Review and Comment to FY 2007-08 Budget Issues.
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THE COST OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

Karen Butter
University Librarian
Presentation to AP&B
November 2005

Library Statistics – FY04

- Volumes, all formats: 821,492
- Gross volumes added: 5,554
- Print journals currently received: 900
- Electronic journals: 6,884
- Electronic health sciences serials: 3,251
- External databases: 60

Issue – publishing is big business

- Scientific communication has become an international, multi-billion dollar business.
- Mergers in the publishing industry reduce competition. Consolidation is a significant factor in journal price inflation.
- Publishers leverage the academy’s reliance on them (publish or perish)

Related Facts

- In 2002, science, technology & medical (STM) publishing was an $11 billion market
- Two of the largest STM publishers account for 60% of UC’s shared digital journals budget but only 33% of ejournal use.

Source: Outsell, Inc.
Related Facts

- UC faculty serve on the editorial boards of top-tier journals
- UC libraries spent $20 million on print and digital journal subscriptions in 2002–03.

Book & Journal Expenditures
ARL Libraries 1996 - 2004

Journal Price Increases
2001 - 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>$1,094</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>$2,140</td>
<td>$2,988</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>$781</td>
<td>$1,061</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$1,081.50</td>
<td>$1,424.50</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Facts

- 55% of the UCSF Library Book/Journal Budget Required for Materials with Ongoing Annual Costs
- Historic Inflation – 8-10%. Flat budget Requires Cancellations
Additional Pressures on the Book/Journal Budget

- Continued Growth in New Journals
- Expanded Areas of Research for UC Faculty (optics, physics, computer science, math)
- Increased Expectations

Strategies to Manage Flat Budget

- 600 Journals Cancelled in 2003-2005
  - Duplicate Format (2004)
  - Low-Use Print Journals (2005)

UC-Wide Initiatives to Contain Cost

- Negotiate as a System
- Multi-Year Consortial Agreements
- Price Caps < Publishers Historic Increase
- Access to Common Journals Systemwide
- New Models to Determine Base for Negotiations

Approximate savings $2M systemwide to date.

New Funding for Library Materials

- $150,000 – (2005/06)
  - Contain print collection at current levels
  - Purchase new online journals
  - Additional Funds for Mission Bay Library
  - 30 new journals
Update on UCSF Digital Library Resources

- American Society of Microbiology – (11 journals)
- Optical Society of American – (6 optic journals)
- PsycArticles (56 journals)
- Sage Publications (343 journals in social sciences/nursing)
- Science STKE and SAGE
- Journal of Clinical Oncology
- Journal of Immunology

Update on UCSF Digital Library Resources – Purchase Files for Older Years

- Nature Publishing Group (now to 1970, soon to 1950)

Update on UCSF Digital Library Resources – New Resources

- Access Medicine (27 online textbooks, including Lange series)
- Merck Index
- Methods in Enzymology (to Vol. 1)
- Safari Tech Books (300+ books in computers/programming)
- Science of Synthesis (Methods in Organic Chemistry)
- SPIE Digital Library (optic science)

Update on UCSF Digital Library Resources – Under Consideration

- AnthroSource (Am. Anthropological Society and UC Press)
- Nature Methods and Nature Chemical Biology
New Models for Scientific Communications

- Charge for Dissemination vs. Charge for Publication
- Institutional Repositories - eScholarship
- Open Access
- NIH Public Access Policy

Transfer Rights but Retain Some Rights
http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/manage/transfer_copyrights.html

Special Committee on Scholarly Communications

- Established in 2004 by UC Academic Senate
- Chaired by Larry Pitts
- White Papers to be issued in 2005

SCSC Proposed Actions

- Peer Review as the fundamental basis for assessing and communicating scholarship
- Dissemination of new knowledge to the widest audience
- Economic balance and sustainability
- Unfettered re-use of scholarship by scholars and within the academic enterprise
- Accommodate disciplinary differences
- Appropriate use of current & future technology to support the above
http://www.library.ucsf.edu/info/about/news/listserv.html

Subscribe to Library News to receive monthly Library News headlines
Or
Check 'What’s New’ box on left side of GALEN site.

www.library.ucsf.edu/
Update on Campus Planning and Construction
Parnassus and Mission Bay

Lori Yamauchi
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Campus Planning

New Construction at Parnassus
- MR I/II Demo Parn. Services Bldg
- 3rd & Irving Apartments
- Kirkham Childcare Center
- Stem Cell Building
- 5th Avenue Housing

Renovation at Parnassus
- MSB/Moffitt Seismic Joint & Retrofit
- HSC-16.O56B
- Cole Hall
- 1420 5th Ave.
- ML-13 Bed Expansion
- HSC-4 Ortho
Parnassus Services Building

New lab animal resource center includes:
- 85,000 GSF / 45,000 ASF
- $50,958,000 approved budget
- $31,631,000 in state funds
- $18,967,000 in non-state funds
- Completed June 2005

3rd and Irving Street Apartments

145 Irving Street Housing project includes:
- 18 two bedroom units (36 beds)
- 17,000 GSF / 14,000 ASF
- $5,640,000 approved budget
- $3,950,000 in external financing
- $1,690,000 in housing reserves
- Projected completion July 2006

Kirkham Child Care Center

Project includes:
- Space for 80 children (4 classrooms and a multipurpose room)
- 8,869 GSF / 5,891 ASF
- $4,374,000 budget
- Funding Source Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds
- Projected completion March 2007

5th Avenue Housing

Project includes renovation of:
- 1432 5th Ave. (2 units, 6 beds, 4,296 GSF)
- 1440 5th Ave. (4 units, 8 beds, 7,389 GSF)
- 1460 5th Ave. (1 unit, 3 beds, 3,290 GSF)
- $2,844,000 approved budget
- $1,874,000 in external financing
- $860,000 in proceeds from property sale
- $110,000 from housing reserves
- Projected completion March 2006
Medical Research I/II Demolition

Project includes:
- Removal of 36,538 GSF from the space inventory
- $3,195,000 approved budget
- $3,195,000 in non-state funds
- Projected completion May 2006

Stem Cell Building

Project:
- Located on MR I/II site
- 80,000 GSF
- Budget to be determined (TBD)
- Funding sources TBD
- Completion date TBD

MSB/Moffitt Seismic Joint and Retrofit

Project involves seismic improvements and space adjustments:
- $18,800,000 approved budget
- $15,012,000 in state funds
- $3,788,000 in non-state funds
- Projected completion Dec. 31, 2007

Cole Hall Renovation

Project involves renovating interior finishes, seating and HVAC upgrade:
- $3,500,000 estimated budget
- Non-state funding source yet to be identified
- Projected completion late 2007
Renovation Projects

MSB-9 Human Genetics Program Lab:
- 2,600 ASF
- $1,104,000 approved budget
- Completed August 2005

HSE-16 Developmental and Stem Cell Biology Lab:
- 4,720 ASF
- $3,873,000 amended budget
- Projected completion April 2006

HSE-6 Orthopedic Surgery Lab:
- 1,851 ASF
- $1,086,000 approved budget
- Projected completion May 2006

L-13, M-13S Bed Expansion:
- 20,000 ASF
- $36,200,000 approved budget
- Projected completion February 2008

Parnassus Projects to be completed by 2012 (LRDP Horizon)

UC Hall decant and demolition:
- Removal of 146,853 GSF from the space inventory
- Timetable and Budget TBD

Lab of Radiobiology demolition:
- Removal of 18,219 GSF from the space inventory
- Timetable TBD

Medical Research IV demolition:
- Removal of 12,252 GSF from the space inventory
- Timetable TBD

Proctor, Surge and Woods demolition:
- Removal of 25,124 GSF from the space inventory
- Timetable TBD

Housing:
- Older Aldea housing demolition TBD
- 1486-88 5th Ave. renovation TBD
- 374 and 735 Parnassus Ave. replacement TBD

Infrastructure Improvements:
- MSB HVAC
- Electrical Distribution System
- West side Utilities
- Telecom / Data improvements

Parnassus Design Guidelines

Scope:
- Parnassus Design Guidelines and Campus Plan will address the developed northern portion of the Parnassus Heights campus site located below the Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve
Parnassus Design Guidelines

Goals:
• To establish, reinforce and enhance a pedestrian friendly zone on Parnassus Avenue and Irving Street
• To develop a more complete pedestrian circulation system with minimum conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular traffic
• To improve the campus identity through signage
• To better define the edges of the campus and create a sense of arrival
• To enhance Saunders Court by making it more usable, enjoyable and attractive
• To establish more consistency and uniformity in courtyards, plazas and garden-like areas
• To preserve and enhance existing passive open space areas
• Building Design Goals TBD

Timetable:
• Prepare Design Guidelines Summer ’05 to Fall ’06
• Prepare Campus Plan Spring ’06 to Fall ’06

Mission Bay

Helen Diller Cancer Research Building

Program includes:
• Neurological Surgery, Urology, UCSF Cancer Center
• 161,757 GSF / 91,168 ASF
• $128,621,000 approved budget
• $85,000,000 in gift funds
• $13,621,000 in campus funds
• $30,000,000 external financing
• Projected completion Fall 2008
Neuroscience Research Building
Phase 1

Program includes:
• Keck Center Neuroscience, Molecular Neuroscience
• 91,700 GSF / 53,700 ASF
• $67,100,000 proposed budget
• $46,000,000 in gift funds
• $21,000,000 external financing
• Projected completion TBD

Mission Bay Hospital Planning

Planning underway includes:
• Land acquisition of the south site
• LRDP Amendment for 210 bed hospital (children, mothers, women’s, and cancer services)
• Site planning and detailed programming
• SB 1953 compliance options
• Timetable change

Mission Bay
Phase 2 Site Planning

Planning for:
• Street Layout
• Infrastructure
• Landscaping and Open Space
The mission of Risk Management Services is to partner with UCSF faculty and staff to identify and manage risks associated with their activities, consistent with the University’s missions of teaching, research and public service.

By strategically managing risk we can reduce the likelihood of losses, create greater financial stability, and protect our resources.
So, what does RMS do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loss Control &amp; Training Programs</th>
<th>Developing and implementing effective loss control programs and training in risk management best practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Programs</td>
<td>Coordinating with third party administrator on claims for theft, damage, and loss of UCSF owned property, including UCSF owned and leased vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Financing</td>
<td>Allocation of self-insurance program costs and insurance premiums across UCSF departments and projection of future self-insurance program costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Programs</td>
<td>Managing claims against UCSF for damage to others’ property, injuries to visitors and the public, employment practices and vehicle liability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UC Self-insurance programs

Regents coverage:
BUS 75 – general, auto and employment liability
BUS 28 – loss, theft or damage to property

In addition, UC carries specialty coverage for losses related to fine arts collections, theft, construction and building risk, transport of goods, and several other areas which are inherently “risky”

Identifying and Reducing the Cost of Risk

By identifying and analyzing the full cost of risk, the campus Risk Management programs will develop strategic plans to reduce liability costs and free up resources to be used for meeting the University’s mission

OP Enterprise Risk Management Initiative

Enterprise Risk Management

- Strategic
- Operational
- Financial
- Hazard
Cost of Risk

2004/05
Cost of Risk
$596 million, systemwide

Cost of Risk – Systemwide and UCSF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>UC systemwide costs, FY 04-05</th>
<th>UC systemwide, Cost per $1000</th>
<th>UCSF Campus costs, FY 04-05</th>
<th>UCSF Campus, Cost per $1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Liability</td>
<td>$4.4 mil.</td>
<td>$0.29</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Liability</td>
<td>$20.7 mil.</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$703,000</td>
<td>$0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>$21.2 mil.</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$3 mil.</td>
<td>$2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Losses</td>
<td>$4.8 mil.</td>
<td>$0.31</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk management process

1. Identify risks using historical data, surveys and interviews.
2. Analyze risks via risk mapping and prioritization based on likelihood and potential impact.
3. Select target risks and develop action plans for risk reduction/management.
4. Implement the plan in partnership with department.
5. Monitor and continually refine - Use RMS information to evolve the risk reduction program.

Risk Management Delivers (Data)

- Identifying meaningful metrics is challenging in non-revenue generating organizations
- Risk Management Services has access to data that can be trended and benchmarked
- Customizable for closer analysis of department risk trends
Claims data tracked by RMS

- New claims
- Claims by department, division, location
- Cost of claims
- Types of claims (i.e. employment, property, contractual, theft, etc.)
- Year-over-year claims frequencies, costs
- Claims “development”
- Catastrophic claims
- Litigation and defense costs
- Allocations for General Liability and Property self-insurance programs

What does the future hold?

- Department by department “scorecard” of claims experience and trends
- Wider communication about risk issues
- Early claims resolution program
- “Partnering for prevention” risk consultation

Go Blue!

“When You’re Through Improving, You’re Through.”

As the winningest head coach in Michigan football history, Schembechler's teams won or tied 13 Big Ten championships during his 21 year tenure.

Contact Risk Management Services

- Laurel Heights, Room 325
- Box 1338
- 476-2498
- Coming soon: the new RMS website
UCSF Professional Liability Program

Neal H. Cohen, MD
Ginger Fleming, JD
Academic Planning and Budget Meeting
January 5, 2006

Professional Liability Program

- UCSF Professional Liability Program
- Risk Management Office
- Risk Management Committee

UC Professional Liability Program

Professional Liability Insurance

- Self-Insurance Program
- Coverage
  - Hospital and Medical Professional Liability
  - Current Self-Insured Retention (SIR) of $7.5 M
  - Per Claim with No Aggregate
- Reinsurance for Excessive Claims
  - Different Layers
  - Purchased from Different Companies
- Premiums Calculated (Allocated) Annually
  - Market Climate
  - Claims History
  - Risk Exposure

UC Professional Liability Program

Professional Liability Insurance

- Coverage for Defense and Indemnification
  - Approved Activities
    - Within the Course and Scope of Employment/Training Program
- Exclusions
  - “Moonlighting”
  - Assault, Battery, Other Criminal Behavior
  - Activities Outside of Course and Scope of Employment
- Licensing Board Investigations (Provision of Limited Coverage Under Review By UCOP)
  - Business & Finance Bulletin BUS-9
Elements of Professional Liability Claim

- Fiduciary Duty
- Breach of Duty
  - Act or Omission to Act Fell Below Applicable Standard of Care as Established by Expert Testimony
  - Provider’s Actions Caused Injury
- Damages According to Proof

Determining Standard of Care

- Established by Expert Testimony
- State and Federal Laws and Regulations
- Professional Journals
- Professional Association Standards and Guidelines
- Facility Bylaws, Policies and Procedures

Professional Liability Coverage

- Duty to
  - Inform and Participate in Review of Adverse Clinical Outcomes
  - Participate in Defense of a Claim or Litigated Matter
  - Comply with UC/Medical Center Policies, Medical Staff Bylaws, Rules and Regulations

UC Professional Liability Program Claims Management

- Third Party Claims Administrator (Octagon Risk Services)
  - Investigates All Professional Liability Claims
  - Provides Recommendations re: Compensation
- Claims Resulting in Litigation are Assigned to Defense Counsel that Specializes in Medical Malpractice
  - Panel of Defense Counsel Firms
**Litigation Process**
- Mediation
- Settlement
- Trial and Verdict

**Litigation Strategy**
- Factors to Consider
  - Liability
  - Extent of Injury/Damages
  - Strength of Expert Support
  - Deposition Testimony
  - Demeanor of Plaintiff and Defendant
  - Sympathetic Nature of Case
  - Business Considerations
  - Key Witness Ability to Withstand Trial

**UC Professional Liability Program Risk Management Office**
- Responds to Concerns about Clinical Management
- Reviews Adverse Clinical Outcomes
- Ensures Compliance with Policies
  - Medical Center
  - Medical Staff Bylaws, Rules and Regulations
  - University of California
- Assists in the Defense of a Claim or Litigated Matter
- Provides Interface with UCOP RM Office

**Risk Management Committee**
- Medical Staff Committee
- Selected Case Review
  - Reviews and Makes Recommendations Regarding Case Management to Octagon and Legal Defense
  - Assists in Defining Need for "Expert" Review
  - Identifies "Lessons to be Learned"
- Recommends Risk Reduction Strategies and Improvements in Care Management Through QIEC and Appropriate Medical Staff Committees
- Reviews and Approves Root Cause Analyses and Defines Follow-Up Requirements
Professional Liability Program

- Reporting of Adverse Outcomes
  - National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB)
  - California Medical Board
  - Department Chair Notified of Claim Resolution
- Allocation Process

Reporting of Adverse Outcomes

- NPDB
  - Requires Reporting of Settlement or Verdict of Any Amount When Made On Behalf Provider
  - Reported if Named as a Defendant, Even if Later Dismissed and Settlement or Verdict Against Regents
  - Provider Entitled To Review Explanatory Statement Prior To NPDB Making Public to Authorized Inquiries

California Medical Board Reporting Requirements

- Requires Reporting of all Judgments and Arbitration Awards of Any Amount
- Mandates Reporting of Settlements
  - Allocation Required among Responsible Providers
  - Not Dependent on Being Named as a Defendant
- Variable Reporting Requirements
  - $30,000 for Physicians
  - $3,000 for Other Providers

UCSF Medical Center Allocation Process

- Initiated After UCOP and Plaintiff Agree to Settle or Following Adverse Verdict at Trial
- Case Referred to “Allocation Committee”
- All Providers Notified in Writing of Allocation Committee Deliberations
- Meeting Date, Time
  - Invitation to Attend or Provide Statement
  - If Trainee, May Request Attendance by Program Director or Other Faculty
- No Legal Representation Permitted
- Allocation is Not For Disciplinary Purposes
UCSF Medical Center Allocation Process

- Committee Reviews Relevant Information
  - Medical Record
  - Case Summary, Including Allegations, Expert Reviews, Defense Counsel Assessment
  - Oral or Written Statement from Providers

Allocation Committee Special Considerations

- Committee Allocates Responsibility
  - Degree of Responsibility of Each Provider
  - Financial Apportionment of Responsibility
- Exceptions
  - Systems Errors
  - Equipment Malfunctions
  - Circumstances Where There is a Settlement For Reasons Other Than Standard of Care

UCSF Medical Center Allocation Process

- Committee Decision Reported to
  - UCSF Medical Center CEO
  - Chair, Risk Management Committee
  - Involved Providers
  - UCOP Medical Director, Risk Manager & OGC
- UCOP Concurs or Requests Re-Review
- UCOP Completes Required Documents and Reports to Licensing Board(s)

Professional Liability Program Special Considerations

- Settlement Process is Not Democratic
  - Input Obtained from Affected Providers
  - Expert Witnesses Used to Support Clinical Judgments and Management Decisions
  - Provide Campus Input, Recommendations to UCOP
  - Obtain Consensus, If Possible
  - Ultimate Decision Made by UCOP Risk Management Office and OGC
Professional Liability Program
Special Considerations

- Rarely is Individual Provider a Named Defendant
  - Cases Filed in Name of Regents
- **However,** Implications More Significant Because of Allocation and Reporting Requirements
  - Allocation is Independent of Settlement Process
  - Must Allocate to All Responsible Parties
  - Must Allocate in Proportion to Degree of “Responsibility”

Professional Liability Program
Impact on Clinical Management

- Participation in Care in Any Way Creates Risk
  - Examining Patient
  - Responding to RN, RT, etc.
  - Writing Any Order
  - Emergency Intervention
  - “Helping Out”
- Extent of Involvement May or May Not Dictate Outcome
- Personal Documentation is Not Necessary to be “Named” in Case

Questions or Concerns

- Risk Management Department is a Valuable Resource
  - Available 24/7
  - Pager 443-2284
  - Phone 353-1842
UCSF Simulation Center

The Time has Come

Ronald Arenson, MD

Goals of a Simulation Center

- Develop high quality simulation experiences
- Provide opportunities to practice and develop skills without putting patients at risk
- Develop inter-professional team training
- Provide opportunities for credentialing
- Conduct research to validate simulation
- Facilitate learning beyond the center

Status at other institutions

- 40% of medical schools use mannequin simulators
- Anesthesia, Cardiology, Surgery are leaders in using simulation
- LCME expects simulation in med school
- Some RRCs now expect simulation
- JCAHO - simulation reduces errors and improves safety
- Central facilities deemed most effective
- Harvard, Stanford, Toronto, UCD, UCLA

UCSF Survey

- Web-based survey
- 4 current small simulation centers
- Resources needed include space, faculty, equipment
- Standardized patients and critical care situation training needed
- Skills in scopes, BCLS/ACLS, Code Blue, medication errors, pharmacodynamics, catheters, microsurgery identified
- Interpersonal exercises in clinical decision-making and communication
Central Facility Opportunities

- Certification / re-cert for nurses and physicians
  - Phlebotomy, central lines, ECGs, vital signs
  - Competency assessment
- Training across disciplines in interventional or surgical techniques
- Shared space, resources, personnel

Facility Characteristics

- Modular, available for all, 24/7
- OR, trauma, ICU, standard patient room and central control area
- Patient interview rooms with adjacent control area, also used for computer-based learning sessions
- High-fidelity mannequins - full-body and parts including some portable equipment
- Microsurgery, bronchoscopy, endoscopy, pelvic exam, ocular
- Procedural skills practice space including endovascular suite
- Small and larger classrooms with remote video
- Research area for development
- Secure data management
  - Credentialing, skills assessment, completion records
- High quality audiovisual technology
- Staff space

Duke Simulation Center

Trauma Man
Catheter-based training

Capital Requirements

- Mannequins - $30,000 - $250,000
- Endovascular simulator - $250,000
- Dedicated microsurgical - $1 million
- Integration software - $150,000 - $200,000
- Space renovation - 3,000 to 12,000 sf at $250 - 300 / sf
- Total of $2.5 million to start

Annual Operating Expenses

- Personnel
  - Director, center coordinator, dedicated trainers, audio-visual technician
- Non-personnel expenses
  - Maintenance, supplies, utilities, rent
- Budget around $600,000 / year

Funding Opportunities

- Philanthropic sources
- Firefighters, paramedics, military
- Research grants
- Medical Center
- User fees but do not want to discourage use
- Some commercial centers expect profits
Next Steps

- Distribute report
- Educate the UCSF community
- Identify champions
- Develop detailed plans
- Identify space
- Raise money
Report of the Committee on Clinical Skills and Simulation Centers:
The Development of a Simulation Center at UCSF

Prepared for the School of Medicine Leadership Retreat
January 27–28, 2006

Committee Chair: Ronald Arenson
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Report of the
Committee on Clinical Skills and Simulation Centers:
The Development of a Simulation Center at UCSF

Summary

Simulation of clinical experiences is an important part of the education of health professionals. Simulators are particularly useful for training interdisciplinary teams to provide coordinated care and for refining skills in the use of particular technologies. Simulation experiences are increasingly recommended, and at times required, by a wide variety of health care regulatory organizations, including LCME, RRCs, and JCAHO. Across the country, many health professions schools, hospitals, and other health care facilities are developing simulation programs.

UCSF currently has many relatively small and dispersed simulation activities. Due primarily to lack of space and resources, the use of simulation experiences at UCSF is underdeveloped. The consolidation of simulation experiences and equipment into a central unit has many educational and economic advantages. A central simulation facility for the professions schools and Medical Center at UCSF would promote excellence in clinical learning and practice, competency maintenance, and inter-professional education, and would ensure that all campus learners have an opportunity to practice and evaluate learning and clinical competence without compromising patient safety. Resources required include space, staff salaries, equipment, and supplies. A central unit provides significant economies of scale, with start-up and operating costs depending on the type of simulation included.

The Committee recommends the serious consideration of a central Clinical Skills and Simulation Center at UCSF. Next steps include educating UCSF leadership in all four professional schools and the Medical Center of the advantages of and need for a central simulation facility; identifying a small group of key leaders to oversee the development of a central simulation facility; and, the creation of concrete plans for the types of simulation to be included, and the location and funding of the center.
Goals and Objectives

A Clinical Skills and Simulation Center is a venue for teaching, learning, assessment and research excellence committed to improving patient care and safety through realistic simulation. The goals of a center are to maintain and enhance quality care and patient safety by:

- Developing high quality simulation experiences based on the needs of clinicians and reflective of current and future health care practices.
- Allowing learners opportunities to practice and develop skills in order to achieve competency without putting patients at risk.
- Developing inter-professional team training for routine and complex situations.
- Providing opportunities for credentialing for practice.
- Conducting research necessary to validate the use of simulation as an effective method for obtaining competency.
- Facilitating learning beyond the center.

The Need for A Simulation Center At UCSF

Simulation of clinical experiences is becoming an important part of the education of health professionals, particularly for teaching teamwork and clinical decision-making. A wide variety of simulation experiences are being incorporated into educational processes in undergraduate and graduate medical and nursing education and other health professions, such as emergency medical technicians.

Simulation experiences range from standardized patients to the use of mannequin simulators. According to a recent survey by Columbia University, approximately 40 percent of all US medical schools use mannequin simulators. Simulators are particularly useful for training interdisciplinary teams to provide coordinated care and for refining skills in the use of particular
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Technologies. Anesthesiology and cardiology, in particular, are leaders in the use of simulators and simulation techniques.

The Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) expects that students will have simulation experiences. Some Residency Review Committees (RRCs) require simulation as part of training, and hospitals need to train and certify professionals for various roles. International, national and local initiatives in educational reform in health care professions are also forces driving simulation center development.

The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations (JCAHO) supports interdisciplinary collaboration for facilitation of patient safety. In a White Paper entitled Healthcare at the Crossroads: Strategies for Improving the Medical Liability System and preventing patient injury, JCAHO suggests inter-professional teamwork and improved communication between health professionals during patient care planning and provision for improved safety and quality. An article published in 2005 in JCAHO’s Journal on Quality and Patient Safety reported that simulation-based training reduces errors and improves patient safety when appropriately designed and delivered. Positive patient outcomes may be facilitated through individual and inter-professional simulation use.

The consolidation of simulation experiences and equipment into a central unit has many educational and economic advantages. The high cost of simulation equipment mandates collaboration across departments, schools and institutions. Equipment purchased for one program when placed in a simulation center may be used in unanticipated ways for other learners. There are learning experiences that require training across disciplines and professions and, without a simulation center, performance in these areas is difficult to improve.

Simulation Centers at Other Major Institutions

Members of this committee visited nearly a dozen simulation centers at other universities and medical centers. These include Harvard, Stanford and Toronto as well as our University of California colleagues at Davis and Los Angeles. Stanford provides an example of a major medical center that has developed an organized simulation center model. Stanford has structured their simulation efforts under the leadership of David Gaba, MD, Associate Dean for Immersive & Simulation-Based Learning. Their center unifies several entities, including the Center for
Advanced Pediatric Education (CAPE), Simulation Center at VA Palo Alto Health Care System, Center for Simulation in Medicine, and Stanford University Medical Media and Instructional Technology (SUMMIT) Labs. The VA Palo Alto center has been in operation for over a decade, and all are recognized pioneers in the use of simulation for health care training.

One example of a large independent private not-for-profit hospital that developed its own simulation center is Riverside Methodist Hospital in Columbus, Ohio. Riverside has a 20,000 square foot Center for Medical Education and Innovation medical education facility simulation training center. The Center allows multidisciplinary training of medical professionals along the full continuum of care. Paramedics and emergency technicians, residents, nurses and attending physicians utilize the center together or individually to learn, to practice, to become re-credentialed, to do research. Through the use of human patient simulators and other advances in medical education technology, the Center enables Riverside Medical Education to simulate patients and the patient experience in a wide variety of clinical situations.

There are key characteristics at other facilities and centers that UCSF should emulate. First, a clear mission is important to each center. Second, the centers emphasize teaching and research. Third, the centers tend to be flexible in how to use space and to meet the needs of the users. Fourth, there has to be strong and consistent commitment to such centers, supporting innovative thinkers in these centers. Many of these centers are members of professional organizations, e.g., the Society for Medical Simulation, committed to simulations, and share freely their recommendations for excellence in such centers. Flexible space is important, room for debriefing is essential, the use of high end technology to record and transmit simulations is helpful, and there seem to be unlimited ways to think about how to use simulations to reach diverse learners (from school age to practicing professionals).

**Survey of Needs at UCSF**

The committee used a web-based survey to document the types of simulations being used at UCSF. Chairs, residency and clerkship directors, and faculty from dentistry, nursing, and pharmacy, and physical therapy provided descriptions of simulations currently in use. Reports were received of simulations at multiple UCSF sites, including Parnassus, SFGH, Mt. Zion, Fresno, and Laurel Heights. Over 20 different simulations were described. These simulations
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generally were to develop decision-making, conceptual understanding, technical skills and attitudes and behaviors. Many of these are simulations for individual learners, and nearly half involved a crew, team, or unit. Four simulations are used by non-UCSF medical professionals. As many as 76 students per month use one of the simulations to a low of about one learner per month. Most of UCSF’s simulations are conducted with concurrent critique. Six simulations have post-hoc debriefing through videotape review.

The resources needed include space and faculty. Most sessions need at least one faculty member often with assistance and with a low faculty to student ratio. The standardized patient scenarios need actors and trainers. Simulation spaces currently include classrooms, classrooms with laboratory space, the UCSF clinical skills center, and operating room. The simulations are for education, training and assessment.

The respondents provided descriptions of current and future needs. Most expressed a clear need for simulation to provide more practice for learners particularly in critical care situations. Indeed there is a recognized need for learners to practice a variety of skills in an environment where they will receive feedback. There is increasing need for fellows and health professional students to develop skills for difficult situations. As noted earlier accrediting agencies expect learners to have developed skills on simulators.

A variety of specific simulation areas not currently available to all schools included a bioskills unit with orthoscopic/flavoscopic digital OR capability, BCLS/ACLS mock codes, Code Blue training, medical and medication error training, and modeling of drugs (e.g., pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic). Respondents identified a need for real-time interprofessional simulation exercises in clinical decision-making and communication skills among teams.

Space was also identified as a need. Currently, overflow facilities are used for observed structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) of medical students. There is inadequate space for teaching physical examination skills. There are schools, such as nursing and pharmacy, that need, but do not have, such simulation space. Pharmacy has expressed a desire to use OSCEs for their student training, but lack space and resources.
Overall, the survey identified some simulation resources at UCSF, underdevelopment of simulations due to lack of space and resources, and a minimal amount of inter-professional education, education identified as needed particularly for patient safety. Compared to what we know is being done at other comparable institutions, our current simulations are primitive at best. In fact, they fail to capitalize on the fullest potential of our multi-disciplinary health care environment, thereby denying optimal training for students and staff, and failing to secure the safest possible environment for our patients.

**Opportunities for a Central Facility at UCSF**

A central Clinical Skills and Simulation Center to be used by the professional schools and Medical Center at UCSF will promote excellence in clinical learning and practice, competency maintenance, and inter-professional education. The facility will ensure that all campus learners (students and health care providers) have an opportunity to safely practice and evaluate learning and clinical competence without compromising patient safety. The current environment in 21st century health care dictates a need to provide mechanisms for learning that are not based on hospital census. There is a need for increased inter-professional collaboration to break down existing silos that may negatively affect safe patient care.

A central Simulation Center could, for example, address important educational needs of the Medical Center’s Nursing Department:

- Recent nurse graduates – review of vital signs, phlebotomy, IV starts, central line care, patient assessment particularly heart and lung sounds, ECG strips etc;
- Experienced staff who need refreshing on a particular skill; and,
- Provide flexible in-service training.

Competency assessment needed for training in the health profession schools at UCSF and the Medical Center will be best accomplished with a centralized facility. Optimal training will capitalize on the strengths of the unique but integrated schools and the Medical Center in team training and critical decision making for safe patient care. Rather than a focus on training solely for independence, simulation facilities can be the place to instill teamwork thinking, practice, and communication. Sophisticated academic uses of simulation training can allow a variety of
alternative clinical scenarios that reflect the full range of patient diagnoses and pathologies providers will see in practice. On the other hand, scenarios that are rarely seen can be practiced to ensure competence. A central facility can meet these multiple goals by creating a dedicated space for bringing students and health care providers together.

To accomplish this vision, a center should have the following characteristics:

- Available for use by all four health professional schools and Medical Center at UCSF.
- Simulated patient space that includes patient rooms, work stations, control room, waiting spaces for learners and standardized patients.
- Procedural skills practice space.
- High fidelity simulation space with full body (adult, child and infant) and part simulators.
- Portable simulator equipment.
- Classrooms attached to simulation areas.
- Classrooms fitted for remote/distance education.
- Research area for the development of new simulations and simulators, and testing of new protocols.
- Some of the space available 24/7.
- Secured assessment and credentialing process.
- Data management to provide timely reports on use and outcomes of simulation and data necessary for research.
- Appropriately staffed facility with office space.
- Modular space to accommodate varied simulations and levels of users.
- Audiovisual technology to support high quality data collection from simulation.

A simulation center will need identified leadership and an advisory committee. There will need to be strong coordination if all components of the center cannot be co-located. Portable equipment may be useful to introduce groups to simulation. Funding is needed to support leadership and staff positions, travel to meetings, equipment and supplies.
A central simulation facility can be managed by a single director and staff who would facilitate materials management, replacements, repair, software update, problem solving, record keeping, and user access. Central facilities generally utilize high fidelity simulation rather than low fidelity. Schools benefit from a central facility by cooperative investment and identification of similar learning needs.

One example of a local initiative in simulation is the proposed development of regional simulation centers in 9 Bay Area counties (Moore Foundation Grant submitted 12/05). Even though funding is expected, partnership simulation sites already are being developed. The Bay Area System Collaborative is the regional organization governing this local initiative with a focus on nursing education. Partnerships are being developed between schools of nursing and hospitals, instant responder organizations, medical schools, respiratory therapy programs, physical therapy programs, and other organizations/professions where health care focus is primary. The first two regional centers are scheduled to open in Alameda County in 2006-07. Central simulation facilities are being developed for a variety of purposes.

The Threat of Not Having a Central Simulation Center at UCSF

If simulation training facilities proliferate at UCSF, they will continue to create inefficient use of space, time, and personnel. A culture change and commitment to safe and high quality patient care are needed to design and use simulation in education that will broadly encompass the teaching of patient care through technology as well as enforce the need for teamwork training. A fundamental review of the way we currently educate health care providers suggests collaborative simulation training is optimal. A non-central facility will result in duplication of effort raising costs due to lack of collaboration and a scattered approach. When facilities are not centralized, they often comprise a narrow focus (e.g., intubation simulator) and can be susceptible to an “object” focus rather than a person focus. To meet the stated goals of the IOM for patient safety and the PEW Foundation for creating health providers for the 21st century, the option of inter-professional training facilities must be realized. On a space constrained campus such as UCSF, a centralized facility makes sense. Placing trainees and educators in close proximity to each other will ensure a dedicated collaborative environment. Essentially all of the virtual care and simulation units at other major health sciences centers are inter-professional.
Organizational Structure of a Central Simulation Center

A consortium consisting of the various schools and the Medical Center might be attracted to make the initial investments in the Center. Other possible funding sources are indicated below. Such a consortium would clearly dictate the organizational structure. These investors/partners would need to have seats on a Board of Directors/Oversight Committee. The Director of the Center would report to this Board. If the primary funding came from one or few sources then special consideration would be required regarding the management and direction for the Center.

Space

Space is always a problem at UCSF. At least one portion of the center should be located in the Medical Center complex so that housestaff, nurses, pharmacists, and physicians could steal away time to go to the center during their busy days. The remainder of the space could be off-site, but needs to be convenient. Certainly, Mt. Zion, China Basin, Laurel Heights, or Mission Bay are possibilities, although Parnassus would be much preferred. The Center could be opened initially with as little as 3,000 ft^2, but this would not be enough space for a sustainable and viable Center. The space requirements for a robust Simulation Center could be 12,000 ft^2 or more, assuming larger classrooms would be located elsewhere and connected via high-quality video and audio systems.

A typical layout would include space for the following:

- OR, trauma, ICU, and standard patient rooms with a central control area. The walls should be removable to make the space more flexible. These rooms use mannequins (adult and pediatric) as well as body part simulators for specialized functions and minimally-invasive surgery.
- Endovascular suite with catheter-based simulators for Cardiology, Radiology and others.
- Special simulation equipment for microsurgery, bronchoscopy, endoscopy, pelvic examination and ocular instruments.
- Patient interview rooms with adjacent control spaces for building clinical interviewing skills. These rooms could also be used for computer-based learning sessions.
• Computer-based simulations – requires personal computers. Some should be located in a classroom with instructor using overhead monitor. Others could simply be web-based and accessible anywhere on the network.

• Audio/visual control center.

• Conference rooms with advanced audio/video equipment. Larger classrooms could be located elsewhere.

• Storage for portable mannequins and supplies.

• Administrative and staff offices.

• Research space.

**Capital needs**

The funding for this facility depends greatly on the type of equipment to be utilized. The most sophisticated mannequin simulators cost between $150,000 and $250,000 each, although mid-fidelity mannequin simulators can be purchased for $30,000 to $40,000 that will meet many training needs. The endovascular simulators probably cost around $250,000 each as well although they may be leased. Construction costs are generally in the $250/ft$^2$ range.

Software to integrate digital audio/visual recording, live simulator data and performance reports into a web-accessible, center-wide solution. Some types of simulation software use electronic keycards to track, monitor, record, and score teaching encounters, regardless of where they are in the center and what task is being performing. This software can cost from $150,000 to $200,000 depending upon the type of audio/video equipment and the extent of software-to-hardware integration that is desired.

Dedicated microsurgical simulators can be very expensive, as much as $1 million or more. To get started will probably cost $2.5 million. In a few years, additional space and equipment might double that cost.

**Personnel**

To start, the center needs a director, a center coordinator, and dedicated trainers. Center coordination may require more than one position. The coordinator(s) must be able to operate and
maintain all simulation equipment and all audio-video equipment. An audio-visual technician will be required in the design, installation, and maintenance of the center. Most of the trainers will be content experts from the various departments and schools who are trained by the center staff first. As equipment is added and functions expanded, additional staff will be required, especially if the center provides services to non-UCSF trainees.

**Operating Expenses**

Typical operating expenses include maintenance, supplies, utilities, and rent, if in an off-campus location. It is difficult to estimate these costs at this time, but the maintenance will be around $200,000 per year and supplies should be relatively modest.

**Funding Opportunities**

One approach to fund such a Center would be a consortium of users, both within UCSF and outside. The UCSF users would include the schools, departments and the Medical Center.

A number of outside groups will probably want to use the facility, including firefighters, paramedics, the military, and other healthcare facility personnel. Although many would simply pay a users’ fee, some of the other healthcare facilities in the area might be interested in a partnership arrangement, sharing upfront costs. Philanthropic sources should also be pursued.

**Business Opportunities**

The primary business opportunities include charging outside groups as indicated above. In a number of centers across the country, the expectation has been to cover all of the costs by charging users a fee to use the facilities. The most successful programs have not charged internal users in order to encourage use, but have charged outside customers. Groups such as firefighters and paramedics often prefer a fixed contract for the year.

Of course, one other strategy would be to invite investors to participate in a profit sharing portion of the enterprise. Such an arrangement is not easy to accomplish in our University environment.
Next Steps

The Committee recommends the serious consideration of a central Clinical Skills and Simulation Center at UCSF, including the following next steps:

- Educate the UCSF community about the need for and advantages of having a central simulation facility. This should include presentations to the leadership of all four health professions schools at UCSF, hospital administrators, and chairs and ORU directors.
- Identify a small group of core leaders to champion a central simulation center at UCSF, including the development of strategies and long-term plans.
- Under the direction and supervision of the leadership group, staff would develop concrete plans for the creation of a central simulation facility at UCSF.
Selected Resources

Overview of Simulation Centers


Medical Schools and Hospitals

University of California, Davis: http://www.ucdmc.ucdavis.edu/healthprofessionals/virtual_care/

University of California, Los Angeles: http://www.anes.ucla.edu/simulator.html

Harvard Medical School: http://www.harvardmedsim.org/

University of Illinois, Chicago: http://www.uic.edu/com/mcme/cpcfaq.htm#mis

University of Pittsburgh: http://www.wiser.pitt.edu/

Riverside Methodist Hospital:

Stanford University: http://med.stanford.edu/irt/immersive/

Society for Medical Simulation: http://www.socmedsim.org/

Industry

Laerdal: http://www.laerdal.com/simman/default.htm

MEDISIM: http://www.medisim.org/

Meti: http://www.meti.com/

Selected Citations


2. Dunn, WF. (Ed.) Simulators in Critical Care and Beyond. Des Plaines, IL: Society of Critical Care Medicine, 2004
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Quality Improvement Project (QIP)

- Analyze, revise, and monitor processes
- Create performance standards and measurement tools
- Monitor outcomes

Initial QIP Focus Areas

- C&G Subcontracts
- Committee on Human Research (CHR)
- Conflict of Interest Committee
- Immune Tolerance Network (ITN)
- Institutional Animal Care and Use (IACUC)

Progress-to-Date

- Documentation and redesign of key systems
- Activity, Performance, and Satisfaction Reports
- Still paper-intensive: IT infrastructure is deficient
- New requirement: Grants.Gov
QIP Phase II

Focus on Information Systems

IT Strategic Planning Construct
Developed by UCSF CIO Group - October 2005

Medical Center
Campus Administration
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Academic Information Systems (AIS) Board
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AIS Board Mission Statement

The Academic Information Systems Board provides strategic guidance and advocacy to optimize UCSF’s education and research information systems.

AIS Board Very High Priorities

- AIS Administrative Structure
- Research Data Infrastructure and Services
- Videoconferencing

Research Data Infrastructure and Services “RDIS”

Gaps in Current Research Environment

- “One-off” feeds of clinical data
- No exploratory analysis of clinical data
- Data risks
  - Security and privacy
  - Integrity and reliability
- High barrier to data sharing
  - Among UCSF faculty and sites
  - With other entities (e.g., Kaiser)
- No ability to mine across databases
- Poor economics
Overview of RDIS

- Research data collection, storage, and sharing capabilities
- Industrial strength, HIPAA appropriate
- Central source of clinical data
  - Research
  - Quality assurance, utilization review
- Featured in the CTSA Application

RDIS Services

- Mediated access to clinical data with appropriate safeguards
- Data storage and management
- Vocabulary services and knowledge management
- Web interface for data extraction and exploration
- Consultation on database construction and analysis

Peer Institutions: Partners

- Core repository for clinical data
- Integrated, graded access controls in collaboration with IRB
- Very sophisticated graphical user interface for exploratory data analysis and retrieval

Peer Institutions: Stanford

- Core repository for clinical data
- NLP analysis of unstructured textual data
- Research data hosting as a core resource
- IRB-approved standard security and privacy
- Applications programming interface (API) for research data applications
Other Peer Institutions

Mayo Rochester
- Clinical and research data repository project in partnership with IBM

University of Pittsburgh
- Home-grown clinical data repository core

RDIS: Next Steps
- Commitment to strategic planning and architecture development
- Due Diligence
  - Identifying needs and functionalities
  - Buy vs. Build
- Early deliverables
  - Basic clinical data access
  - Research data hosting services
### Academic Administration and Compliance Information Systems

- **Office of Research**
  - Compliance Systems
- **Office of Sponsored Research**
  - Pre-Award Systems

### Pre-Award Systems Needs

- **Grants.Gov**: Electronic submission of federal contracts and grants
- **Customer and user-friendly**
  - Ideal: Fully-integrated system, “one-stop shop”
  - Eliminate duplicative data entry
- **Flexibility to adapt to changing needs**
  - Ability to capture new fields of information quickly
- **Robust reporting capabilities**
  - Routine and ad hoc reporting must be supported

### Pre-Award Systems Assessment

**Huron Consulting Group**

- Identify needed pre-award functionality missing from current OR systems
- Assess gaps in current systems
- Recommend enhancement of current systems and/or purchase of commercial system(s)

### Huron Recommendations

- **Pre-Award**: UCSF should consider purchasing a commercial system
  - Options: Coeus, InfoEd, Peoplesoft 8.9/9.0
- **Compliance**: UCSF should consider purchasing a commercial system
  - Options: Click Commerce, InfoEd
  - Limit R&D development to areas not available in commercial systems (e.g., LARC, EH&S)
- **Grants.Gov**: Choose short-term solution
  - Pure Edge has very limited functionality
Office of Academic Affairs
- Online faculty review and promotion system

Student Academic Affairs
- To be determined

Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems
Conceptual Framework *

* Co-CIO Showstack and Co-CIO Lopez will jointly direct the new organization and specific organizational reporting relationships will be defined and developed over time.
Campus Core Research Facilities

Core Research Facilities are innovative and advanced technology facilities that provide instrumentation and specialized services that are beyond the reach of individual investigators due to limitations of expertise, or financial or logistic constraints. Core research facilities are distinct from facilities that provide routine service, such as cell culture or animal care.

A Campus Core Research Facility (CCRF) provides instrumentation and specialized services that benefit a broad segment of the UCSF research community, and are available to the whole community. Modern biomedical and translational research increasingly demand that institutions create and maintain CCRFs. To do so successfully, the institution must:

- create centralized governance and decision-making mechanisms for evaluating, designating or disestablishing CCRFs, and for strategic planning and prioritization;
- employ sound business practices that ensure that services are delivered in an economically feasible and responsible manner;
- continuously acquire or create new instrumentation or methodological capabilities that keep the CCRFs at the leading edge of technological capability.

A problematic current situation

The demand for core services in the absence of centralized coordination has driven the development of redundant facilities in various UCSF venues, in departments, ORUs and programs, and in clusters of two or more individual labs. Such operations may have insufficient user base, or they may compete; many operate in deficit because user fees fail to match costs, or because poor administrative practices lead to incomplete collection of user fees.

Absence of central oversight compromises quality and needs assessments, rational decisions to expand or downsize, or to create or support a new facility.

Facilities lack the resources to create or update instruments, or for staff to develop new technological capabilities that benefit researchers.

Elements and features of a proposed solution

1) A CCRF Director would be appointed to oversee business and operations administration of all CCRFs, coordinate and facilitate the acquisition of campus or extramural resources for CCRFs, and receive and manage requests for additional resources.

2) A CCRF Steering Committee would be appointed, comprised of faculty experts in various technology areas and chaired by the Director, to do long term planning, assess the quality and costs of services provided by CCRF’s, determine the need and demand
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for new services that could potentially rise to CCRF status, and terminate CCRFs that are no longer justified scientifically or economically sound.

3) CCRFs would be designated by the Steering Committee. It is anticipated that the requirement for broad campus relevance (as well as space and funding constraints) will limit the total number of CCRFs to perhaps a half dozen. Likely examples include: Genomics, Mass Spec/Proteomics, Biostatistical Analysis, Imaging, Flow Cytometry, Transgenic/Targeted Mutagenesis. Each CCRF would encompass a range of specialized services; e.g., the Campus Genomics Core Facility offers DNA sequencing, SNP analysis, expressions arrays, array CGH, quantitative PCR.

4) In many cases, CCRFs would be assembled by consolidation, coordination and reorganization of multiple existing cores, eliminating redundancies and enabling economies of scale to create more favorable business models.

5) A centralized, web-based business management system would facilitate oversight and financial management of daily operations, as well as tracking and scheduling of services for users and providers. This system will enable timely collection of recharge income and improve overall financial management.

6) The costs of ongoing operations of CCRFs would be covered by recharge income. Subsidies from extramural sources may reduce rates charged to some or all investigators. In general, newly established CCRFs would be expected to break even within three years of operation.

7) A modest level of institutional support would be required for capital equipment acquisition, for updating instrumentation, and to allow professional core staff to develop new service capabilities, to establish expertise on new instruments, to discover novel technological approaches, and to educate users. Some but not all instrumentation costs would be recovered by depreciation.

Example: Genomics – benefits accruing from the first CCRF

- Consolidated administration and services across existing facilities at Parnassus, Mission Bay, Cancer Center, Gladstone, Gallo and LBNL; nine positions were eliminated, saving $490,000.
- Elimination of service redundancies released space and funds to establish new genomic capabilities (methylation, low-end genotyping).
- Campus experts in genomic technologies were brought together to enhance services and education.
- Reduction of equipment redundancies allowed increase in services offered and reduction in user costs.
• Will allow coordinated financial management of interrelated services, and expanded authority from the Budget Office to allow rate adjustments that better reflect actual use.
• Campuswide coordination will reduce redundant requests for support, and assure that each request is backed by a broad campus constituency.

Budget justification

See attached three-year funding model summarizing institutional support needs for a CCRF administrative component, and for three CCRFs:
- Year 1 $1.6 million
- Year 2 $1.4 million
- Year 3 $1.2 million

With time and experience, and success operation of the first three CCRFs, the Steering Committee may seek to launch perhaps three additional CCRFs during this period. Institutional funding needs for CCRFs that have not yet been selected for establishment can be approximated only crudely, but might reach an additional $1-1.5 million per year.

CCRF Administration
- One–time cost of $300,000 would expand and enhance current Cancer Center web-based core facility administrative database.

Mass Spectrometry
- Operating manager and co-manager are in place;
- SRA III will facilitate full function of the Parnassus site; costs for this position will be fully recovered from recharges by Year 3;
- SRA III to bring the Mission Bay site to full functional capability; costs for this position will be fully recovered from recharges by Year 3;
- the $35,000 service contract is for an instrument that provides a new service;
- $75,000 for protected staff time to enable new technology development.

Genomics
- $125,000 for protected staff time to enable new technology development; more than mass spectrometry because there are more instruments and services within this technology field.

Biostatistical Analysis
- Two senior statisticians (serving the Mass Spectrometry and Genomics CCRFs) will report to a faculty director in biostatistics. Support for these positions will be fully recovered from recharges after year 3. Support for the faculty director will continue after year 3. The scope of this CCRF is likely to expand to serve other CCRFs and coordinate with CTSI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core Operational</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>183,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>183,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIPMENT</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,680</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>3,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD Specialist</td>
<td>73,385</td>
<td>16,145</td>
<td>89,530</td>
<td>89,530</td>
<td>53,718</td>
<td>17,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mission Bay)</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD SRA III</td>
<td>60,200</td>
<td>13,244</td>
<td>73,444</td>
<td>73,444</td>
<td>44,066</td>
<td>14,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236,418</td>
<td>141,851</td>
<td>47,284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service contract</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development and support for the Core Admin dB</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core Support TOTAL</td>
<td>489,680</td>
<td>201,480</td>
<td>201,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236,418</td>
<td>141,851</td>
<td>47,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>% of effort</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Asst. Professor</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>18,020</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>124,020</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Sr. Statistician</td>
<td>68,250</td>
<td>15,015</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83,265</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Sr. Statistician</td>
<td>68,250</td>
<td>15,015</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83,265</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>(Data Manager)</td>
<td>60,200</td>
<td>13,244</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73,444</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>SRA III</td>
<td>60,200</td>
<td>13,244</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73,444</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124,020</td>
<td>124,020</td>
<td>124,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83,265</td>
<td>49,959</td>
<td>16,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73,444</td>
<td>44,066</td>
<td>14,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363,994</td>
<td>268,004</td>
<td>172,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORE TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124,020</td>
<td>124,020</td>
<td>124,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83,265</td>
<td>49,959</td>
<td>16,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73,444</td>
<td>44,066</td>
<td>14,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363,994</td>
<td>268,004</td>
<td>172,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OTHER EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Equipment/Cost Share</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected technology development time for managers and technicians</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORE TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL GRAND TOTAL**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,625,092</td>
<td>1,411,335</td>
<td>1,220,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A-21/CAS Relief FY 2006-07
3 year Model (year 2)

- **Principles**
  - The model defines the academic component share through a calculable formula
  - The model incents the growth of off-campus research

- **Assumptions**
  - 3 year trial starting FY05-06
  - $12.55 million funding base (FY04-05 allocation)

- **Formula**
  - New allocation based on incremental ICR received by UCSF
  - On-campus Generated ICR
    - Based on Academic Department share of approved organized research F&A rate
    - Incremental share re-computed each year
  - Off-campus Generated ICR
    - Recognizes administrative hardship of operating off-campus
    - Incentive allocation set at 40% of off-campus new increment received
**A-21/CAS Relief FY 2006-07**

**Effective Academic Department Share**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-07 Acad Dept A21/CAS Relief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICR Available to UCSF</strong></td>
<td>( $ \ 97.88 ) ( = ) ( 72.76% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCSF Generated ICR</strong></td>
<td>( $ \ 134.51 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Dept Component</strong></td>
<td>6.64% ( = ) 12.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organized Research Rate</strong></td>
<td>51.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Acad Dept Share</strong></td>
<td>( 72.76% \times 12.89% ) ( = ) ( 9.38% )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# A-21/CAS Relief FY 2006-07

## Proposed Total Allocation

### A-21/CAS Allocation

(Dollars in 000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 04-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR On Campus</td>
<td>$109,116</td>
<td>$117,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Off Campus</td>
<td>$15,283</td>
<td>$17,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ICR Generated</td>
<td>$124,399</td>
<td>$134,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 04-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICR On Campus Allocation Increment</td>
<td>$8,202</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Off Campus Allocation Increment</td>
<td>$1,910</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Allocation Increment Total:** $1,530

### Allocation to Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004-05 Actual</th>
<th>2005-06 Actual</th>
<th>2006-07 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Allocation</td>
<td>$11,140</td>
<td>$12,550</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Increment (Rounded)</td>
<td>$1,410</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td><strong>$1,530</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Allocation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004-05 Actual</th>
<th>2005-06 Actual</th>
<th>2006-07 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,550</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
<td><strong>$15,780</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

June 2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
<th>DENTISTRY</th>
<th>MEDICINE</th>
<th>LPPI</th>
<th>NURSING</th>
<th>PHARMACY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Allocations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Funds</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$997,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$1,147,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004-05 A-21/CAS Relief Temporary Allocations:</td>
<td>$702,000</td>
<td>$9,239,000</td>
<td>$306,000</td>
<td>$373,000</td>
<td>$783,000</td>
<td>$11,403,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New FY 2005-06 Temporary Increment:</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$1,260,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FY 2005-06 Temporary Allocation:</td>
<td>$782,000</td>
<td>$10,499,000</td>
<td>$446,000</td>
<td>$568,000</td>
<td>$808,000</td>
<td>$13,103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocations - Permanent &amp; Temporary:</td>
<td>$799,000</td>
<td>$11,496,000</td>
<td>$487,000</td>
<td>$604,000</td>
<td>$864,000</td>
<td>$14,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UCSF
### FY 2006-07 BLOCK GRANT - ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Funds</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>LPPI</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent Allocations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Fund</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$997,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$1,147,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Off Distribution Increments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005-06 A-21/ CAS Relief Temporary Allocations</td>
<td>$782,000</td>
<td>$10,499,000</td>
<td>$446,000</td>
<td>$568,000</td>
<td>$808,000</td>
<td>$13,103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New FY 2006-07 Temporary Increment:</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$1,315,000</td>
<td>($108,000)</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$253,000</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FY 2006-07 Temporary Allocation:</strong></td>
<td>$798,000</td>
<td>$11,814,000</td>
<td>$338,000</td>
<td>$622,000</td>
<td>$1,061,000</td>
<td>$14,633,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Allocations - Permanent &amp; Temporary:</strong></td>
<td>$815,000</td>
<td>$12,811,000</td>
<td>$379,000</td>
<td>$658,000</td>
<td>$1,117,000</td>
<td>$15,780,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission Statement

“UCSF Global Health Sciences is dedicated to improving health and reducing the burden of disease in the world’s most vulnerable populations. It integrates UCSF expertise in all of the health, social, and biological sciences, focuses that expertise on pressing issues in global health, and works with partners in countries throughout the world to achieve these aims.”

Historical Context (1)

- 1999 – UCOP unsuccessfully explores development of joint UCSF-UCB SPH
- 2000 – President Atkinson requests a UCSF – SPH proposal
- 2001 – UCSF proposes School of Advanced Health Studies to Office of the President and retains it through 2003 as part of overall academic plan
- 2003 – UCSF Academic Planning & Budget Committee suggests a campus wide program in Global Health Sciences (GHS) as an interim step before creating a new school
- 2003 – Chancellor Bishop establishes UCSF Global Health Sciences and appoints Haile T. Debas as its Executive Director
- 2005 – Official launch of UCSF Global Health Sciences
Founding Centers and Institutes

- AIDS Research Institute (Coates, Greenspan)
- Cancer Population Studies (Hiatt)
- Center for Health and Community (Adler)
- Epidemiology & Biostatistics (Grady, Hulley)
- Institute for Global Health (Rutherford)
- Institute for Health Policy Studies (Lafty)
- Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences (Washington)
- Proctor Foundation (Margolis)
- Sandler Center for Basic Research in Parasitic Diseases (McKerrow, Kelly)

Core Administrative Structure

- Executive Director
- Administrative Director
- Associate Director of Research
- Faculty Education Coordinator
- Staff Education Coordinator
- Key Committees
  - Executive

Growth 2003-2006

**September 2003**
- Staff: 3 FTE
- All sources: $1,000,000
- Expenditures: $904,000

**June 2006 (proj.)**
- Staff: 9.36 FTE
- All sources: $2,231,023
- Expenditures: $2,182,866

Growth 2006 – 2007

**June 2006 (proj.)**
- Staff: 9.36 FTE
- All sources: $2,231,023
- Expenditures: $2,182,866

**June 2007 (proj.)**
- Staff: 13.61 FTE
- All sources: $3,327,795
- Expenditures: $3,058,602
Strategic Objectives

1. Increase UCSF contribution to global health
   - Coordinate, facilitate, provide supportive services
2. Create interdisciplinary culture of science within global health
   - Education and training
   - Catalyze and integrate research
3. Capacity building locally and developing countries
   - Human resource for health
   - Enhancing institutions

Coordination, Facilitation

- Affiliation agreements and MOUs
- Support administration of internationally sponsored projects
- Personal safety and security abroad
- Promote innovation in global health
- Facilitate interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaborations (UC, international)
- Appropriate recognition in academic policies and practices for international activities
- Intellectual forum in global health
- Establish knowledge and information management services (website, database)

Education and Training

UCSF Trainees

- PhD and MS Programs
  - Curriculum committee for Master’s program
  - Graduate Group being formed
  - Master’s will form foundation for PhD
- Area of Concentration in Global Health – driven by students
  - Medical student program expanding to all schools
  - Students enrolled in BMS and CCIB graduate programs (2 this year)
  - Clinical residency programs
    Medicine, Pediatrics, FM, Surgery, Obstetrics/Gynecology, Psychiatry, Orthopedic Surgery, Neurology, Urology

Trainees from Partner Institutions

- Sandwich Certificate Program (Kenya)
  - Enrolled in a degree program in home institutions
  - Study as an enrolled student at UCSF for 3-6 months (Master’s students) or 1 year (PhD students)
  - Supported by a grant from NIH/Fogarty Center
  - Funding is basic, additional funding would allow program to expand and provide better support for students
- Other proposed/planned programs
  - Research Administration & Management
  - International traineeships
Research

- Bay Area global health research seminars
- Cross-cutting, multidisciplinary research themes
- General Global Health Research Center (part of CTSA proposal)
- Sponsor training through research

Capacity Building

- Local: partnership with SFGH
- Institution enhancing
  - Muhimbili University College of Health Sciences (Tanzania)
  - Preclinical basic science faculty
- Human resources for health
  - Scholarships in faculty development
  - Research fellowships (clinical, basic science)

Executive Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Home Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faber, Nancy</td>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deake, Rodey</td>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Statistics Dept of Clinical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalaby, John</td>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyman, Mark</td>
<td>Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Stephen</td>
<td>Cell &amp; Molecular Pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford, Renee</td>
<td>Obstetrics &amp; Gynecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Nancy</td>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan, Sarah</td>
<td>Anatomy &amp; Cell Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solnick, Charles</td>
<td>Genetics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberger, K</td>
<td>Genetics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steering Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Home Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faber, Nancy</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Jeffrey</td>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Adam</td>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiBello, Jack</td>
<td>Rehabilitation &amp; Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forshheimer, Mike</td>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givens, John</td>
<td>Obstetrics &amp; Gynecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Robert</td>
<td>Carcinogenesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helgason, Ann</td>
<td>AIDS Community Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoehn, Philip</td>
<td>Med-SFGH Pulmonary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, Stephen</td>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin, Charles</td>
<td>Pediatrics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyser, Steven</td>
<td>Pediatrics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Renee</td>
<td>Rehabilitation &amp; Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo, Daisy</td>
<td>UCSF Global Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leong, Kelly</td>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Biophysics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu, Wen-Chung</td>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKerrow, James</td>
<td>Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulton, Jamie</td>
<td>Physiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panetta, Nancy</td>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, George</td>
<td>Genetics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saha, Dinesh</td>
<td>Cardiovascular Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiff, Michael</td>
<td>Pediatrics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder, Sven</td>
<td>Pediatrics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shum, Chi-Chun</td>
<td>Pediatrics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, Eric</td>
<td>UCSF Global Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberger, K</td>
<td>Genetics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberger, G</td>
<td>Genetics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yee, Warren</td>
<td>Pediatrics &amp; Genomics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Involvement of Schools other than Medicine

- Representation on GHS Committees
- Vietnam: Pharmacy in 2004
- Tanzania: Recent developments in Nursing
- UCSF Presidential Chair: GHS/SON nominate Jaime Sepulveda Amor

Financial Self-Sufficiency

- Fund raising in full swing as of May 2006
- Need endowment of $30-40 million

Two Primary Foci

- External: Capacity Building in Developing Countries (Contracts, Grants & Gifts)
- Internal: Education & Institutional Coordination (Institutional & Other $)
Relations to IGH and Other Programs

- Discussions underway re IGH integrating as a SOM ORU under Global Health Sciences.
- Coordinating/facilitating role with other programs and units on campus
  - Safety and Security
  - Research Administration

Program Plans Next 3 Years

Education & Training
- Areas of Concentration
- Global Health Clinical Scholars
- MS in Global Health

Research
- Coordinate, Stimulate Cross-Cutting Efforts
- Research seminars and symposia

Capacity Building in Developing Countries

Existing Collaborations
- Tanzania
- Uganda
- Kenya

Collaborations Planned
- India and China
- Vietnam
- Mexico
- Latin America
- Eastern Europe
Program Plans Next 3 Years

Other UC Programs in Global Health
- Global Health Sciences is one-of-a-kind!
- The future? Perhaps:
  - UC Global Health Sciences Program
  - or
  - School for Global Health Sciences
From APB Chair Patty Robertson:

Dear AP and B members,

As you know, one of the most expensive programs on our list to evaluate is the Global Health Sciences Proposal. Unfortunately, Haile is out of the country and won't be able to attend the meeting this week. One of his senior administrators will however, present the powerpoint that was shown to the Executive Budget Committee. I sent Haile 5 questions of areas we were interested in that are not covered in the presentation, and here are his answers below. Please read carefully prior to the meeting. Thank you.

Patty

Within the next 2 or 3 weeks, we will be sending you our 5-year strategic plan developed through working groups of faculty from all four of our professional schools and the School of Public Health at Berkeley. When Chuck Smukler appears before your Committee, he will be able to make the presentation I gave to the Executive Budget Committee that you attended, He will also be able to answer any other questions and give clarifications on issues the Committee regards as relevant.

For now, I will limit my response to answering the 5 questions you put to us.

• **Involvement of Schools other than Medicine:**
  Global Health Sciences (GHS) is a campus-wide entity and all our four Schools participate in all its core activities and members from all the Schools are involved in its committees and participated in the development of our strategic plan over the past 9 months. Attached please find the membership list the key Committees: Executive, Steering, Sub-committee on Education, Sub-committee on Research; and the Interdisciplinary Curriculum Committee which has nearly completed the task of developing the curriculum for the Masters degree in Global Health Sciences.

  In 2004, GHS joined the School of Pharmacy in a summit meeting in Hanoi with the Vietnamese Universities of Pharmacy and the Ministry of Health. As a result of that meeting, the UCSF School of Pharmacy has developed important collaborations with the Universities of Pharmacy in Vietnam.

  This year, the School of Nursing and GHS jointly nominate Dr. Jaime Sepulveda Amor, the Director of Mexico's National Health Institutes for the 2006-2007 UCSF President's Chair. If the nomination is successful, Dr. Sepulveda will spend a year at UCSF during which time we plan to develop significant collaborations between GHS, the School of Nursing, and Mexico.

• **Financial Self-Sufficiency:**
  Since most donors do not like to support core administration of academic programs, the only way
GHS can function without Campus resources if it developed an endowment of roughly $30-40 million. GHS's fund-raising activities went into full swing only in May 2006. Three significant barriers account for this delayed activity: (1) The Development Office assigned a fund-raiser to GHS only in May, 2006; (2) I was away for a year of sabbatical during which I was unable to engage in fund-raising; (3) Key prospects for GHS are also prospects for Mission Bay and we had to wait until they made their pledge to Mission Bay. This has now happened and we are working with the Developing Office to approach them.

The programs of GHS are broadly of two types: those that are education programs or coordinating activities for UCSF, and those that come under the rubric of capacity building in developing countries. The former will always require some University funding, although, wit time, increasingly extramural funding should be sought. The latter, however, needs to be funded entirely by extramural funding, both private and public. GHS now has the prospect for significant private funding for its capacity building programs in Africa, and subsequently in Latin America, and perhaps also Asia.

GHS has asked the Chancellor for additional 3-year core funding.

**Relationship with Institute for Global Health (IGH) and other International Programs:**

Several considerations suggest the wisdom of integrating IGH with GHS: (1) The existence of the two entities with similar names on the Campus has caused ambiguity within and without UCSF, especially among our potential donors; (2) The IGH membership has indicated its wish to join GHS by a vote; (3) The two programs are engaged in similar and often complimentary projects; and (4) Integrating the administrative staff of the two entities will result in significant savings and avoidance of duplications. I presented these arguments to Chancellor Bishop and recommended integration of the two programs. He felt that as an ORU, IGH has to remain in the School of Medicine and cannot be moved under the Chancellor's control.

The idea was dropped until Dean David Kessler indicated that he feels that we could work out an arrangement in which the two entities can come together under the banner of GHS while keeping the ORU in the School of Medicine. Dean Kessler and I had preliminary discussions (and I thought understanding) to do this. We have a second meeting planned next week to which he has invited several people. The concept that I hope we will agree to will have the following components: (a) Integration of the administrative staff into one unit; (b) Keep the ORU in the School of Medicine reporting to the Dean through GHS; (c) the ORU also would administer research grants of individual members of GHS who are also School of Medicine faculty; (d) Multidisciplinary research grants that include faculty from several Schools, all training grants and grants for capacity building will be administered by GHS and report to the Chancellor's Office; the name IGH would be changed (Dean Kessler prefers “GHS-som”), but the ORU will continue to have a Director, who would report to the Dean through GHS. This way I think we will have reached a Solomonic solution that accomplishes everybody’s goals.

GHS had briefly considered a merger with Women’s Global Health Imperative, the program in international research directed by Nancy Padian. WGHI has a huge administrative structure and GHS in the end felt that it was not in its best interest to consider the merger at this time.

We play a coordinating and advisory role to other international programs on Campus.

**Programmatic Details for the next 3 years:**

*Programmatic goals for UCSF:*

1. **Areas of Concentration for students.** The AoC in Global Health is well developed in the School of Medicine, largely because of a budget that the School committed to the program. The program is now open to students of all professional schools but additional budget is necessary to give all interested students experience abroad. In 2005, two graduate students from the basic sciences have been taking courses in AoC in Global Health. We hope to increase this number to 5 in 2006, and the eventual equilibrium number is probably no more than 8, which we hope to reach in 3 years.

2. **Global Health Clinical Scholars Program:** This is a program born of a grass-roots movement. Several residency programs in the School of Medicine has come together under the auspices of GHS to develop a rigorous 2-3 year program including lectures, seminars, on-line case studies, and a one-month experiential study in a GHS partner institution abroad. Dr. Chris Stewart, Program Director in Pediatrics will spend 20% of his time in GHS developing this curriculum. Several
universities in the U.S. are interested in developing similar programs and have asked to visit UCSF.

(3) MS in Global Health: We have been working with the Graduate Division in the planning of this program. An Interdisciplinary Curriculum Committee, has nearly completed developing the curriculum. A Graduate Group, drawn from the core members of GHS is being assembled. The proposal will be submitted to the Graduate Council in late September, 2006. We hope the first class will be admitted for the Fall of 2007, at the latest. Our PhD program will build on the MS program and will take another 2-3 years to develop.

(4) Research: The main role of GHS is coordination and identification of cross-cutting research themes. We hope to have stimulate one or two large research project grants within the next three years. We hold monthly research seminars and have began a quarterly Bay Area Global Health Research Symposium that brings together all the Schools from UCSF, the Berkeley Schools of Public Health Business as well as the private sector.

Capacity Building Programs with Partner Institutions in Developing Countries

EXISTING COLLABORATIONS:

1. **Tanzania**: UCSF now has an institutional affiliation with Muhimbili University of Health Sciences (MUCHS) of Dar-es-Salaam University. We have had joint planning on curriculum and faculty development and through CDC sponsorship, exchange visits of senior leaders in Education from the two Universities occurred in 2005 and 2006. GHS arranged for Visiting Lecturers in Biochemistry for MUCHS for the past Winter Semester and is seeking outside funding to expand this program to other preclinical years. Faculty development and developing an educational infrastructure is the centerpiece of our collaboration. Several UCSF Departments have or are planning to send students and residents on rotations to MUCHS.

2. **Uganda**: Significant collaborations in residency training has occurred between UCSF Departments of Medicine and Surgery. In collaboration with Makerere University, the World Bank and WHO, GHS is planning a Surgical Workforce Training Program in Uganda.

3. **Kenya**: GHS, under the leadership of Craig Cohen, has developed a MS and PhD Sandwich Training Program with the Kenyan Medical Research Institute and The Jomo Kenyata University. The program has 5-year funding from NIH Fogarty International. The students do the mid-portion of their training at UCSF and receive a certificate, but return home to complete their thesis and receive their academic degrees from their own University.

**COLLABORATIONS PLANNED FOR THE NEXT 3 YEARS**

1. **India and China**: GHS has been asked to participate in the international programs of the University of California Office of the President. The initiative has all come from UCOP for these planned collaborations, and we expect UCOP to fund them.

2. **Vietnam**: As mentioned earlier, our School of Pharmacy has developed collaborations with the Universities of Pharmacy in Vietnam. In June 2006, a delegation from GHS visited Ho Chi Minh City at the invitation of the HCM City University of Medicine and Pharmacy and the HO Chi Minh City Health Services Department. As a result of our recent discussions, we expect to jointly seek external funding for collaborations in education and research capacity building.

3. **Mexico**: As mentioned earlier, Dr Sepulveda will be spending a year at UCSF as the UCSF President's Chair. During that time, we plan to define significant collaborations with Mexico in education, research and health services.
4. **Latin America**: We are seeking private funding for collaboration in research capacity building in Nicaragua in partnership with the Berkeley School of Public Health. Several faculty members from different Schools are encouraging GHS to develop partnerships with institutions in Brazil and Argentina. No specific plans have been laid out as yet.

5. **Eastern Europe**: There is significant interest among several members of GHS to explore possible collaborations in Croatia and Bosnia. Again, this is at the idea stage.

- **OTHER UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PROGRAMS IN GLOBAL HEALTH SCIENCES**: Although several UC Campuses engage in significant interracial activities, and UCB and UCLA, have Schools of Public Health, no other GHS program like ours exists. Indeed, the Office of the President has expressed their enthusiasm that other Campuses develop GHS programs so that a virtual UC-wide GHS program can be developed. Executive Vice Chancellor Eugene Washington and I have been asked by Chancellor Bishop to explore this concept fully. We have an appointment with Provost Hume Rory soon to do this. Clearly, such an initiative will require resource investment from UCOP, but if they do, UCSF GHS is willing and ready to provide the leadership.

Finally, although UCSF had submitted a plan for a new School some 5 years ago, The University is said to be planning to open two new Schools of Public Health (UCD and UCI). It would appear that UCSF’s request was totally neglected. My own view is that UCSF deserves new resources to either develop a School for Global Health Sciences or to establish UC-wide program in Global Health Sciences.

Patty, I apologize for the length of this communication, but I did want to provide AP and B with full information. GHS needs your enthusiastic support. As you can see within 3 short years, with minimal resources, we have established GHS that has brought academic excitement and new idealism to UCSF, has become recognized as a visible asset by UCOP, and has become nationally and internationally recognized.

Haile.

-----Original Message-----
From: Robertson, Patty
Sent: Saturday, June 24, 2006 5:55 PM
To: Debas, Haile M.D.
Subject: RE: AP and B

Thanks Haile. Patty

-----Original Message-----
From: Debas, Haile M.D.
Sent: Saturday, June 24, 2006 2:42 PM
To: Smukler, Chuck; Robertson, Patty
Cc:
Subject: RE: AP and B

Patty,
I feel very badly that I shall not be able to attend the AP and B meeting. GHS owes its existence to the support and recommendation of the AP and B Committee. I will work with Chuck to try and address fully your questions, all of which are cogent.
Haile.

From: Smukler, Chuck
Sent: Saturday, June 24, 2006 1:43 PM
To: Robertson, Patty
Cc: Debas, Haile M.D.
Subject: RE: AP and B
Patty,

My, that is quite a list of questions! You have zeroed in on some important issues and I will do my best to address them in the 10 minutes! Should I bring my flack jacket and answers or just the answers? 😊

See you next week

Chuck

Charles Smukler
Senior Program Consultant
UCSF Global Health Sciences
3333 California Street, Suite 285
San Francisco, CA 94143-0443
tel: 415.476.0508
fax: 415.502.6052
smuklerc@globalhealth.ucsf.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Robertson, Patty
Sent: Saturday, June 24, 2006 11:54 AM
To: Smukler, Chuck
Subject: AP and B

Hi Chuck,
Thanks for agreeing to come to our AP and B meeting next week.
Our Committee is very interested in the important international work UCSF is doing. We have some particular questions we would like you to address, either during your ten minute presentation or the during the ten minutes of questions:
1. Most of the work that the committee is familiar with, is within the School of Medicine. Is there formal involvement of the other schools? In what way?
2. Our understanding is that by now, the program would be self-sufficient. What have the barriers been? What philanthropic donations have been made so far?
3. What relationship does your program have with Dr. Rutherford and Dr. Padian's program, as well as with other international programs at UCSF?
4. We would really like programatic details of your plans in the next three years. Which countries do you envision permanent ties with?
5. Are there other UC Global Health Sciences Units, and if so, do you anticipate funding from the Office of the President to help support and coordinate all units?

Thanks. Patty Robertson, MD
Chair, AP and B
OAAIS Consolidated Budget Proposal for FY 2006-07

Executive Budget Committee
June 20, 2006

UCSF IT Strategic Planning Renewal

- Adopted Planning Principles
  - Align IT systems with overall UCSF strategies
  - Maximize IT as a lever to accomplish UCSF strategy
  - Recognize technology and info systems as valuable and valued
  - Understand life cycle of IT and the commoditization decision
  - Wisely manage the regulatory and security/risk environment
- Recognizes UCSF’s IT picture as overlapping and inter-depandent

October 2005 - CIO Group & IT Governance Committee

Convergence of interests and needs between academic and admin IT has led to a new, more collaborative org model for campus effective July 1

Campus Administration

Research and Education

Addressing Campus IT Needs

Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems

Conceptual Framework *

- Jon Showstack and Randy Lopez will jointly direct the new organization and specific organizational reporting relationships will be defined and developed over time.

Administrative Systems
Security
Network
Customer Service
Academic Systems
Educational Systems
Research Systems

EVC Washington / SVC Barclay
Co-CIO Showstack / Co-CIO Lopez
Estimated timeframe for post-implementation support needs:

- **FY 2009-10**
  - Leave Accrual
  - Time & Attendance

- **FY 2007-08**
  - P2P
  - Purchasing
  - Accts Payable

- **ASAP**
  - RAS (Phase I)
  - Pre-Award
  - Grants.gov

All projects require post-implementation support.

Ongoing Post-Implementation Costs:

- $1.4M in unbudgeted new costs:
  - Application support (5 FTE from LINK RAS)
  - Database support (2 FTE to support doubling of PS footprint)
  - Ad hoc reporting support (2 FTE)

- Good News
  - Salary savings expected in the $550K range

- Bad News -
  - Network recharge recovery gap of $300K
  - Increased demands for training investment anticipated to be $250K

- Bottom line - $1.4M gap (status quo)

Reporting Architecture:

- **Current State**
  - Weblinks provides "canned reports" against defined data sets (departmental tool)
  - First phase Data Warehouse developed and piloted (Central Office tool - Budget Office sponsorship)

- **Proposed Project**
  - Define scalable/extensible blueprint for BOTH central and departmental needs
  - Integrates with emerging portal project

- **Costs**
  - Recurring - $241K (FY 2006/07); $454K thereafter (3 FTE phased)

“Common Ground” Projects:

- **Areas where IT solutions should be applied & leveraged broadly across UCSF**
  - IT Infrastructure
    - Security
    - Data and Voice networks
    - Wireless strategy and deployment
  - Architecture & Tools
    - Architecture Planning
    - AuthN/AuthZ
    - Portal
    - Software Upgrades and Productivity Tools
    - Hardware Upgrades
Security – Perimeter Security

- **Current State**
  - AC50 firewall installed and operating
  - Network Perimeter – minimal protection
- **Proposed Project**
  - Hardware based solution to filter unnecessary traffic
  - Create infrastructure to support separation of external/external network resources
  - Protect the NGMAN “Core” Network
- **Costs**
  - $1M in one time; $55K in recurring staff costs

Security – Intrusion Detection

- **Current State**
  - No way to detect network intrusions
  - Limited capability to detect existence of compromised hosts
  - Cited as significant deficiency in internal audit
- **Proposed Projects**
  - Network based defense system (hardware)
  - Recurring consultant costs to test and probe system
- **Costs**
  - $250K in one time costs next year, additional one time costs of $125K in FY 07/08; recurring staff costs of $130K/yr plus depreciation expenses of $40K (next year) and $98 K (following years)

Security – Compliance & Support

- **Current State**
  - Security tools available - no staff support
  - Security standards developed - no staff support
  - Cited as significant deficiency in internal audit
- **Proposed Project**
  - Permanent staff support for security tools as well as for technical compliance
  - Temporary staff support for one year for compliance assessment support to departments
- **Costs**
  - $285K in recurring staff costs plus $120K in one time costs

Security - File Encryption

- **Current State**
  - UCOP Policy requires encryption for restricted data (e.g. ePHI, SSNs)
  - UCSF has not yet deployed a solution
- **Proposed Project**
  - Build an infrastructure to enable enterprise file encryption for desktop and mobile devices using UCOP approved tools.
  - Implement centralized secure file storage system.
- **Costs**
  - $438K in one time costs (with recurring maintenance and depreciation costs of $70K thereafter)
Data and Voice - Network

**Current State**
- NGMAN project to replace our SONET "layer one" network between sites
- Infrastructure within buildings are in need of repair or replacement (esp. Parnassus)

**Proposed Project**
- NGMAN will be focus on next fiscal year and "inter-building" (already funded)
- Next need to work on INTRA-building network ("layers 2/3")
- Cost recovery system (for both data and voice) should be reconsidered and discussed

**Costs**
- Very significant but can be phased over time

---

Wireless Network

**Current State**
- QB3 Pilot (in conjunction with occupants) deployed successfully
- Minimally supported wireless elsewhere with many "rogue access points" ("open doors" to network)

**Proposed Project**
- Could either deploy expensive tools to detect and cut off rogue access points (aka "open back doors") or invest in expanded and secure wireless access

**Costs**
- OPTION A - Significant one time costs ($1.5M) plus recurring costs for staffing and maintenance and replacement ($280K) plus depreciation expense ($200K)
- OPTION B – Deploy secure wireless with a goal of near ubiquity, obviating need for more WAPs (larger cost but higher value)

---

Telephony

**Current State**
- Reliant upon old technology (Centrex) that is more expensive and less flexible than modern "IP enabled" technologies
- Voice mail system is at end of life and needs to be replaced

**Proposed Projects**
- Bid the replacement of Centrex to enable migration before end of current Centrex contract
- Replace Voice Mail system (can migrate to new technology)
- Develop more rational cost recovery plan for voice and data

**Costs**
- $350K for technical and bid support consulting (one-time)
- Costs beyond 2006-07 for new system are large but recoverable
- $250K for new Voice Mail System (plus recurring maintenance of $36K)
- $125K for consulting for internal cost basis and cost recovery analysis

---

Mission Bay MPOE

**Current State**
- With Mission Bay growth and the need for resiliency (alternate entry point for voice and data) an additional "Point of Entry" is needed

**Proposed Project**
- Capital project for this project is being studied with CPFM but will have equipment replacement and maintenance costs to ENS

**Costs**
- $240K in recurring depreciation and maintenance expenses (post implementation)
Architecture Planning

Current State
- Applications are being deployed more rapidly
  - Deployments are both centralized & decentralized
- Deployments are both built and bought
- Technology architecture is not well leveraged (some exceptions – e.g. server consolidation project)

Proposed Project
- Develop an internal architecture plan that dovetails existing and planned technology deployments and better leverages investments
- Consultant assistance to review PS support deployment org options to improve quality and consistency of PS support

Costs
- $314K in one time costs (consulting); $430K in recurring staff costs for ongoing architecture planning

Business Continuity

Current State
- Critical IT Systems lack disaster recovery plans and equipment that could resume key ops post-disaster
- Overdue, high-risk Audit issue

Proposed Project
- Implement a first phase program to provide for minimal recovery of key business systems (moving to median of UC campus plans)

Costs
- $325K in one time costs; $175K in recurring costs (‘hot site’ contract plus maintenance and depreciation)

Identity Management

Current State
- Identity management systems solution by IBM has been selected after extensive bid process
- Deployment for first phase applications planned for next fiscal year

Proposed Project
- Consultant support for development and deployment of infrastructure plus budgeting functional owner approved by IT Governance earlier this year

Costs
- $135K in one time consulting support; recurring costs of $148K/yr for functional owner (06/07); growing to $580K thereafter (07-08 post-LINK implementation)

Software Upgrades

Current State
- Currently deployed software now critical part of existing and planned architecture
- We are outgrowing our legal license limits (Oracle) or must upgrade to newer versions (PS & Cognos) to have access to critical capabilities

Proposed Project
- Consultant support to ensure smooth PeopleSoft upgrade to 8.9 (P2P critical path)
- Upgrade costs for more Oracle licenses and Cognos Upgrade

Costs
- $200K one time costs for consulting (PS Upgrade) plus $210K one time costs for software plus $26K recurring maintenance
Hardware Upgrades

**Current State**
- Growing suite of application and reporting demands are beginning to outstrip current hardware limits (data warehouse and Weblinks, in particular). Data backup cycles absorbing precious CPU availability.

**Proposed Project**
- Hardware upgrades to AIX hardware and implementation of VTS backup tools to improve data backups

**Costs**
- $225K in one time costs plus $34K in software maintenance, plus depreciation expenses of $56K a year

Productivity Tools

**Current State**
- Growing quantity and complexity of applications are creating difficulty and risk in job scheduling process
- Current 3270 terminal emulation poorly supported and is not suitable to support emerging needs (GUI OLPPS or Portal)

**Proposed Project**
- Job scheduling software deployment
- Web based terminal emulation system deployment

**Costs**
- $310K in one time costs (software, hardware and consulting); recurring costs of $39K (maintenance and depreciation)

Summary of Non-Academic Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LINK Post-Imp.</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,449,000</td>
<td>1,499,715</td>
<td>Current projected deficit for LINK cost implementation (e.g. RAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1,810,779</td>
<td>531,104</td>
<td>608,144</td>
<td>Additional $150K in future one time cost expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>319,000</td>
<td>576,500</td>
<td>Includes Wireless Network Security and MPOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>Voice Mail plus planning and cost analysis and recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1,718,308</td>
<td>913,525</td>
<td>1,810,338</td>
<td>Planning and staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>5,754,087</td>
<td>1,800,629</td>
<td>3,069,482</td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> includes equipment replacement of approximately $400K per year increase in FY07-08 recurring costs due to fully loaded maintenance and FTE expense.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic IT Administration

- **Current State**
  - Permanent staffing for initial planning has been limited to 1 FTE and “borrowed” or in-kind support
  - Planned activities to support academic IT will require a small, permanent set of administrative staff

- **Proposed Project**
  - Four permanent FTE proposed to provide core admin support to help lead and support academic priority projects

- **Costs**
  - $432K in recurring staffing support

Research Data Infrastructure & Services (RDIS)

- **Current State**
  - UCSF’s clinical and translational research hampered by lack of access to a centralized well-coordinated clinical and research data repository

- **Proposed Project**
  - Develop a central repository of clinical and research data as well as a suite of services to support the effective application and use of these data
  - Critical part of CTSA Grant Proposal for UCSF

- **Costs**
  - $3.6M for initial phase (first three years)

Grants. Gov

- **Current State**
  - Feds are phasing in mandatory electronic submission of all applications (Feb 2007 deadline)
  - Limited tools provided to support such submissions, especially for large applicants like UCSF
  - Currently reviewing RFI’s from vendors to assess possible tools to help solve this problem

- **Proposed Project**
  - Based on vendor responses, assess and deploy both a short and longer term solution or solutions

- **Costs**
  - Timing of costs (short term vs long term) not clear but total costs estimated to be $1.5M over 3 years

Pre-Award Research Admin

- **Current State**
  - RAS Phase I now implemented but Phase II (to focus more on pre-award solutions) pending
  - While PS provides pre-award functionality, best fit to UCSF’s needs may not be PeopleSoft

- **Proposed Project**
  - First phase is to conduct a more detailed needs assessment and “fit-gap” to PS product
  - Second phase (based on above assessment) would be to deploy best fit solution

- **Costs**
  - $150K in year one for needs assessment and planning; total costs estimated to be $3.8M over three years
Research Compliance

- **Current State**
  - Research compliance demands have grown in complexity and size (e.g. CHR and IACUC)
  - Self-developed solutions have been deployed for some activities (RIO) but do not cover the full range of needs

- **Proposed Project**
  - First phase is to conduct a more detailed needs assessment
  - Second phase (based on above assessment) would be to deploy best fit solution (including build vs buy)

- **Costs**
  - $75K in year one for needs assessment and planning; total costs estimated to be $1.2M over three years

Online Faculty Appointment and Advancement

- **Current State**
  - Faculty promotion and advancement process now is a time and paper-intensive activity for a very critical and key process
  - Most large institutions are developing automated document and work flow management solutions to support the process

- **Proposed Project**
  - First phase is to conduct a more detailed needs assessment
  - Second phase (based on above assessment) would be to deploy best fit solution

- **Costs**
  - $75K in year one for needs assessment and planning; total costs estimated to be $1.1M over three years

Student Academic Affairs

- **Current State**
  - Student academic affairs currently supports a range of student activities, including SIS, classroom scheduling, financial aid and student health
  - Concerns exist with the insularity of the systems that support these processes, their lack of interoperability with other campus systems and the general quality and integration of the support

- **Proposed Project**
  - First phase is to conduct a more detailed needs assessment
  - Second phase (based on above assessment) would be to deploy best fit solution

- **Costs**
  - $75K in year one for needs assessment and planning; total costs estimated to be $925K over three years

Academic Senate – Course Approval System

- **Current State**
  - Development, approval and management of courses by the Senate relies upon manual processes and paper-based document management

- **Proposed Project**
  - UCSF’s Academic Senate has requested the development of an automated course approval system (perhaps modeled after solution deployed at UCSB) to improve this process
  - An initial needs assessment would be conducted before deciding upon and deploying a solution

- **Costs**
  - $75K in year one for needs assessment and planning; total costs estimated to be $450K over three years
## Summary of Academic Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Three Year Cost (estimates)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Staffing</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>$430K Recurring (with inflation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDIS</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>Initial three year funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants.Gov</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>Near term solution plus long term solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Application Suite</td>
<td>7,475,000</td>
<td>$450K in business assessment, then estimated implementation for full suite of apps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,975,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University-Community Partnerships Program
Proposed 2006-07 Budget

What We Do

• Created in FY 2005-06 to serve the UCSF and the broader community
  • For the UCSF community
    • Strengthen, expand participation in community partnerships
    • Expand our knowledge about neighboring communities and their needs
  • For the broader community
    • Enhance understanding of UCSF
    • Improve community access

Why We’re Doing It

• UCSF Mission addresses community service
  “...to serve the community at large through educational and service programs that take advantage of the knowledge and skills of UCSF faculty, staff and students.”
• Program captures notion of bi-directional benefit and mutual participation

What We’ve Accomplished

• Created a 20-member Council – 10 UCSF representatives; 10 community representatives (March 2006)
• Hired a program director with extensive experience in community/university partnerships (April 2006)
• Integrated CGR’s existing Community Partnership Program (April 2006)
• Created five working subcommittees of the Council to advance the program (May 2006)
• Elected, installed co-chairs (June 2006)

University Community Partnerships Council
Community Members

Co-Chair: Gwen Henry, Associate Director, Florence Crittenton Services
• Tavi Baker, Manager of Health Services, Boys & Girls Clubs of San Francisco
• Lynda Boyer-Chu, Health Coordinator, Gloria R. Davis Academy, SFUSD
• Larry Del Carlo, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp
• Eli Horn, Executive Director, Visitacion Valley Community Beacon Center

University Community Partnerships Council
Community Members (continued)

• Sharon Johnson, Youth Program Manager, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
• Dwayne Jones, Director, Communities of Opportunity, Mayor’s Office of Community Development
• Eric Lewis, Teacher, Mission High School, SFUSD
• John Nickens, Director of Clinical Services, Progress Foundation
• Nora Rios Reddick, Executive Director, Horizons Unlimited of San Francisco
University Community Partnerships Council

University Members

Co-Chair: Kevin Grumbach, Professor and Chair, Family & Community Medicine, SOM
- Charles Alexander, Assoc. Dean, Student Affairs and Dean’s Office, SOD
- Patricia Caldera-Muñoz, Academic Coordinator, Health Education Partnership
- Gerri Collins-Bride, Clinical Professor & Vice-chair, Community Health Systems, SON
- Christine Des Jarlais, Asst. Dean, Graduate Division

University Community Partnerships Council

University Members (continued)

- Dixie Horning, Executive Director, National Center for Excellence in Women’s Health, SOM
- Cindy Lima, Special Asst to the CEO, Medical Center Administration
- Howard Pinderhughes, Associate Professor & Vice Chair, Social & Behavioral Sciences, SON
- Lorie Rice, Academic Administrator, Dean’s Office, SOP
- Naomi Wortis, Asst. Clinical Professor, Community Partnership Resources Center, Family & Community Medicine, SOM

Areas of Common Interest – Subcommittees

- Employment/Economic Development
- Community-Based Research
- Service Learning
- UCPC Grants
- Educational Outreach (Youth & Adult)

Program Objectives: 2006-07

- Define and strengthen University Community Partnerships Council to have a greater impact within UCSF and neighboring communities
- Support the work of the Council’s Areas of Common Interest (ACI) and identify resources necessary to realize ACI’s plans and objectives
- Create a website to serve as the primary information source on UCSF and community partnerships
Program Objectives: 2006-07

- Identify external funding sources to solidify University Community Partnerships Program
- Hold recognition event in Spring/Fall 2007 to spotlight community partnerships, highlight best practices, and acknowledge our partnership champions

Proposed 2006-07 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits</td>
<td>195,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Partnership Grants</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings &amp; Events</td>
<td>51,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website, database</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;E</td>
<td>18,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, media</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional develop.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$416,408</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 17, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, DBS
UCSF Academic Chair
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Dear Chair Greenspan,

On March 16, 2006, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) reviewed the white papers *Responding to the Challenges of Scholarly Communication*, and here expresses its support for these policies with the following comments:

- While the Committee appreciates that these policies are put forth for the benefit of faculty and the University, there is concern regarding the complexities of any individual negotiating copyright with publishers. The Committee also recognized a real need for faculty education regarding issues of copyright, limited licensing fair use, and use by the author; and education for such issues as they apply to monographs, electronic textbooks, personally created works (fiction or non-fiction works), teaching materials, and personal or didactic Web sites. The Committee hopes that as the SCSC moves forward with these policies, the University would provide opportunities for discussion and education.

- Considering the complexity and burden putting individuals in the position to negotiate copyright individually with publishers, there should be a University support mechanisms to negotiate on behalf of authors and to add the strength of the collective University to such negotiations.

- While ultimately publication in open access venues such as the Public Library of Science is of benefit to researchers and the University, such publication schemes shift the cost of publication to the researcher or Principal Investigator. University or departmental financial support would be good incentive for faculty to submit their creative activity to such venues.

Sincerely,

Patricia Robertson, MD
Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET
Patricia Robertson, MD, Chair

April 21, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: APB Support for Faculty Compensation for Academic Senate Service

Dear Chair Greenspan,

On April 20, 2006, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) reviewed the request from the Executive Office of the Academic Senate to consider the inclusion of faculty compensation for Academic Senate service as a permanent allocation to the annual budget of the Office of the Academic Senate. Tamara Maimon, Director of the Office of the Academic Senate, provided the Committee with an overview and background information leading to this request.

The Committee unanimously supports the Executive Office of the Academic Senate’s request, and we respectfully ask that you transmit this letter of support to the Chancellor for further consideration.

Sincerely,

Patricia Robertson, MD
Professor of Clinical Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Services
Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
UCSF Academic Senate
21 March 2006

Patty Robertson, MD
Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
UCSF

Dear Dr. Robertson,

On behalf of the Faculty Wellbeing Subcommittee of the Chancellor’s Council on Faculty Life, we are writing to request funding to create two exercise facilities for faculty at San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) and the VA Hospital (VA). Based on the success of the exercise facility that Dr. Jeff Pearly recently created at Mount Zion, we believe these new facilities will address a long-standing need for exercise and recreational facilities at the SFGH and VA sites.

The 2004 Report of the Focus Groups on Academic Stress highlighted the need for recreational facilities for faculty, many of whom experience an increasing level of stress in their professional lives. An exercise facility will provide faculty with easy access to opportunities for physical activity, which may mitigate some of the stresses of their professional activities.

We respectfully request $40,000 to fund two exercise facilities, one at SFGH and one at the VA. Each site will receive $20,000, which will be used to purchase equipment such as treadmills, elliptical machines, exercise bikes, free weights, benches, mats and towels. Dr. Sue Carlisle (SFGH) and Dr. Diana Nicoll (VA) have expressed their support for the concept of an exercise facility at their site and will identify the appropriate space. Ms. Tracey Gearlds, of Millberry Union, is amenable to assist with the creation of these facilities. The Faculty Wellbeing Subcommittee will work with Drs. Carlise and Nicoll and the Millberry Union staff to create exercise facilities at SFGH and the VA.

Respectfully submitted,

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH
Mary Croughan, PhD
Stuart Eisendrath, MD
Jeffrey Pearl, MD
COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET

Patricia Robertson, MD, Chair

April 21, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: APB Support for Faculty Fitness Facilities at SFGH and the VA

Dear Chair Greenspan,

On April 20, 2006, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) reviewed the request from the Subcommittee on Faculty Wellbeing of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Quality of Faculty Life for Academic Senate support for funding the creation of fitness facilities at the San Francisco General Hospital and Veteran Affairs campus sites. Stuart Eisendrath, Chair of the Subcommittee on Faculty Wellbeing, provided the Committee with an overview and background information leading to this request. The Subcommittee of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Quality of Faculty Life will be requesting a total of $40,000 via the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration.

The Committee unanimously supports the request of Subcommittee on Faculty Wellbeing of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Quality of Faculty Life and we respectfully ask that you transmit this letter of support to the Chancellor for further consideration.

Sincerely,

Patricia Robertson, MD
Professor of Clinical Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Services
Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
UCSF Academic Senate

Enclosure/ Communication from Subcommittee on Faculty Wellbeing (March 21, 2006)

cc: Stuart Eisendrath, Chair – Chair, Subcommittee on Faculty Wellbeing
COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY
Thomas B. Newman, MD, MPH, Chair

TO: Patricia Robertson, MD, Chair
Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

RE: Request for Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds for UCSF Library

DATE: April 13, 2006

I am writing on behalf of the Committee on the Library to request Academic Senate support for new permanent funding in the amount of $150,000 for library materials beginning in fiscal year 2006-2007.

Maintaining the breadth and depth of UCSF’s collection in the face of continuing increases in the volume and cost of scholarly publication is one of the single greatest challenges confronting the library. To meet this challenge, the UC libraries have collaborated closely and pooled their resources so that all UC faculty, students and staff, irrespective of their location, have access to library collections required of an eminent research university.

The UC libraries working together have leveraged their size and shared assets to negotiate very favorable prices for the more than 8,000 journals and 200 databases. The Library will need to find an additional $80,000 next fiscal year simply to maintain its current level of participation in system-wide packages that are core to the mission of UCSF. From 2001-2005 the average price of a health sciences journal increased 38%. Estimates for the coming year predict that journal prices will rise between 8-9%, yet down from the 10-15% in past years. So while we continue to see annual inflationary increases it has moderated over the past five years.

The inflationary increases are only one of the pressures on the library budget. Faculty are requesting that the library add new databases and journals. For example, a site license to Scopus, a database that offers greater coverage of the science, technology, and medicine than MEDLINE would cost $45,000 a year and Embase, a database with strong coverage in drug research and development, would cost $10,000 a year. Other resources, such as Faculty of 1000 Medicine and Journal Watch, keep faculty abreast of new research but would cost approximately $8,500 a year. Publishers continue to create new journals in areas of increasing specialization. Nature Publishing Group, once a relatively small publisher, released eight new journals in 2005/6 and recently announced three more titles for 2006/7. Newly developed clinically-oriented resources such as DynaMed and InfoPOEMS cost $35,000 a year.

Faculty and students are requesting journals and databases in disciplines new to UCSF including optics, physics and applied mathematics. Resources such as Safari Online offer more than 200 online computer and programming books to assist desktop support staff. Costs that were one-time are now annual. Electronic textbooks and older, archive files of journals now require yearly fees to maintain access where they were previously they were one-time costs.

Systewmide collaboration has significantly expanded UCSF’s access to digital collections but campus contributions are required for participation. We also recognize that digital access has enabled faculty to reduce their departmental and personal subscriptions shifting costs to the library. It’s clear that the Library is making effective use of the
resources it receives when one considers that UCSF’s budget for library books and journals is, in fact, 23% less than its peer institutions.

To address the static budgets in previous years, the Library cancelled journal subscriptions in multiple formats. This strategy preserved core resources and supported faculty and student preferences for digital subscriptions. I’m sure you will agree that the current digital content, while more expensive than print content previously available, also provides a much higher level of service to the campus community. For example, where I used to have to go (or later send someone) to the library to photocopy articles, now I can print most of them in a minute from my desktop. I no longer need to subscribe to many journals, and do not need to keep them on my shelves because the digital content is so quickly available. Researchers and clinicians both have benefited academically and financially from this wonderfully available digital content. However, the library has reached the end of this strategy and without new funding will have to eliminate essential resources.

UCSF proudly continues to attract new researchers and programs at an amazing pace. Investigators are expanding into new research areas without funding for the library to purchase journals, databases and other materials to support that work.

We are therefore requesting Academic Senate support for $150,000 in permanent funds to cover the cost of inflation and to purchase a limited number of new journals and databases for fiscal year 2006-2007.

If you would like additional information, please contact Thomas Newman (newman@epi.ucsf.edu) at (415) 514-8007 or Karen Butter, University Librarian (karen.butter@library.ucsf.edu) at (415) 476-5557.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Newman, MD, MPH
Chair, Committee on Library
COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET
Patricia Robertson, MD, Chair

April 21, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: APB Support for Library Budget Increase

Dear Chair Greenspan,

On April 20, 2006, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) reviewed the request from the Academic Senate Committee on Library to support the request of the Library for additional permanent funds to support library journal and book purchases. Karen Butter, University Librarian, provided the Committee with an overview and background information leading to this request. The Library will be requesting a $150,000 increase to the permanent allocation to the Library annual budget to cover the cost of inflation for digital materials and to purchase a limited number of new journals and databases for the fiscal year 2006-2007.

The Committee unanimously supports the Library’s request for additional permanent funding in the amount of $150,000, and we respectfully ask that you transmit this request to the Chancellor for further consideration.

Sincerely,

Patricia Robertson, MD
Professor of Clinical Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Services
Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
UCSF Academic Senate

Enclosures/ Communication from Committee on Library (April 13, 2006)

cc: Tom Newman, Chair, Academic Senate Committee on Library
Karen Butter, University Librarian
COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON COURSES OF INSTRUCTION
Eileen Grady, PhD, Chair

April 18, 2006

Dear Chair Greenspan:

It is with great enthusiasm that the Committee requests your consideration and support for the implementation of an online course preparation, review and approval system at UCSF. The members of the Committee recently had the opportunity to review the online course system developed by the UC Santa Barbara Academic Senate Office and strongly believes that the implementation of a similar system at UCSF would offer many advantages over the current system for faculty and the UCSF campus community for the following reasons: 1) It would add an exponential amount of efficiency to the current paper-based system by significantly decreasing the amount of time necessary for faculty to prepare course forms and respond to Committee requests for changes, as well as facilitate approvals at levels of department, school, Senate and Registrar. 2) It will facilitate maintenance of an accurate online catalog. 3) It will simultaneously serve as an archive of courses and course actions readily available to the campus community. 4) It would firmly establish a permanent delineation of the responsibilities of the Senate Committee and the Registrar to enable a smooth course review process in the future, regardless of the personnel and faculty involved.

The Committee realizes that currently there are no funds allocated to either the Academic Senate or the Registrar to develop a UCSF online course system, but would like to ask that the Academic Senate advocate for funding necessary to develop and implement such a system. The Santa Barbara Academic Senate Office indicated that they have a total of 1.8 FTE dedicated to IT and technology development, which allowed for the development of their system, in cooperation with their Registrar’s Office. We respectfully request that you forward our request to the Senate’s Academic Planning and Budget Committee for conceptual approval and support for funding. We would greatly appreciate any support to begin to formulate the necessary software required. We anticipate that this process would occur over a period of one to three years, as three years were required by the Santa Barbara’s Senate Office.

Reasons for Investing in an Online Course System at UCSF
The most significant advantages of a well-designed online course review system for the UCSF campus would be a significant reduction of faculty time, errors and omissions as well as an increased efficiency at all levels of the course review process. First, by automating many of the tasks now carried out on paper, delays due to the movement of the printed forms would be eliminated. For example, each course form requires three signatures before it can be submitted to our Committee. This signature approval process could be integrated into an online system, eliminating the need to transfer paper forms between offices. Second, an online course review system could be “smart” programmed to ensure that forms are completely filled in before the application could proceed to the next step. Many of the delays in the current system are due to
incomplete or incorrectly completed forms. At least 90% of the forms we currently process need correction or completion.

Most importantly for our Committee, members would be better equipped to fulfill their mandate, which includes verifying appropriate faculty titles, verifying that similar courses are not currently being taught, and understanding how the course under review fits into the curriculum offered at UCSF as a whole.

An online course review system could integrate with an electronic archive system in the Registrar’s office to make course information more readily available to the UCSF campus community. Currently, the approved printed course forms are only available for photocopy at the Registrar’s office during a ten-day period following the course review process. Through an online course system, this information could be available to the appropriate parties upon demand. In addition, an online course review system could include a course renewal option which would automatically archive courses which had not been attended in the last five years. This could keep the online course catalog up-to-date.

When UCSF is able to implement an online course review system, two critical elements of the current system should be preserved. First, the face-to-face meetings of the Committee should continue to be an integral part of the course review process. The health science curriculum at UCSF requires a careful peer review process and the working discussions held during Committee meetings are essential. The diversity of perspectives offered by a full committee review ensures that the appropriate action is taken and that a plurality of voices from each School is represented. With the implementation of an online course review system, the committee would still meet to discuss courses, however these meetings could be much shorter and more efficient. Moreover, Committee members who are occasionally called upon to submit their opinions in absentia might be able to more easily participate in the Committee’s work.

UCSF faculty are required to include course objectives for each course. Currently, these objectives are an integral part of the course review process for the Committee. However, once the course application is reviewed and the form is archived at the Registrar’s office, those objectives are not readily accessible. An online course review system could include a mechanism for accessing that information for appropriate users such as Committee members or staff.

I hope this request will be given serious consideration. The Committee would welcome the opportunity, through its established Sub-Committee on Course Form Automation, to participate in any future discussions and provide additional detail needed for consideration of this proposal.

Please feel free to contact me at 502-7920 if I can be of any further assistance, or if you would like to meet to further discuss this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

Eileen Grady, PhD
Chair, UCSF Committee on Courses of Instruction
COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET
Patricia Robertson, MD, Chair

June 2, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: APB Support for Funding the Development of an Online Course Preparation, Review, and Approval System

Dear Chair Greenspan:

On June 1, 2006, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) reviewed your request to evaluate the proposal from the Academic Senate Committee on Courses of Instruction to support the development of an online course preparation, review, and approval system.

Following a presentation from Eileen Grady, Chair of the UCSF Committee on Courses of Instruction the Committee enthusiastically and unanimously voted to support funding necessary for the development of an online course system at UCSF, modeled after the system in place in the UCSB Senate Office. The Committee believes that conversion from the current paper-based system to an online system will save valuable faculty and staff time and resources and will improve the overall system for faculty, staff and student access to course information.

Jonathan Showstack, Academic Information Technology Coordinator in the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor, expressed support for this project and indicated that he would work with Senate Office Director Tamara Maimon to identify a projected budget to initiate the first phase development of an online course system beginning in 2006-07. The Committee requested that the development of an online course processing system be given a high priority status by the Academic Information Systems Board and the EVC.

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget respectfully requests that you transmit this letter of support to the Chancellor as soon as possible for funding beginning in FY 2006-07. Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours sincerely,

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

Enclosure: Communication from Committee on Courses of Instruction (April 18, 2006)

cc: Eileen Grady, Chair, Academic Senate Committee on Courses of Instruction
Jonathan Showstack, Academic Information Technology Coordinator
**Project** | **Issue** | **Funds Requested/Needed** | **Priority Score** | **Comments**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Global Health Sciences | Since FY 2003-04, $1,727,733 in Chancellor’s funding has been allocated for start-up support of the Global Health Sciences (GHS) program. The School of Medicine Dean’s Office has also provided $950,000 in support over the initial three year period. This support was intended to be seed funding while the program secured adequate extramural funding. The program is now requesting that both the Chancellor and the School of Medicine Dean continue to support the growth of this new program for another three year period through FY 2008-09. The following Chancellor’s support is requested:  
• $1.7 million for FY 2006-07,  
• $1.6 million for FY 2007-08, and  
• $1.6 million for FY 2008-09.  
• **$4.9 million – Three Year Total**  
The FY 2006-07 allocation is requested to partially fund the following:  
• 4.40 FTEs-existing positions,  
• 4.25 FTEs-new positions, and  
• related operating expenses.  
Other sources of support include the Medicine Dean’s Office, the Galante Professorship, extramural funding, and gifts/endowments. | | | 
Administrative Systems Advisory Committee (ASAC) Strategic Plan FY 2006-2010 | The ASAC Strategic Plan for FY 2006-10 describes Phase II of campus-wide priority information systems projects that build on the successes of the Phase I plan. Funding for Procure-to-Pay, Research Administration Phase II, E-Workplace Portal, Effort Reporting, and Payroll Expense Transfers was approved last fiscal year. In addition to the $15.6 million approved in FY 2005-06, ASAC is requesting an additional $3.7 - $4.1 million for implementing the Time and Attendance/Vacation Leave Accruals system. Work on this project is currently not scheduled to begin until FY 2008-09 which is when the funding will be required. | | | 
Academic Information Technology – OAAIS | Beginning in FY 2006-07, the campus’ academic and administrative IT organizations will become more closely aligned under the new Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems (OAAIS) with the Academic IT Coordinator and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration jointly directing this new organization. The following three year cost estimates have been identified for the following Academic projects/needs:  
• $1.4 million – Academic IT Staffing  
• $3.6 million – Research Data Infrastructure & Services (RDIS)  
• $1.5 million – Grants.Gov  
• $7.5 million – Academic Application Suite  
• **$14.0 million – Three Year Total** | | |
## Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee
### Summary of FY 2006-07 Budget Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Funds Requested/Needed</th>
<th>Priority Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Information Technology –</strong></td>
<td>In FY 2005-06 under the previous CIO, ITS presented estimated one-time costs of projects that it considered its most important strategic initiatives through FY 2009-10. The majority of these five year cost estimates were for the following: • Next Generation Metropolitan Area Network (NGMAN) - $19 million, and • Improving enterprise information security - $4 million. These projects/initiatives are currently underway.</td>
<td>Better estimates for FY 2006-07 costs have now been identified as well as new initiatives. These are as follows: • $1.8 million – Network Services (Data, Voice, Wireless) • $2.3 million – Enterprise Information Security New Initiatives • $762,000 – Telephony • $2.6 million – Architecture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Materials -</strong></td>
<td>In FY 2005-06, the Academic Senate championed a permanent funding request from the Library to cover the cost of inflation for digital materials and to purchase a limited number of new journals and databases. $150,000 in one-time support was allocated. Continuation of the funding beyond FY 2005-06 would be evaluated as part of the spring 2006 annual budget planning and review process.</td>
<td>The Senate is again supporting the Library’s request for $150,000 in permanent funds to increase the Library’s materials and journal subscriptions budget.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Support –</strong></td>
<td>In FY 2005-06, $114,000 in one-time support was allocated to the Office of the Academic Senate to reimburse departments for faculty who serve in leadership roles on the Senate committees. In addition, $6,000 in one-time support was allocated to the Office of Research to cover the Chair of the Conflict of Interest Advisory Committee.</td>
<td>The Senate and Office of Research are requesting that this support be made permanent beginning in FY 2006-07.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Fitness Facilities –</strong></td>
<td>The 2004 report of the focus groups on stress among academics highlighted the need for recreational facilities to give faculty the opportunity to mitigate some of the stresses of their professional activities through physical exercise. The Chancellor’s Council on Faculty Life is requesting funding to create two exercise facilities for faculty at San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) and the VA Hospital.</td>
<td>$20,000 in one-time funding per facility for a total of $40,000 is requested to purchase exercise equipment for SFGH and the VA. Appropriate space at each location will be identified to be used for this new purpose.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee
## Summary of FY 2006-07 Budget Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Funds Requested/Needed</th>
<th>Priority Score (1=Low, 5=High)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Course Preparation, Review, &amp; Approval System – Academic Senate</td>
<td>The Academic Senate with the support of the Academic IT Coordinator is proposing that an online course preparation, review, and approval system be developed to automate what is currently a manual, paper forms-driven process. One key feature of this system will be an online course catalog benefiting both faculty and students. Significant faculty and administrative time savings are also anticipated as a result of this system.</td>
<td>$75,000 in one-time support is requested for the needs assessment and planning phase of the project. Total costs over three years are estimated to be $450,000.  <em>(This request is also included under the Academic Information Technology – OAIS request within the $7.5 million Academic Application Suite line item.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Community Partnerships Program</td>
<td>In FY 2005-06 with the approval of the Chancellor’s Executive Committee, up to $305,700 in temporary support was allocated to the Community and Governmental Relations department to implement a University-Community Partnerships Program that would facilitate community partnerships, incubate new initiatives, and help to overcome institutional barriers impeding civic engagement.</td>
<td>The program is projecting that $241,000 will remain unexpended from the FY 2005-06 allocation. They are requesting that this savings be carried forward and that an additional $175,400 in temporary support be allocated for a total FY 2006-07 allocation request of $416,400. This amount will support full year costs of the program coordinator, an assistant, and related start-up and operating expenses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-21/CAS Relief</td>
<td>The FY 2005-06 temporary and permanent indirect cost recovery (ICR) allocations to the Schools totaled $14,250,000 which was based on a new funding formula.</td>
<td>The proposed allocation for FY 2006-07 would be an increase of $1,530,000 for a total permanent and temporary allocation of $15,780,000, an 11% increase over FY 2005-06. This is the second year of a three-year funding model trial that provides incremental ICR according to a formula that incents off-campus research growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay Operations &amp; Start-up</td>
<td>With the completion and occupancy of the Campus Community Center and the Housing Complex, the population at Mission Bay continues to increase. The Chancellor’s Mission Bay Operations and Services Committee continues to define service delivery concerns and issues. Service providers have submitted FY 2006-07 requests for funding that are currently under final review by Budget and Resource Management.</td>
<td>The preliminary budget request for FY 2006-07 for Mission Bay services is $19,015,000. Of this total, $10,919,000 is for recharge and auxiliary services. The request for Chancellor’s permanent and temporary support is $8,096,000 of which $7,999,000 is permanent and $97,000 is temporary. These amounts exclude the purchased utilities and OMP shortfall for the Mission Bay buildings that are described below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee
## Summary of FY 2006-07 Budget Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Funds Requested/Needed</th>
<th>Priority Score (1=Low, 5=High)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Utilities and Operations and Maintenance of Plant (OMP) Funding Shortfall</strong></td>
<td>UCSF’s State utilities budget continues to be substantially under funded. The situation worsened in FY 2005-06 from the effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Utilities costs are projected to continue to increase in FY 2006-07. At this point, OP has not committed to any additional funding to offset these increased costs. OP has not funded a substantial portion of the OMP costs for the Mission Bay facilities as well. Additionally, OMP funding has not been provided for the Parnassus Services Building (PSB) and OP has removed funding for UC Hall. There is no relief anticipated in the near future.</td>
<td>Purchased utilities and other OMP budgets for FY 2006-07 are currently under review. For FY 2005-06, Chancellor’s funding for purchased utilities is expected to be $9.2 million and $7 million for other OMP costs. FY 2006-07 costs are expected to be higher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Campus Core Research Facilities (CCRFs)**                             | The proposed CCRFs will provide centralized instrumentation and specialized services to the UCSF research community. Currently, the absence of such centralized services has resulted in the development of redundant facilities at various campus venues, departments, ORUs, programs, and in clusters of two or more individual labs. | Chancellor’s funding is requested over a three year period to develop core administrative services and the following initial CCRFs: Mass Spectroscopy, Biostatistical Analysis, and Genomics. The funding request is as follows:  
• $1.6 million - Year 1  
• $1.4 million – Year 2  
• $1.2 million – Year 3  
**$4.2 million – Three Year Total**  
This funding will support a Core Operational Manager position, positions to staff the initially proposed CCRFs, and related operating and equipment costs. |                                                                                                           |                                                                                     |
COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET
Patricia Robertson, MD, Chair

July 7, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: APB Review and Priority Ranking of FY 2006-07 Budget Issues

Dear Chair Greenspan:

On June 22 and 29, 2006, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) reviewed the Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee Summary of FY 2006-07 Budget requests. After hearing presentations on 11 of the 13 items, and after much Committee discussion, the Committee expresses the following priority ratings (1=Low and 5=High) and comments:

1. **Global Health Sciences Program**
   - Rating: 4
   - Recommendation: Partial Funding at 60% of Request for 2006-07

   The Committee recommends that:
   
   A. Funding be granted for only one year, at 60% of the requested $1.7 million ($1,020,000), and gives it a ranking of 4. During the next year the program may begin raising the $30-$40 million it needs for its endowment, as there is now a development officer assigned to the program. APB requests that prior to making a request for additional funds in 2007-08, that the program make a report to the campus regarding the grants and gifts it has gained, as well as a progress summary of its programs.

   B. The steering committee for Global Health Sciences Program be more inclusive of representatives from the Schools of Nursing, Pharmacy, and Dentistry.

   C. In 2006-07, the Global Health Sciences Program report on the status of the Program’s consideration related to the formation of a new School of Global Health.

   The Committee continues to be concerned about the lack of an umbrella organization for international programs at UCSF, which would eliminate confusion about the various programs in existence at UCSF and the potential for administrative and other cost savings to the campus.

2. **Administrative Systems Advisor Committee (ASAC) Strategic Plan**
   - Rating: 5
   - Recommendation: Funding at 100% of Requested Amount
3&4. **Academic Information Technology - OAAIS**  
**Rating: 5**  
**Recommendation: Funding at 100% of Requested Amount**

The Committee enthusiastically supported the multiple proposals to upgrade and improve technology and access to technology for faculty, students and staff as proposed. Additionally, the Committee supports the concept of combining information technology and telecommunications and Academic Information systems into a single campus unit for improved coordination, implementation and potential administrative cost savings.

5. **Increase to Annual Budget of the Library**  
**Rating: 5**  
**Recommendation: Funding at 100% of Requested Amount to Permanent Budget**

The Committee believes that a permanent allocation of $150,000 to the Library’s budget is essential to maintain journals, books and other online materials necessary to fulfill the academic mission of the University and strongly supports this proposal.

6. **Academic Senate Service Support**  
**Rating: 5**  
**Recommendation: Funding at 100% of Requested Amount to Permanent Budget**

These funds provide support for faculty members who serve in a leadership capacity in the Academic Senate, and for members of CAP, who devote a significant amount of time to the faculty promotion review process. While the funds serve as a token recognition to the faculty for the quantity and quality of their contributions to essential campus initiatives, it also serves to recognize the essential role faculty members play in the University’s system of shared governance.

Additionally, the Senate’s Committee on Committees reported that the ability to offer these small stipends has made a significant difference in the ability to recruit faculty to Senate Committees with high work loads (such as CAP) and to serve in leadership roles, which demand more time.

Prior to this year, UCSF was the only UC campus without some form of faculty support for Academic Senate service. The Committee recommends that $114,000 be made a permanent allocation to the Academic Senate Office for distribution to Academic Senate Officers, members of CAP and faculty in other leadership positions as determined by the Academic Senate Executive Committee in consultation with the Executive Vice Chancellor.

7. **Faculty Fitness Facilities at SFGH and VAMC**  
**Rating: 5**  
**Recommendation: Funding at 100% of Requested Amount**

The Committee is extremely supportive of these two initiatives, modeled after the facility that has been set up at Mt. Zion for faculty use. The Committee believes that these two new facilities will contribute to other efforts underway to address faculty stress and well-being.

Additionally, in light of the recent death of the UC Santa Cruz Chancellor, the Committee wishes to note that it offers enthusiastic support should the Chancellor’s Council on Faculty Life, submit a last-minute budget proposal or a budget request prior to next fiscal year, for a faculty wellbeing program at UCSF.
8. Online Course Preparation, Review and Approval System  
Rating: 5  
Recommendation: Full Funding at 100% of Requested Amount  

The Academic Senate Committee on Courses of Instruction proposal to develop and model a UCSF Online Course System after the one developed by the UC Santa Barbara Academic Senate was enthusiastically endorsed by APB. In consultation with Jon Showstack and Randy Lopez, it was agreed that the oversight and development for this project would be managed by OAAIS and the total projected funding for FY 06-07 has been included as a line item in their budget request ($75,000 – Needs Assessment and Planning and $450,000 estimated over three years for development and implementation).

The Committee believes the development and implementation of an Online Course Preparation, Review and Approval System is essential to significantly improve efficiency and accuracy of the UCSF course system and to provide a time- and cost-savings to faculty, staff and administration. The Committee considers this item to be of high priority.

9. University-Community Partnership Program  
Rating: 5  
Recommendation: Funding at 100% of Requested Amount  

The Committee notes the importance of this program and recommended support, with the understanding that the requested additional allocation of $175,400 for FY 06-07 will complete the start-up costs for this program.

The Committee expects that, in the future, this program’s budget requests will be integrated into the budget of the Vice Chancellor for University Planning and Advancement. The Committee also suggests that the Program continue to gather and coordinate information regarding other existing community and clinical outreach programs on campus.

10. A-21/CAS Relief  
Rating: 5  
Recommendation: Full Funding at 100% of Requested Amount  

No additional comment.

11. Mission Bay Operations  
Rating: 1  
Recommendation: Implement a Gift/STIP Tax on donations to Mission Bay to offset Operational Expenses  

The Committee believes that the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds should be used to support faculty and other necessary campus programs but not buildings, and therefore provides a rating of 1.

The Committee recommends that in lieu of using such a large amount of limited funds for operational expenses for Mission Bay, that a gift/STIP tax be instituted on all donations to Mission Bay in order to offset operational expenses at that site.
12. State Utilities and OMP Funding Shortfall  
Rating: None  
Recommendation: Establish a Campus-Wide Task Force to Examine Alternative Energy Solutions and Ways to Decrease Energy Consumption at UCSF.

The Committee notes that this is a necessary expense, and as it is beyond the control or influence of the Faculty, the Committee does not express a rating for this item.

The Committee strongly recommends the establishment of a campus-wide Task Force to examine alternative energy solutions and methods of educating the campus community on means to decrease energy consumption. The Committee also recommends exploring an increase of indirect overhead to industry contracts/grants to assist in coverage of utility expenses.

13. Campus Core Research Facilities
Rating: 4  
Recommendation: Partial Funding at 50% of Requested Amount

The Committee, after hearing a presentation from School of Medicine, Executive Vice Dean Keith Yamamoto and reviewing the proposal, believes that the proposed administrative cost component is excessive. The Committee believes that all of the administrative costs related to the Core facilities should be self-sustaining through the re-charge system, with limited expenses for personnel to do creative outreach and investigate new technologies.

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget respectfully asks that you transmit our priority ratings, recommendations, and comments to the Chancellor for consideration. Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours sincerely,

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

enclosure/ Matrix Summary of FY 2006-07 Budget Issues with APB Comments

cc: Steve Barclay, Senior Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance  
Members of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
### Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee

**Summary of FY 2006-07 Budget Issues**

**Ratings from the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget – 07/07/06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Funds Requested/Needed</th>
<th>Priority Score (1=Low, 5=High)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Global Health Sciences            | Since FY 2003-04, $1,727,733 in Chancellor’s funding has been allocated for start-up support of the Global Health Sciences (GHS) program. The School of Medicine Dean’s Office has also provided $950,000 in support over the initial three year period. This support was intended to be seed funding while the program secured adequate extramural funding. | The program is now requesting that both the Chancellor and the School of Medicine Dean continue to support the growth of this new program for another three year period through FY 2008-09. The following Chancellor’s support is requested:  
- $1.7 million for FY 2006-07,  
- $1.6 million for FY 2007-08, and  
- $1.6 million for FY 2008-09.  
**$4.9 million – Three Year Total**  
The FY 2006-07 allocation is requested to partially fund the following:  
- 4.40 FTEs-existing positions,  
- 4.25 FTEs-new positions, and  
- related operating expenses.  
Other sources of support include the Medicine Dean’s Office, the Galante Professorship, extramural funding, and gifts/endowments. | 4 | **Partial Funding at 60% of Request for 2006-07**  
The Committee recommends that:  
A. Funding be granted for only one year, at 60% of the requested $1.7 million ($1,020,000), and gives it a ranking of 4. During the next year the program may begin raising the $30-$40 million it needs for its endowment, as there is now a development officer assigned to the program. APB requests that prior to making a request for additional funds in 2007-08, that the program make a report to the campus regarding the grants and gifts it has gained, as well as a progress summary of its programs.  
B. The steering committee for Global Health Sciences Program be more inclusive of representatives from the Schools of Nursing, Pharmacy, and Dentistry.  
C. In 2006-07, the Global Health Sciences Program report on the status of the Program’s consideration related to the formation of a new School of Global Health.  
The Committee continues to be concerned about the lack of an umbrella organization for international programs at UCSF, which would eliminate confusion about the various programs in existence at UCSF and the potential for administrative and other cost savings to the campus. |
| 2. Administrative Systems Advisory Committee (ASAC) Strategic Plan FY 2006-2010 | The ASAC Strategic Plan for FY 2006-10 describes Phase II of campus-wide priority information systems projects that build on the successes of the Phase I plan. Funding for Procure-to-Pay, Research Administration Phase II, E-Workplace Portal, Effort Reporting, and Payroll Expense Transfers was approved last fiscal year. | In addition to the $15.6 million approved in FY 2005-06, ASAC is requesting an additional $3.7 - $4.1 million for implementing the Time and Attendance/Vacation Leave Accruals system. Work on this project is currently not scheduled to begin until FY 2008-09 which is when the funding will be required. | 5 | No additional comment. |
### Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee

**Summary of FY 2006-07 Budget Issues**

**Ratings from the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget – 07/07/06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Funds Requested/Needed</th>
<th>Priority Score (1=Low, 5=High)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Academic Information Technology – OAAIS | Beginning in FY 2006-07, the campus’ academic and administrative IT organizations will become more closely aligned under the new Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems (OAAIS) with the Academic IT Coordinator and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration jointly directing this new organization. | The following three year cost estimates have been identified for the following Academic projects/needs:  
- $1.4 million – Academic IT Staffing  
- $3.6 million – Research Data Infrastructure & Services (RDIS)  
- $1.5 million – Grants.Gov  
- $7.5 million – Academic Application Suite  
**$14.0 million – Three Year Total** | 5 | The Committee enthusiastically supported the multiple proposals to upgrade and improve technology and access to technology for faculty, students and staff as proposed. Additionally, the Committee supports the concept of combining information technology and telecommunications and Academic Information systems into a single campus unit for improved coordination, implementation and potential administrative cost savings. |
| 4. Administrative Information Technology – OAAIS | In FY 2005-06 under the previous CIO, ITS presented estimated one-time costs of projects that it considered its most important strategic initiatives through FY 2009-10. The majority of these five year cost estimates were for the following:  
- Next Generation Metropolitan Area Network (NGMAN) - $19 million, and  
- Improving enterprise information security - $4 million.  
These projects/initiatives are currently underway. | Better estimates for FY 2006-07 costs have now been identified as well as new initiatives. These are as follows:  
- $1.8 million – Network Services (Data, Voice, Wireless)  
- $2.3 million – Enterprise Information Security New Initiatives  
- $762,000 – Telephony  
- $2.6 million – Architecture  
**$7.5 million – Total FY 2006-07 one-time & recurring costs** | 5 | See above. |
| 5. Library Materials - Academic Senate | In FY 2005-06, the Academic Senate championed a permanent funding request from the Library to cover the cost of inflation for digital materials and to purchase a limited number of new journals and databases. $150,000 in one-time support was allocated. Continuation of the funding beyond FY 2005-06 would be evaluated as part of the spring 2006 annual budget planning and review process. | The Senate is again supporting the Library’s request for $150,000 in permanent funds to increase the Library’s materials and journal subscriptions budget. | 5 | The Committee believes that a permanent allocation of $150,000 to the Library’s budget is essential to maintain journals, books and other online materials necessary to fulfill the academic mission of the University and strongly supports this proposal. |
# Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee
## Summary of FY 2006-07 Budget Issues

### Ratings from the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget – 07/07/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Funds Requested/Needed</th>
<th>Priority Score (1=Low, 5=High)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Committee Support – Academic Senate</td>
<td>In FY 2005-06, $114,000 in one-time support was allocated to the Office of the Academic Senate to reimburse departments for faculty who serve in leadership roles on the Senate committees. In addition, $6,000 in one-time support was allocated to the Office of Research to cover the Chair of the Conflict of Interest Advisory Committee.</td>
<td>The Senate and Office of Research are requesting that this support be made permanent beginning in FY 2006-07.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>These funds provide support for faculty members who serve in a leadership capacity in the Academic Senate, and for members of CAP, who devote a significant amount of time to the faculty promotion review process. While the funds serve as a token recognition to the faculty for the quantity and quality of their contributions to essential campus initiatives, it also serves to recognize the essential role faculty members play in the University’s system of shared governance. Additionally, the Senate’s Committee on Committees reported that the ability to offer these small stipends has made a significant difference in the ability to recruit faculty to Senate Committees with high work loads (such as CAP) and to serve in leadership roles, which demand more time. Prior to this year, UCSF was the only UC campus without some form of faculty support for Academic Senate service. The Committee recommends that $114,000 be made a permanent allocation to the Academic Senate Office for distribution to Academic Senate Officers, members of CAP and faculty in other leadership positions as determined by the Academic Senate Executive Committee in consultation with the Executive Vice Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty Fitness Facilities – Academic Senate</td>
<td>The 2004 report of the focus groups on stress among academics highlighted the need for recreational facilities to give faculty the opportunity to mitigate some of the stresses of their professional activities through physical exercise. The Chancellor’s Council on Faculty Life is requesting funding to create two exercise facilities for faculty at San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) and the VA Hospital.</td>
<td>$20,000 in one-time funding per facility for a total of $40,000 is requested to purchase exercise equipment for SFGH and the VA. Appropriate space at each location will be identified to be used for this new purpose.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Committee is extremely supportive of these two initiatives, modeled after the facility that has been set up at Mt. Zion for faculty use. The Committee believes that these two new facilities will contribute to other efforts underway to address faculty stress and well-being. Additionally, in light of the recent death of the UC Santa Cruz Chancellor, the Committee wishes to note that it offers enthusiastic support should the Chancellor’s Council on Faculty Life, submit a last-minute budget proposal or a budget request prior to next fiscal year, for a faculty wellbeing program at UCSF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Funds Requested/Needed</td>
<td>Priority Score (1=Low, 5=High)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Online Course Preparation, Review, &amp; Approval System – Academic Senate</td>
<td>The Academic Senate with the support of the Academic IT Coordinator is proposing that an online course preparation, review, and approval system be developed to automate what is currently a manual, paper form-driven process. One key feature of this system will be an online course catalog benefiting both faculty and students. Significant faculty and administrative time savings are also anticipated as a result of this system.</td>
<td>$75,000 in one-time support is requested for the needs assessment and planning phase of the project. Total costs over three years are estimated to be $450,000. <em>(This request is also included under the Academic Information Technology – OAIS request within the $7.5 million Academic Application Suite line item.)</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Academic Senate Committee on Courses of Instruction proposal to develop and model a UCSF Online Course System after the one developed by the UC Santa Barbara Academic Senate was enthusiastically endorsed by APB. In consultation with Jon Showstack and Randy Lopez, it was agreed that the oversight and development for this project would be managed by OASIS and the total projected funding for FY 06-07 has been included as a line item in their budget request ($75,000 – Needs Assessment and Planning and $450,000 estimated over three years for development and implementation). The Committee believes the development and implementation of an Online Course Preparation, Review and Approval System is essential to significantly improve efficiency and accuracy of the UCSF course system and to provide a time- and cost-savings to faculty, staff and administration. The Committee considers this item to be of high priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. University-Community Partnerships Program</td>
<td>In FY 2005-06 with the approval of the Chancellor’s Executive Committee, up to $305,700 in temporary support was allocated to the Community and Governmental Relations department to implement a University-Community Partnerships Program that would facilitate community partnerships, incubate new initiatives, and help to overcome institutional barriers impeding civic engagement.</td>
<td>The program is projecting that $241,000 will remain unexpended from the FY 2005-06 allocation. They are requesting that this savings be carried forward and that an additional $175,400 in temporary support be allocated for a total FY 2006-07 allocation request of $416,400. This amount will support full year costs of the program coordinator, an assistant, and related start-up and operating expenses.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Committee notes the importance of this program and recommended support, with the understanding that the requested additional allocation of $175,400 for FY 06-07 will complete the start-up costs for this program. The Committee expects that, in the future, this program’s budget requests will be integrated into the budget of the Vice Chancellor for University Planning and Advancement. The Committee also suggests that the Program continue to gather and coordinate information regarding other existing community and clinical outreach programs on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A-21/CAS Relief</td>
<td>The FY 2005-06 temporary and permanent indirect cost recovery (ICR) allocations to the Schools totaled $14,250,000 which was based on a new funding formula.</td>
<td>The proposed allocation for FY 2006-07 would be an increase of $1,530,000 for a total permanent and temporary allocation of $15,780,000, an 11% increase over FY 2005-06. This is the second year of a three-year funding model trial that provides incremental ICR according to a formula that incents off-campus research growth.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No additional comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee
### Summary of FY 2006-07 Budget Issues
#### Ratings from the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget – 07/07/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Funds Requested/Needed</th>
<th>Priority Score (1=Low, 5=High)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Mission Bay Operations &amp; Start-up</td>
<td>With the completion and occupancy of the Campus Community Center and the Housing Complex, the population at Mission Bay continues to increase. The Chancellor’s Mission Bay Operations and Services Committee continues to define service delivery concerns and issues. Service providers have submitted FY 2006-07 requests for funding that are currently under final review by Budget and Resource Management.</td>
<td>The preliminary budget request for FY 2006-07 for Mission Bay services is $19,015,000. Of this total, $10,919,000 is for recharge and auxiliary services. The request for Chancellor’s permanent and temporary support is $8,096,000 of which $7,999,000 is permanent and $97,000 is temporary. These amounts exclude the purchased utilities and OMP shortfall for the Mission Bay buildings that are described below.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Committee believes that the Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds should be used to support faculty and other necessary campus programs but not buildings, and therefore provides a rating of “1”. The Committee recommends that in lieu of using such a large amount of limited funds for operational expenses for Mission Bay, that a gift/STIP tax be instituted on all donations to Mission Bay in order to offset operational expenses at that site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. State Utilities and Operations and Maintenance of Plant (OMP) Funding Shortfall</td>
<td>UCSF’s State utilities budget continues to be substantially under funded. The situation worsened in FY 2005-06 from the effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Utilities costs are projected to continue to increase in FY 2006-07. At this point, OP has not committed to any additional funding to offset these increased costs. OP has not funded a substantial portion of the OMP costs for the Mission Bay facilities as well. Additionally, OMP funding has not been provided for the Parnassus Services Building (PSB) and OP has removed funding for UC Hall. There is no relief anticipated in the near future.</td>
<td>Purchased utilities and other OMP budgets for FY 2006-07 are currently under review. For FY 2005-06, Chancellor’s funding for purchased utilities is expected to be $9.2 million and $7 million for other OMP costs. FY 2006-07 costs are expected to be higher.</td>
<td>No Rating</td>
<td>The Committee notes that this is a necessary expense, and as it is beyond the control or influence of the Faculty, the Committee does not express a rating for this item. The Committee strongly recommends the establishment of a campus-wide Task Force to examine alternative energy solutions and methods of educating the campus community on means to decrease energy consumption. The Committee also recommends exploring an increase of indirect overhead to industry contracts/grants to assist in coverage of utility expenses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13. Campus Core Research Facilities (CCRFs) | The proposed CCRFs will provide centralized instrumentation and specialized services to the UCSF research community. Currently, the absence of such centralized services has resulted in the development of redundant facilities at various campus venues, departments, ORUs, programs, and in clusters of two or more individual labs. | Chancellor’s funding is requested over a three year period to develop core administrative services and the following initial CCRFs: Mass Spectroscopy, Biostatistical Analysis, and Genomics. The funding request is as follows:  
- $1.6 million - Year 1  
- $1.4 million – Year 2  
- $1.2 million – Year 3  
$4.2 million – Three Year Total  
This funding will support a Core Operational Manager position, positions to staff the initially proposed CCRFs, and related operating and equipment costs. | 4 | Partial Funding at 50% of Requested Amount |

Prepared by Budget and Resource Management
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>09/08/05</th>
<th>10/13/05</th>
<th>11/10/05</th>
<th>12/15/05</th>
<th>01/05/06</th>
<th>02/09/06</th>
<th>03/16/06</th>
<th>04/20/06</th>
<th>05/18/06 Canceled</th>
<th>06/01/06</th>
<th>06/22/06</th>
<th>06/29/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patty Robertson (Chair)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Sniderman (Vice-Chair)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Bernstein</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Green (Adjunct Rep)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit Chelsa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Finkbeiner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Fried</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Susan Hansen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James O. Kahn</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>errupted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kroon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Oppenheimer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Rodnick</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Seaman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Wallhagen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gardner, Ex Officio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Showstack, Ex Officio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Barclay, Ex Officio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Marshall, Ex Officio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Spaulding, Ex Officio</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Loomer Dentistry FC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Bikle, Medicine FC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Elyse</td>
<td>Elyse</td>
<td>Elyse</td>
<td>Elyse</td>
<td>Elyse</td>
<td>Elyse</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Elyse</td>
<td>Elyse</td>
<td>Elyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Davies, Nursing FC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>RSVP’d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Robert Newcomer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Jacobson, Pharmacy FC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>