MINUTES
Thursday, June 19, 2008


GUESTS:  Mike Irwin, Executive Director, Financial Services and Administration; James Asp, Director, University Development and Alumni Relations

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) was called to order by Chair Chesla on June 19, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. in room S 30.

The minutes of May 15, 2008 were approved.

Chair’s Report
Chair Chesla spoke to campus budget planning and the current state of the process. Chair Chesla reported highlights from the Academic Senate Coordinating Committee (minutes are online here).

Report from the University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB)
N. Oppenheimer summarized the recent meeting of UCPB. Agendas and minutes are posted to the UCPB Web page.

Proposal for New Development Office Funding Model—Mike Irwin, Executive Director, Financial Services and Administration
Jim Asp introduced himself to the Committee and gave some history and context to funding the Development Office. It was noted that the Development Office receives no campus or state funds and must be self-sustaining. Mike Irwin presented research regarding the current budget of the UCSF Development Office and comparable institutions (Attachment 1). M. Irwin then reviewed with the Committee the proposal developed by the Huron Group for a new Development Office Funding Model (Attachment 2).

Discussion followed.

The Committee discussed with B. Spaulding, J. Asp, and M. Irwin means of facilitating faculty buy-in, and stressed the importance of getting faculty input on a basic level followed later by faculty town hall meetings hosted by the highest possible leaders in the Budget Office.
The Committee discussed different possibilities for Senate and faculty review of such proposals.

**Re-review: Proposal for Funding IT Infrastructure—Jon Showstack, Co-CIO of the Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems; John Curry and Andrew Laws, The Huron Group**

J. Showstack reviewed with the Committee the proposal developed by the Chancellor’s Data and Voice Services Advisory Committee (DVSAC) and the Huron Group: Proposal for Funding IT Infrastructure ([Attachment 3](#)).

S. Marshall stressed the importance that faculty be notified and informed as soon as possible that this charge is coming, the potential impacts of these charges, and steps they should be taking—such as inclusion in proposals to Contracts and Grants. Network charges are no indirect charges, but can be charged to federal programs as direct costs.

J. Showstack also spoke regarding the Recharge Committee. APB Member Steven Cheung, who served on the DVSAC, agreed to serve.

**Review and Evaluation: Budget Issues FY 2008-2009**

Chair Chesla presented the matrix “Budget Issues FY 2008-2009” prepared by the Office of Budget and Finance for the Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee ([Attachment 4](#)).

This year, the matrix does not present the usual proposals with specific funding details, but rather one item returning for specific funding (the Science and Health Education Partnership or SEP), the annual and non-negotiable A-21/CAS Relief, and then two proposed funding models: one for information technology and the other for University Development and Alumni Relations (UDAR).

The Committee reviewed, discussed, and evaluated each item.

**Science and Health Education Partnership (SEP)**

SEP had been asked to improve means of measuring effectiveness and present data regarding outcome measures. SEP presented what they could to the EBC, but are inexperienced in measuring outcomes.

The Committee will include in its recommendations to the Chancellor a recommendation that students involved in the PRIME US program become involved in the SEP program and work with UCSF faculty mentors to push the issue of accountability and to develop more formal evaluation processes. The Committee recommends that the SEP devote more of their resources to evaluation and should report back to APB and the Executive Budget Committee annually with quantifiable data regarding their success. Continued funding should be contingent on outcome reporting.

Priority ranking: 2.00

**Information Technology Infrastructure Funding Model**

A high priority vote is a vote for changing the model, a recommendation to accept the specifics at this time. Based on discussion in the meeting, the Committee decided that the response from APB will include a its support for a per capita charge model.

Priority ranking: 4.63

**University Development and Alumni Relations (UDAR) Funding Model**

The Committee stressed its displeasure with the lack of faculty involvement in developing the proposed model, and wants to include in its response a desire for more faculty education and consulting on this issue.
The question was raised as to what a high or low score would indicate. Should the Committee give this a low score as a reflection of displeasure at the exclusion of faculty? Adding to this complication is the inclusion of two different models on.

The Committee recommends that a faculty administrative committee, inclusive of clinical and Senate faculty, should review the proposed models as the process moves forward. Such an advisory committee would be similar which were involved in developing the IT infrastructure funding models.

The Committee decided not to express a numerical ranking on this issue as it is unclear as to what such a ranking would represent. The Committee will not include a numerical ranking, but will include the above comments.

**A-21/CAS Relief**
The Committee decided not to express a numerical ranking on this issue as this item will be funded regardless of Senate recommendation.

**Review: Response from the Chancellor Regarding Academic Space Issues at Laurel Heights**
Chair Chesla provided the Committee with the Chancellor’s response to the communication sent by the Academic Senate expressing concerns over space reallocations at the Laurel Heights site (Attachment 5).

**Old Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.

Chair Chesla adjourned the meeting at 3:25 p.m.