COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET

June 19, 2008

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

RE: APB Review FY 2008-09 Budget Issues

Dear Chancellor Bishop:

The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget reviewed the “Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee Summary of FY 2008-09 Budget Issues” and has the following recommendations or comments to the four items presented therein.

1. Science and Health Education Partnership (SEP) Rating: 2.00

The Committee notes that last year’s support was conditioned upon the SEP implementing systematic evaluation of the program. While the Committee recognizes that the SEP has put a great deal of effort into creating some evaluation strategies and reporting on these results, these strategies may not adequately represent the outcomes of the program.

There is considerable experience among the UCSF faculty in devising program evaluation strategies and locating or devising outcome measures of clear, quantifiable change that can be attributed to the program. The Committee recommends that faculty mentors be identified to work with the SEP program to further develop meaningful and reliable program evaluation strategies. Furthermore, the Committee recommends, as a possibility, the involvement of students in the PRIME US program.

It is the opinion of the Committee that the SEP should devote additional resources to evaluation and should report back to the Executive Budget Committee and APB on an annual basis with quantifiable data regarding their success. Continued funding should be contingent upon this outcome reporting.

2. Information Technology Infrastructure Funding Model Rating 4.63

The high priority rating for this item reflects the Committee’s support for changing the status quo and implementing a sustainable funding model for information technology infrastructure. Based on the Committee’s
review of the report from the Data and Voice Services Advisory Committee (DVSAC) and the Proposal for Funding IT Infrastructure produced by the Huron Group, the Committee supports some form of a per capita funding model. The committee also generally supports the recommendations presented in the DVSAC final report. Key to this support is a plan for continued faculty involvement, in the form of a proposed Recharge Committee. APB Member Steven Cheung, who served on the DVSAC, has agreed to be the APB representative to the proposed Recharge Committee.

3. University Development and Alumni Relations (UDAR) Funding Model  No Rating

The Committee makes no priority rating because it is unclear what a numerical rating for this item, which contains multiple proposals, would represent. Concern was expressed in the Committee that the current proposal put forth by the Huron group has received systematic input neither from Senate faculty nor the clinical faculty who would be affected by the proposals. The UDAR funding model was presented in an overview fashion to the Committee in the fall of 2007. The Committee believes that there needs to be more research and faculty involvement before putting a new Development Office funding model into place. Because of the complexity of the issues under discussion, we recommend that a faculty/administrative committee, inclusive of Senate and non-Senate faculty (Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty), be comprised to provide input to the models being proposed. Such an advisory committee could be similar in structure and activity to the DVSAC. It is our perception that a small group of faculty can develop the detailed understanding necessary and can actively engage during the planning process to represent varied faculty positions and series. Faculty involvement by committee and education of the larger faculty along the way via town hall meetings worked successfully for developing the UCSF Strategic Plan. A similar process is being employed to develop and communicate the proposed IT funding model. The Committee recommends a similar course be taken here.

4. A-21/CAS Relief  No Rating

As in last year’s review, the Committee offers no priority rating for this item as the formula appears set. In general, members of the faculty support as much return of indirect costs to the department and the Principal Investigator as possible, and transparency about how formulae are set.

Overall

The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget appreciates the opportunity to review and make recommendations regarding the FY 2008-09 budgetary issues. The Committee acknowledges there are fundamental changes in the campus budgeting process that are being explored with the help of the Huron Group. To the extent that these changes move the campus in the direction of greater transparency in the budgeting process and systematic linking of budgetary decisions to the Strategic Plan, we support change. We suggest that to the greatest extent possible Senate faculty be involved in planning potential budget and funding models, and that faculty in all series be consulted about the impact of proposed changes on their activities before proposals are finalized. In turn, we urge that faculty be informed in a timely manner and in multiple forums (through Academic Senate Committees, Faculty Councils, town hall meetings and campus publications) about proposed changes.

We respectfully request a timely response to this letter once decisions have been made. This will allow the committee to discuss them in detail at the first meeting in September of 2008.

Sincerely,

Catherine Chesla, RN, DNSc, FAAN
Chair, Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
cc: David Gardner, MD, Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
All Committee Members