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The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget took up the following Systemwide issues this year:

**University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB)**
Norman Oppenheimer served as the UCSF and APB representative to the UCPB. Topics engaged by UCPB and discussed in APB include the following:

- Budget projections and the compact with the State of California
- Fiscal Impact Statements
- Student-to-faculty ratios and enrollment in undergraduate education
- Asset/financial management, non-interest-bearing accounts, and “cloaked” monies
- Faculty salary scales
- Statewide/UC-wide budget cuts

Agendas, minutes, and reports from UCPB are available online at the Systemwide Academic Senate Website.

**Adjustment to UC Salary Scales**
Vice Provost Academic Affairs and ex-officio Member of the Committee Sally Marshall kept the Committee apprised of the developments, decisions, and concerns rising out of the systemwide plan to increase faculty salary scales.

**Divisional Business**

This year, the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

**UCSF Strategic Plan**
APB Chair Jack Rodnick served on the UCSF Strategic Planning Board and continually reviewed the work of the Board and their recommendations to the Committee. Chair Chesla replaced Jack Rodnick as the representative to the Strategic Planning Board beginning March 2008.

**Resource Planning for UCSF**
Throughout the year, Eric Vermillion and representatives from the consulting firm The Huron Group were invited to APB to report on the Office of Finance’s and the Huron Group’s work in developing financial plans and funding models for the University. Presentations included reports on campus financial planning, progress of the Development Office, creating a Development Office funding model, and IT infrastructure funding model. Development Office presentations included information presented by Associate Vice Chancellor for Development Jim Asp and Executive Director, Financial Services & Administration in Office of University Development and Alumni Relations Mike Irwin.

These presentations are included in the Appendix.

**Classroom Improvement Initiative**
J. Castro gave the Committee an informational presentation regarding the recent $1 million allocation of Chancellor’s discretionary funds to the Classroom Improvement Initiative, and the goals and current progress of the Initiative. The office of Student Academic Affairs and Classroom Services hosted a couple of town hall meetings to discuss classroom immediate needs and goals. The presentation of November 15, 2007 is available online and linked as Appendix 3.

**Sustainability and Environmentally Friendly Practices**
In the meeting of November 15, 2007, the Committee heard a presentation regarding sustainability at UCSF from Tom Newman, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics.
T. Newman gave the Committee an informational presentation regarding the recent efforts of the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics towards a more environmentally-friendly campus operation. This department is leading the University in the green efforts, and their initiatives are presented online at http://www.epibiostat.ucsf.edu/general/administration/green.html.

T. Newman stressed that sustainability needs to be a priority of the campus and of each school, and encouraged the creation of a campus-wide program lead by faculty and students. Having such a central program with a mission statement and structured goals would increase the likelihood for funding. The Committee discussed sustainability issues and possibilities for the University. Once example cited for the benefit of UCSF faculty is that the Berkeley campus grants the purchase of carbon offsets for air travel as an allowable expense.

T. Newman and E. Fuentes-Affleck are now Co-Chairs of the Academic Senate Task Force on Sustainability.

**Indirect Cost Recovery**

On December 6, 2007, Eric Vermillion, Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance, gave the Committee an overview of the budget processes and issues for the University of California and UCSF. E. Vermillion also provided Committee Members with a binder of documents entitled “Overview of the University of California and University of California, San Francisco Budget Process” which included, among other sections, organizational charts, system-wide processes, campus processes, the 2008-09 annual budget, and the budget compact.

As a result of the Strategic Planning effort, E. Vermillion will work to devise a clearer, more transparent system for UCSF’s finances. Huron Consulting, who addressed the Committee in November, will be reviewing and reporting on finances at UCSF.

**Bridge Funding Opportunities for Faculty**

Dina Halme gave an informational presentation to the Committee regarding bridge funding opportunities available to UCSF faculty in the School of Medicine. Slides from this presentation are available online (PDF) and are linked as Appendix 4. The funding structure for this program is that the School of Medicine, the Chancellor’s Office, and the department each contribute a third to each allocation (limited to $100,000 total). The program was originally designed for two years with a commitment of $1.5MM from the Chancellor, $1.5MM from the SOM Dean’s Office, and an expected match from the home departments of the PIs receiving the award, for a total of $4.5MM. The program was presented as the successful model currently in use for Medicine, although this model could be adapted for the other schools.

B. Spaulding suggested when this program was approved in Executive Budget Committee there was an anticipation that if the Deans of the other schools came forward, the Chancellor could contribute a proportionate amount of support to those school proposals. Extended discussion followed.

During follow up conversations with Academic Senate Chair David Gardner, the Committee learned that the smaller schools declined to participate in similarly constructed bridge funding programs.

**Review of the Proposed Simulation Center to be Housed in the Library**

The Committee heard two presentations during the year regarding the proposed Simulation Center to be constructed in the Library. The Committee reviewed plans for space allocation and plans for related classrooms in the Library. The Committee deferred to the authority of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication in its review and recommendations of space reallocations. However, the Committee expressed concern regarding how access to these facilities would be structured in the future. The primary concerns is that his valuable resource, which will be removing common space from campus use, should be broadly accessible to all schools and departments, and that the process for accessing the space be transparent.
Academic Space Use Issues at Laurel Heights
At the February meeting of APB, the Committee reviewed a Communication to UCSF Academic Senate Chair from Nancy Adler, Director of the Center for Health and Community, on behalf of all academic units at the Laurel Heights Campus (Appendix 10). In this Communication, she expressed the concern of the academic faculty at Laurel Heights regarding the anticipated conversion and loss of auditorium and conference space which has been serving as large academic spaces at this site. There are no other large venues for academic purposes at Laurel Heights.

Nancy Adler has been speaking on behalf of the Laurel Heights academic units on this issue, but is currently out of town and unable to address this Committee. In her stead, Helene Lipton, Chair of the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council and a faculty member located at Laurel Heights, addressed the Committee regarding their concerns.

Tracey Gearlds, Director of Campus Life Services Programs & Services, is the Director overseeing this program and attended APB and gave an informational presentation including a brief history of Laurel Heights space allocation, constraints on space allocation at this site, possible proposed plans for the conference space now that it is no longer self-sustaining.

At this time, the conference space is under review for repurposing as it is no longer profitable or self-sustaining as is required for such auxiliary spaces (the spaces in question are designated Auxiliary Space). Historically, the conference space at Laurel Heights has been able to meet its requirement to be self-sustaining because the Regents were regular customers for their services. The regents now meet at the new conference space at the Mission Bay campus. Without that income stream, the space must be allocated to other uses.

Also on hand at this meeting was Lori Yamauchi, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning, who contributed to the discussion.

Issues discussed included the following:

- There are three meeting rooms in question, there are charges for two of the rooms, but the Regents room on the lower level is available for LH residents use without charge. Charges for the other room are necessary as CLS is required to generate revenue as an Auxiliary Enterprise. By the assignment letter to CLS from the Chancellor, these spaces cannot be supported by Chancellor’s funds.

- Lori Yamauchi noted that originally there were meeting rooms on the upper level to be dedicated for academic use, but those were ultimately repurposed to other academic uses.

- It is important to note, contrary to the letter, that there have been no changes to charges or allocation as of yet. There is no proposal on the table for the repurposing of the space, but discussions of possible uses are taking place.

- Some fee-reductions or fee-abatements have been negotiated by some units for certain rooms.

- In order to reassign this space for academic use, the campus would have to determine the cost of operations, find a budget point and sufficient funds to cover it, and reassign the space to a new entity to manage the space as an academic space.

- Laurel Heights does feature conference rooms situated throughout the site, but these are small room. There are no dedicated classrooms per se.

- The available space is across the different campus sites needs to be evaluated. Space is a premium at all sites, and conference space such as those at the Mission Bay Community Center and Millberry Union are also managed by CLS and only available for fee. The situation at LH is not necessarily inequitable across campuses. Other specific academic spaces at Parnassus incur a charge if used for non-academic purposes.
A distinction was raised and a suggestion put forth that the charge for spaces should be based on the purpose for reservation: academic or non-academic purposes. This applies to all spaces, all campuses, including CLS-managed space.

The Committee requested additional information of Joe Castro (SAA), Joe Carlson (Registrar) and Stella Hsu, Associate Vice Chancellor, Campus Life Service Administration for further discussion at the April meeting.

Joe Carlson and Joe Castro were able to attend the April 10, 2008 meeting of APB to address the concerns over academic space available at Laurel Heights. The Senate Analyst and Joe Castro pulled together additional information and data regarding available classroom space across the campuses and specifically space usage data regarding the Laurel Heights site (Appendix 11).

The Committee concluded its investigation and discussion of classroom space issues at Laurel Heights in the May 15, 2008 meeting. Also present at this meeting were Joe Castro, Nancy Adler (whose initial inquiry prompted this investigation), Stella Hsu, and Lori Yamauchi. Stella Hsu reported that the conference center can no longer operate as a self-sustaining entity and must be closed. As a result of the stated priority for better training articulated in the new strategic plan, the conference space was evaluated as potential training space.

Nancy Adler reported that there are currently no immediate space needs, but that there is a fear that the auditorium might be made completely unavailable to faculty at Laurel Heights for academic purposes.

Ultimately, the Committee voted to make a recommendation to the Chair of the Academic Senate for transmittal to the Chancellor that should the conference space at Laurel Heights currently managed by Campus Life Services be transferred to other purposes or entities, that some spaces, particularly the Regents’ Room and the auditorium, be considered mixed-use space and available for academic purposes free of charge. Furthermore, as possible, the Committee recommended that some meeting spaces continue to be made available to the community at whatever charge is considered reasonable. (Appendix 12).

Senate Chair David Gardner transmitted these recommendations to the Chancellor, who indicated in a communication to the Committee that the recommendations of APB would be taken into account in the determination of space dedication at Laurel Heights (Appendix 13).

Faculty Participation in Budget Planning
Chair Chesla discussed formal Academic Senate representation and involvement in budget planning, and the areas in which the Academic Senate is involved in conjunction with the Administration. Chair Chesla also reviewed a 2002 memo from then APB Chair Stan Glantz which detailed how the Senate and the Committee should be involved in campus and budget planning. The Faculty Council Chairs present discussed the manner and extent to which their Deans solicited or engaged review and comment from their faculties or Faculty Councils. The 2002 Stan Glantz memo details what the Deans should be providing to the Faculty Councils.

Eric Vermillion, Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance and John Curry of the Huron Group addressed the Committee on occasion and provided APB with a two page “High Level Summary” of the Huron Group’s recommendations (Appendix 14).

Creating and Funding a Campus IT Infrastructure
In the meeting of October 18, 2007, Jonathan Showstack, Co-CIO of the Office of Administrative and Academic Information Systems (OAAIS) presented the Committee with an update on activities of the Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems (Appendix 2).

In the meeting of April 10, 2008, Jonathan Showstack reviewed with the Committee the background, charge, and context of the work of the UC Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC), and their final December 2007 report: Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure (Appendix 8). Discussion followed.
The Committee supports the findings and recommendations of this report and Chair Chesla will communicated this recommendation to UCSF Senate Chair Gardner at the Executive Committee.

In the meeting of May 15, 2008, Jonathan Showstack reviewed with the Committee the recommendations of the Data and Voice Services Advisory Committee (DVSAC) to the Chancellor’s Executive Committee (Appendix 9). Showstack introduced the presentation of the IT infrastructure funding proposals given by Andrew Laws of the Huron Group (Appendix 17).

The details of these proposals were discussed at length by the Committee and comments were included in the Committee’s response to the Chancellor’s FY 2008-09 Budget Issues.

**Proposed New Development Office Funding Models**

Eric Vermillion, Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance; John Curry and Andrew Laws of the Huron Group; James Asp, Director, University Development and Alumni Relations; and Mike Irwin, Executive Director, Financial Services and Administration; gave informational presentations regarding their proposed revised Development Office Funding Models. (May 15, 2008)

Jams Asp and Mike Irwin gave a history of the Development Office, a breakdown of its goals and operations, the requirements for funding and comparable funding models (Appendix 15).

Eric Vermillion, John Curry and Andrew Laws presented their research and recommendations for a new Development Office Funding Model (Appendix 16).

The details of these proposals were discussed at length by the Committee and comments were included in the Committee’s response to the Chancellor’s FY 2008-09 Budget Issues.

**Annual Review of Chancellor Budget Issues**

Due to lack of funding, this year there were not the usual proposals for Chancellors Discretionary Funds. Instead, the Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee and the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget were asked to comment on a matrix that only included four items: one set funding item (A-21/CAS relief), one returning program (the Science and Health Education Partnership), and proposals for two funding models: IT Infrastructure and the Development Office. The matrix of FY 2008-09 Budget Issues is linked to this report as Appendix 18.

The Communication expressing the recommendations of the Committee to the Chancellor is linked to this report as Appendix 19. The recommendations of the Committee are follows:

- **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.

- **Information Technology Infrastructure Funding Model** (Rating: 4.63)
  
The Committee supports 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.

- **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.

- **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.

**Informational Presentations**

Over the course of the year, the Committee heard numerous informational presentations and provided feedback during meetings. Links to these presentations are included in the Appendix.

- At the November 15, 2007 meeting, Joseph I. Castro, Associate Vice Chancellor Student Academic Affairs gave an informational presentation on the Classroom Improvement Initiative.
- On February 14, Helen Loeser, Associate Dean of Curricular Affairs of the School of Medicine, gave an informational presentation regarding the process and progress of repurposing the second floor of the library as a learning center, including the development of a campus central clinical simulation center. It is hoped that this renovation will be completed by the fall of 2010.
- At the March 13, 2008 meeting, Lori Yamauchi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning gave an informational presentation regarding the Parnassus Design Guidelines and Master Plan Draft. (Appendix 5). Paul Green volunteered to participate on the Parnassus Campus master Plan Advisory Committee.
Task Forces and Other Committee Service

This year, members of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget served on the following Academic Senate task forces or other campus committees as representatives of APB or the Academic Senate. Where possible, the reports from these task forces or committees are linked to or attached to this Annual Report.

- Strategic Plan Advisory Committee: UCSF Strategic Plan Web site.
- Task Force to Review UCSF Policies for Faculty Reimbursement of Grant Cost Overruns: Report
- Chancellor’s Data and Voice Services Advisory Committee (DVSAC) Report; Report from the UC Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC): Creating a Cyber Infrastructure.
- WASC Accreditation Committee
- Task Force Reviewing the Proposal for a New Department of Emergency Medicine
- Task Force Reviewing the Proposal for the Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences
- Task Force Reviewing the Report of the Five Year Review of QB3
- Task Force to Review Revised Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction
- Sustainability Task Force, Report given to the Committee October 18, 2008.

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2008-2009:

**Developing the Funding Model for IT Infrastructure**
The Chancellor’s Data and Voice Services Advisory Committee (DVSAC) continues their work based upon their own investigation and recommendations as well as the recommendations of the Huron Group. The next expected phase is the convening of a Recharge Committee who will recommend the amount and manner in which a funding model will be implemented. APB Member Stephen Cheung has agreed to serve on this Committee representing APB. Stephen Cheung also served on DVSAC.

**Funding Model for the Development Office**
This will be an ongoing concern for the Committee and the campus. More information will be forthcoming from the Chancellor, and it is expected that there will be a significant effort to involve more faculty in the development and implementation of a new funding model over the next year. In its communication to the Chancellor June 19, 2008, the Committee wrote:

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.
Appendices

Due to the extensive nature of these appendices, these documents will not be embedded into the PDF of this Annual Report, nor will paper versions be attached to hard copies. This Annual Report is posted on the APB Web page on the Academic Senate Web site, and all appendices are linked below to the corresponding PDF document online.

Appendix 1: Summary Comparison of FY 2007-08 Budget Allocations

Appendix 2: Update on Activities of the Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems Presented to the UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget October 18, 2007.

Appendix 3: Classroom Improvement Initiative Presentation by Joseph I. Castro, Associate Vice Chancellor Student Academic Affairs (November 15, 2007).

Appendix 4: School of Medicine Presentation Regarding Joint Chancellor and School Bridge Funding Program (February 14, 2008).

Appendix 5: Parnassus Design and Long Range Plan Presentation from Lori Yamauchi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning.

Appendix 6: Communication from the Chair of the Task Force to Review Faculty Reimbursement of Grant Cost Overruns to UCSF Senate Chair David Gardner (February 25, 2008).

Appendix 7: Source Documents and Recommendations of the Task Force Reviewing the Proposal for a New Department of Emergency Medicine are indexed and available for download from this Web page.

Appendix 8: Report from the UC Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC): Creating a Cyber Infrastructure.

Appendix 9: Report from the Chancellor’s Data and Voice Services Advisory Committee (DVSAC).

Appendix 10: Communication from Nancy Adler Representing Academic Units at Laurel Heights to the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (February 11, 2008).

Appendix 11: Information and Data Regarding Laurel Heights Space Usage from Joe Castro, Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Affairs.

Appendix 12: Communication from the Committee to Academic Senate Chair David Gardner Regarding Academic Space Concerns at Laurel Heights (May 15, 2008).

Appendix 13: Communication from the Chancellor to the Academic Senate Regarding Space Allocation at Laurel Heights (June 3, 2008).

Appendix 14: High Level Summary (two pages) of the Huron Group’s 12 Recommendations.

Appendix 15: Presentation from Mike Irwin, Executive Director, Financial Services and Administration; James Asp, Director, University Development and Alumni Relations regarding Development Office Funding.

Appendix 16: Development Office Funding Model Proposal from the Huron Group.

Appendix 17: The Huron Group Proposal for Funding IT Infrastructure.

Appendix 18: Matrix of FY 2008-09 Budget Issues Prepared for the Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee.

Appendix 19: Recommendations from the Committee to the Chancellor Regarding Budget Issues FY 2008-09 (June 19, 2008).

Appendix 20: 2008-2009 Attendance Record
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