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## COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET

### Committee Meeting Schedule 2007-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>September 27, 2007</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>M-1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>October 18, 2007</td>
<td><strong>1:00-3:00 P.M.</strong></td>
<td>S-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>November 15, 2007</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>S-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>December 6, 2007</td>
<td><strong>1:00-3:00 P.M.</strong></td>
<td>S-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>January 10, 2008</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>S-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>February 14, 2008</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>S-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>March 13, 2008</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>S-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>April 10, 2008</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>S-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>May 15, 2008</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>S-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>June 12, 2008</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>S-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>June 19, 2008</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>S-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>June 26, 2008</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>S-118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: It is anticipated that some of the June meetings may be cancelled pending the 2007-08 budget timeline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Campus Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Campus Box #</th>
<th>Campus Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Rodnick (M) Chair</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Family and Community Medicine</td>
<td>353-3595 clinic 597-9370 office 443-4285 pager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodnickj@fcm.ucsf.edu">rodnickj@fcm.ucsf.edu</a> (works for Blackberry)</td>
<td>0886</td>
<td>50 Beale Street, 12th Floor Inst Gbl Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit Chesla (N) Vice Chair</td>
<td>RN, DNSc, FAAN</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Family Health Care Nursing</td>
<td>476-4439</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kit.chesla@nursing.ucsf.edu">kit.chesla@nursing.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0606</td>
<td>521 Parnassus, 431J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Adey (M)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>HS Assoc Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Nephrology</td>
<td>502-7930</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adeyd@surgery.ucsf.edu">adeyd@surgery.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0780</td>
<td>M 884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Balmes (M)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Professor In Residence</td>
<td>Occupational Medicine</td>
<td>206-8953 206-5960</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbalmes@medsfgh.ucsf.edu">jbalmes@medsfgh.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0843</td>
<td>SFGH 30 3520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Bernstein (M)</td>
<td>MD, PHD</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Pediatrics – Cardiology &amp; CVRI</td>
<td>502-8633</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harold.bernstein@ucsf.edu">harold.bernstein@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>HSE 1422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Boudreau (M)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assoc Professor in Residence</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>206-6951</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Nancy.Boudreau@ucsf.edu">Nancy.Boudreau@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>SFGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Cheung (M)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Otolaryngology</td>
<td>353-2951</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scheung@ohns.ucsf.edu">scheung@ohns.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0342</td>
<td>A744 400 Parnassus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejal Desai (N)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>514-4503</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tejal.desai@ucsf.edu">Tejal.desai@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>1700 4th Street, QB3 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Fried (D)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assoc Professor In Residence</td>
<td>Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences</td>
<td>502-6641</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daniel.fried@ucsf.edu">daniel.fried@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0758</td>
<td>D2234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Green (D) Adjunct Rep</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assoc Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>Oral &amp; Maxillofacial Surgery</td>
<td>476-4902</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.green@ucsf.edu">paul.green@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0440</td>
<td>C522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Gold (M)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Pulmonary Medicine</td>
<td>476-2092</td>
<td><a href="mailto:warren.gold@ucsf.edu">warren.gold@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0111</td>
<td>M 1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kroon (P)</td>
<td>PharmD</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Clinical Pharmacy</td>
<td>476-5586</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisa.kroon@ucsf.edu">lisa.kroon@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0622</td>
<td>C 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Oppenheimer (P)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Chemistry</td>
<td>476-3038 476-4031</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oppen@cgl.ucsf.edu">oppen@cgl.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0446</td>
<td>S 1109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Sniderman (M)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Professor of Clinical Pediatrics</td>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>206-4739</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ssnyderman@sfgphds.ucsf.edu">ssnyderman@sfgphds.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>SFGH</td>
<td>SFGH 6E7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Campus Phone</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Campus Box #</td>
<td>Campus Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Wallhagen (N)</td>
<td>PhD, RN,</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Physiological Nursing</td>
<td>476-4965</td>
<td><a href="mailto:meg.wallhagen@nursing.ucsf.edu">meg.wallhagen@nursing.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0610</td>
<td>N-631A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Fuentes-Affleck</td>
<td>MD, MPH</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>206-4196</td>
<td><a href="mailto:efuentes@sfghpeds.ucsf.edu">efuentes@sfghpeds.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>SFGH</td>
<td>MS 6E/SFGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair, Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Barclay, VC Admin. &amp; Finance Ex Officio</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance</td>
<td>476-4148</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbarclay@ovcaf.ucsf.edu">sbarclay@ovcaf.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0288</td>
<td>LHts 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Spaulding, VC Advancement &amp; Planning, Ex Officio</td>
<td>MA, MPA</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>University Advancement &amp; Planning</td>
<td>476-6563</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bspaulding@uap.ucsf.edu">bspaulding@uap.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0292</td>
<td>LHts 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Marshall</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>514-0421</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SMarshall@chanoff.ucsf.edu">SMarshall@chanoff.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0401</td>
<td>S 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Provost Academic Personnel, Ex Officio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Showstack</td>
<td>PhD, MPH</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>Medicine/Institute For Health Policy Studies Co-Director and Co-CIO, OAAIS</td>
<td>476-2650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathan.showstack@ucsf.edu">jonathan.showstack@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0400</td>
<td>LHts 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAAIS Liaison Permanent Guest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Agabian Dentistry FC Chair Permanent Guest</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Cell and Tissue Biology</td>
<td>476-6845</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nina.agabian@ucsf.edu">nina.agabian@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0640</td>
<td>C 740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newcomer Nursing FC Chair Permanent Guest</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>476-1408</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert.newcomer@ucsf.edu">robert.newcomer@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0612</td>
<td>LHts 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyse Foster Medicine FC Chair Permanent Guest</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Professor of Clinical Cardiology</td>
<td>Cardiology</td>
<td>353-9156</td>
<td><a href="mailto:foster@medicine.ucsf.edu">foster@medicine.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0214</td>
<td>M 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene Lipton Pharmacy FC Chair Permanent Guest</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Clinical Pharmacy</td>
<td>476-2964</td>
<td><a href="mailto:liptonh@pharmacy.ucsf.edu">liptonh@pharmacy.ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>0613</td>
<td>LHts 420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senate Staff:
Wilson Hardcastle
wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu
(415) 476-4245, www.ucsf.edu/senate

07/12/07
# Academic Senate Staff Phone List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Office Location</th>
<th>Committee/TF Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shilpa H. Patel</td>
<td>Senior Senate Analyst</td>
<td>514-2696</td>
<td>MUE 253</td>
<td>Privilege &amp; Tenure, Library, Dentistry Faculty Council, Research, Equal Opportunity Committee on Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Hardcastle</td>
<td>Senior Senate Analyst</td>
<td>476-4245</td>
<td>MUE 231A</td>
<td>Academic Personnel, Academic Planning and Budget, Coordinating Committee, Rules and Jurisdiction, Nursing Faculty Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather M. Alden</td>
<td>Senior Senate Analyst</td>
<td>476-8827</td>
<td>MUE 231</td>
<td>Courses of Instruction, Education Policy, School of Medicine Faculty Council, Clinical Affairs Committee, Graduate Council (Liaison)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Dargan</td>
<td>Senate Analyst/Coordinator</td>
<td>476-1308</td>
<td>MUE 253</td>
<td>Academic Freedom, Pharmacy Faculty Council, Faculty Welfare/In Memoriam, DCRL/FRL/DIT Coordinator, Research Travel Grants/Journals, Web Calendar Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Academic Planning And Budget

Divisional Bylaw Excerpt

112. Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

A. Membership

1. This Committee shall consist of at least eleven and not more than nineteen members of associate rank or higher, excluding ex officio members. At least one Senate member from each School will be on the Committee. Up to four members can be from the Clinical or Adjunct Series. The membership should reasonably reflect UCSF’s broad spectrum of geographical locations and of teaching, clinical, and research activities. [Am 1 Sep 03, 18 Nov 2004]

2. The Vice Chair of the Division and the Vice Chancellors for Administration and Finance, University Advancement and Planning, and Academic Affairs shall serve as ex officio members. [Am 2 June 92, 1 Sep 03]

3. All members shall be voting members except when proscribed by Academic Senate Bylaws and Regulations. [Am 1 Sep 03]

4. No standing Dean, Associate Dean, or Department Chair shall serve as a member of the Committee. However, individuals previously holding these positions may be Committee members. [Am 1 Sep 03]

5. The Chair of the Committee shall serve a two year term as Chair. [Am 18 Nov 2004]

B. Duties:

1. To confer with and advise the Chancellor and Administrative officers on policy and matters regarding budgets, resource allocation, academic planning, physical planning, and general assignment of teaching space.

2. To initiate studies with regard to budget and planning on proposed activities that would significantly impact the academic and research mission of the campus as a whole or any two of the Schools. [Am 1 Sep 03]

3. To maintain liaison with other committees of the Division, Chancellor-appointed committees and Faculty Council of the Schools on matters related to budget, resource allocation, academic planning, and physical planning. [Am 1 Sep 03]

4. To make recommendations to the Chancellor and Academic Senate agencies concerning allocation of educational resources, academic priorities, and the planning and budgetary process. [Am 1 Sep 03]
Shared governance with the Academic Senate is one of the distinctive features of the University of California. The system of shared governance gives University faculty, operating through the Academic Senate, a voice in the operation of the University. In addition, it imposes on faculty a measure of responsibility for the manner in which the University operates. Faculty participation in governance of the University through the agency of the Academic Senate is a guiding force that unifies the nine campuses of the University into a single system under a uniform standard of excellence.

DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

The Academic Senate of the University of California operates under the authority of standing orders of the Board of Regents.

Standing order 105.2 delegates to the Academic Senate, subject to the approval of the Board, the authority to --

♦ Determine the conditions for admission; and
♦ Determine the conditions for certificates and degrees, other than honorary degrees.

The Senate also is charged to recommend to the President candidates for degrees in all courses and is to be consulted, through committees as determined by the President, on the award of all honorary degrees.

Further, the Senate is delegated the authority to --

♦ Authorize and supervise all courses and curricula (excepting Hastings College of the Law, the San Francisco Art Institute, the courses offered by professional schools with graduate work only, and non-degree courses of University Extension); and
♦ Determine the membership of faculties (excepting Hastings College of the Law and the San Francisco Art Institute).
In addition, the Senate is authorized to --

- Select committees to advise the Chancellors on the campus budgets, and the President on the University budget;
- Advise the President and the Chancellors on matters concerning the administration of the libraries;
- Select a committee to approve publication of manuscripts by the University of California Press; and
- Lay before the Board, but only through the President, any matter pertaining to the conduct and welfare of the University.

Finally, Regents standing order 103.9 guarantees to any faculty member a hearing before an appropriate committee of the Academic Senate in the case of a termination for good cause prior to the end of the faculty member’s contract with the University.

These delegations of authority impose on the faculty significant responsibility for the maintenance of the quality of the instructional and research effort of the University of California.

- The authority to determine the conditions for admission charges the Senate with defining the quality of the students entering the University at both graduate and undergraduate levels. This authority is exercised by the creation of minimum standards of eligibility for admissions that are uniform throughout the system.
- The authority to establish conditions for degrees and to supervise courses and curricula charges the faculty with the responsibility to monitor the quality of the educational programs that students must complete to earn their degrees and to maintain the quality of the components of those programs.
- The authority to determine the membership of the faculty has two elements. The Senate has a responsibility to monitor the quality of the faculty who teach courses, who develop the educational program and who conduct research at the University of California. Faculty throughout the University are evaluated under a uniform set of criteria that are intended to maintain a level of excellence on each campus. Second, in order to ensure the quality of the faculty, the Senate monitors faculty welfare issues that affect recruitment and retention of high quality faculty.
- The authority to advise on the budget of the campuses and the University empowers the Senate to advocate budget allocations that channel resources into activities which enhance the academic programs of the University.
- The authority to advise on the administration of the libraries gives the faculty a voice in the maintenance of the basic intellectual infrastructure of the University.
♦ The authority to select a committee to approve publication of manuscripts of the University of California Press provides the faculty with supervisory control over the quality of the Press.

♦ The authority to conduct hearings in disciplinary cases charges the faculty with responsibility for enforcing standards of faculty conduct that are embodied in the Faculty Code of Conduct and other policies of the University.

ORGANIZATION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

The basic structure of the Academic Senate, and the identity of its principal standing committees, evolves from the authorities and responsibilities delegated to the Senate by the Board of Regents. Note that while this paper principally addresses the organization of the system wide Academic Senate, organizational structures of the divisional senates on each of the nine campuses generally parallel the organization of the system wide Senate.

The ultimate policy authority of the Senate resides in the Assembly of the Academic Senate. The Assembly consists of elected representatives from each of the campuses plus the chairs of each of the divisional senates and the system wide officers. Although the Assembly is regularly scheduled to meet three times per year, it only is required to meet annually. In the past few years, the Assembly has met on an annual basis.

The Academic Council may loosely be described as the executive body of the Academic Senate. The Academic Council is charged with advising the President on behalf of the Assembly. The Academic Council includes the chairs of the most significant Senate committees, principally those committees directly charged with executing the responsibilities delegated to the Senate by the Board of Regents. Thus, in addition to its chair and vice-chair, who are also the chair and vice-chair of the Assembly, the Academic Council includes the chairs of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, the University Committee on Educational Policy, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, the University Committee on Academic Personnel, and the University Committee on Planning and Budget. In addition, the chairs of each of the divisional senates are members of the Academic Council. The Academic Council meets eleven times a year on a monthly basis, with special meetings if the need arises. The President and senior officers of the University regularly attend the meetings of the Academic Council to discuss issues of system wide interest. The Academic Council usually meets on the Wednesday preceding the meetings of the Board of Regents.

Each of the standing committees represented by its chair on the Academic Council includes representatives from corresponding committees at each campus. Thus, as issues percolate up to the Academic Council, the Council has the benefit of the review of literally hundreds of University of California faculty participating through the various levels of the Senate governance structure. Faculty participate in these activities, almost universally
without additional compensation, as a part of their responsibility to the University motivated by their dedication to the well-being of the institution.

The functions of the principal standing committees of the Senate are tied to the authority delegated to the Senate by the Board of Regents.

- With respect to undergraduate admissions, conditions for admission and admissions policies are reviewed and established by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). The divisional senates generally maintain parallel admissions committees. Graduate admissions are monitored by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). The divisional senates generally refer to the parallel divisional committee as the Graduate Council.

- Conditions for undergraduate degrees and regulations relating to the undergraduate education program are established and reviewed by the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and its counterparts on each campus. While there is no corresponding system wide committee, individual course approvals are the responsibility of divisional courses committees. The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs is responsible for the approval and periodic review of all graduate programs, including professional programs.

- Policies and procedures for determining the membership of faculties, and more importantly, policies for the advancement of faculty members, are under the jurisdiction of the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). The divisional committees on academic personnel at the campuses review merit and promotion recommendations for individual faculty members. The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) advises the Senate and the administration on benefit programs and other welfare issues affecting faculty. Under the bylaws of the Academic Senate, membership in individual departments is subject to approval by the faculty in the individual departments.

- Consultation with the President on the budget is the responsibility of the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). Corresponding planning and budget committees advise the Chancellors on each campus. In addition, because budget allocations directly affect research support, the chair of the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), is an ex-officio member of UCPB.

- Library matters are considered by the University Committee on Libraries.

- Manuscripts for the U.C. Press are approved by the Editorial Committee.

- Hearings in disciplinary cases are conducted by the divisional Committees on Privilege and Tenure. There is also a University Committee on Privilege and Tenure which meets

* The procedures for system wide approval of program or degree establishment, disestablishment or consolidation are contained in a compendium for program review prepared by the Academic Planning Council and the Academic Senate. The compendium is available on-line through the University of California home page.
to consider system wide issues concerning disciplinary process. The privilege and tenure
commitees also consider grievance matters raised by individual faculty members who
believe that they have been denied faculty privileges as specified in University policies.
Grievance cases include claims by faculty that they have been judged in a merit or
promotion case according to inappropriate criteria.

The reports and recommendations of all of the Senate committees are reviewed by the
Academic Council which reconciles conflicting points of view and reflects the positions of
the divisional senates. The Academic Council thus becomes a focal point for system wide
faculty input into policy issues before the University. Through the broad participation of
faculty from every campus on the principal standing committees, the Academic Council has
developed a system wide perspective on most University issues that is not reflected in any
other body within the University structure. Regular consultation at the Council meetings
with the senior officers of the University provides an opportunity for both parties to
formulate policy positions that reflect the perceived interests of both groups. Indeed, as the
next section demonstrates, the leadership of the Academic Senate is regularly engaged with
the Administration in almost all aspects of the University.

ACADEMIC SENATE/ADMINISTRATION INTERFACE

The chair and vice-chair of the Assembly and Academic Council, along with almost
all of the chairs of the standing committees that are represented on the Academic Council,
are in regular consultation with members of the system wide administration through a variety
of system wide committees and task forces. Some of these relationships are through formal
standing committees of the University, others are through ad hoc committees and task forces
appointed to resolve a particular issue. A partial listing of these relationships includes the
following --

♦ Board of Regents: The chair and vice-chair of the Assembly and Academic Council sit
  on the Board of Regents as non-voting faculty representatives.

♦ President and Provost: The chair and vice-chair of the Academic Council meet
  individually, once a month, with the President, the Provost, the Senior Vice President for
  Business and Finance, and the Vice-Provost for Research, among others, to discuss issues
  of immediate concern and develop a common agenda.

♦ Executive Budget Committee: The chair and vice-chair of the Academic Council are
  members of the Executive Budget Committee which advises the President on the
  development and allocation of the University Budget. The Executive Budget Committee
  is chaired by the Provost and includes the vice presidents with budget responsibilities and
  two Chancellors.

♦ Academic Planning Council (APC): The chair and vice-chair of the Academic Council,
  and the chairs of UCEP, UCPB, and CCGA are members of this system wide academic
  planning body. The APC is chaired by the Provost. The chair of the Academic Council

is the vice-chair of the APC. This group includes the vice-presidents for Agriculture and Health, the Vice Provost for Research, a chancellor, an executive vice-chancellor, a vice-chancellor for student affairs, and two at-large faculty members, among others.

♦ President’s Council on the National Laboratories: The chair and vice-chair of the Academic Council, and at least one other representative of the Academic Senate, are members of this group which advises the President on the management of the National Laboratories and has review responsibility of the Labs under the terms of the management contract with the Department of Energy. The Senate representatives also serve on the sub-panels of the Presidents Council including the National Security Panel and the Environmental Safety and Health Panel.

♦ Council on Research: The chair of the Academic Council, the chair of UCPB and the chair of UCORP are members of the Council of Research which is chaired by the Vice-Provost for research and includes the vice-chancellors of research from each campus.

♦ Search Committees: Either the chair or vice-chair of the Academic Council, or both, serve on almost all search committees for senior system wide university officers. Standing committee chairs often are also included on search committees. Under existing Regents procedures, the chair of the Academic Council serves on the faculty advisory committee to the Regents’ Search Committee in the selection of the President. Traditionally, either the chair or the vice-chair of the Academic Council serves as the chair of this Faculty Advisory Committee.

♦ Task Forces and Special Projects: Chairs of Senate standing committees are regularly called upon to participate in the work of special committees. Recently these have included task forces to develop an affordability model for student financial aid, to review the faculty disciplinary procedures, to review part time professional degree programs and recommend policies, and to review the executive program, among others.

AN ASSESSMENT OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

Critics of shared governance in the University of California generally raise two concerns; the faculty has too much power, and the process of faculty evaluation of proposals only contributes delay and inefficiency to the implementation of needed change.

The faculty of the University of California does indeed exercise great influence on the affairs of the University. Without the faculty there would be no prestigious research accomplishments. Without the faculty there will be no educational program. No central governing authority can direct an individual faculty member to the next great research breakthrough. Nor can a central governing authority direct individual faculty to inspire a classroom of undergraduates with the joy of the discovery of new knowledge. The governors and administrators of a university system must work to provide a supportive atmosphere that encourages creative people to perform at their highest level in a collective research and education enterprise. The faculty, through the Academic Senate, seek to advise the Board of Regents and the administration on the development of policies and procedures that will
enhance the research and education enterprise while maintaining appropriate standards of conduct with necessary and reasonable oversight.

Shared governance provides the faculty with a mechanism to participate in the development of policy to guide the University in its continuing quest for excellence in all of its missions. The faculty’s sense of participation in the collective endeavor creates a collective responsibility of ownership among the faculty for the University’s academic programs. With that responsibility comes a culture that seeks to nourish the values of excellence and academic freedom which are the hallmarks of a successful institution of higher education. Removing the faculty from meaningful participation in governance would deprive the University of one of the principal forces driving its constant progress towards higher quality results in its teaching, research and service.

The relationship between the Academic Senate and the administration, both system wide and on the campuses, has evolved over the past few years into a partnership that works to bring the faculty into decision making processes at the formulation stage. The faculty becomes a partner with the administration in working out common ground from which to face the challenges of the times. Standing on that common ground, it becomes difficult for one side or the other to pull the rug out from under a policy direction. Without mutual participation in decision making the faculty and the administration would stand apart on opposite sides of a table unproductively complaining each about the recalcitrant position of the other as is the case in some universities with a unionized faculty.

Clearly the consultation inherent in shared governance is a difficult and time consuming process for all participants. The time devoted to consultation undoubtedly delays implementation of what proponents always believe is a good idea. However, the University of California is too complex of an institution to be managed by a central authority. The filter of other minds, and the tests of experience broader than that of a few people more often than not adds value to the formulation of a proposal. In many cases, consultation has thwarted unwise ideas. Examples may also be found of bad decisions that may have been prevented with broader consultation with affected groups. Overall, we enhance our collective skills by reaching out to broad constituencies for participation in governance.

That is not to say that the processes of consultation and shared governance cannot be improved nor made to function more efficiently. Like any dynamic organization, the Academic Senate must be responsive to change through an ongoing evaluation of its organizational structure with an eye to streamlining its operations. That is a continuing challenge to Senate leadership.
ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
Stanton Glantz, Ph.D., Chair

June 4, 2002

PROPOSED INTEGRATION OF THE
ACADEMIC PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE INTO
CAMPUS SHORT- AND LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND BUDGETING

I. INTRODUCTION

The Academic Planning and Budget Committee proposes an integration that will allow the Committee to review and provide recommendations to the Chancellor and Deans, or their designees, to the Executive Budget Committee and to Senate agencies regarding long-range and strategic planning and budget issues. The mission behind this integration is to increase meaningful faculty participation in, and thereby broaden the faculty contribution to, UCSF’s strategic planning and budget processes. Ultimately, this policy will institutionalize Academic Senate appraisal of all planning and budget issues that affect UCSF’s academic mission, such as long-range planning, allocation of financial and personnel resources, and establishment of academic priorities. Committee members will specialize throughout their tenure on the Committee. The Committee believes that by reorganizing and integrating into the campus-wide planning and budget processes, it will better meet its mission and increase responsiveness to and participation of all UCSF faculty.

II. BACKGROUND

The Academic Planning and Budget Committee is working to enhance the Regents’ policy of shared governance on behalf of the UCSF Division of the Academic Senate. The UC Regents have recognized the importance of this relationship by conferring upon the Senate an important role in the decision-making processes throughout the University. Shared governance, operating through the agency of the Academic Senate, is an integral and valued part of the University of California. The concept of shared governance underlies the consultative structure by which most decisions of significant consequence within the University of California are made. With regard to the UC planning and budget processes, this view is exemplified in the relevant Standing Order: “The Academic Senate is authorized to select a committee or committees to advise a Chancellor concerning a campus budget.” Standing Order of the Board of Regents, 105.2(d).

Successful implementation of important policy initiatives involves, from the outset, the understanding, agreement and active participation of the faculty. As the body on which the Regents have conferred the formal faculty voice, the Academic Senate provides a vehicle for that participation. Too often, however, the Senate has become involved only in the later stages of policy planning and development. This situation has led many faculty to feel disengaged from the decision-making process,
which in turn often results in a withdrawal into their own personal professional interests to the detriment of UCSF’s academic and campus life. The Senate and the Administration working together in true shared governance will foster an atmosphere of trust and communication, which is vital if the interests of UCSF are to flourish and succeed.

The Senate Academic Planning and Budget Committee is a critical link between the Administration and the Senate for some of these issues. It is in a position to analyze and advise regarding a broad range of policy decisions, planning issues, and budgetary matters that will affect the campus as a whole and to serve as a mechanism that engages other Senate committees in this process as appropriate. By restructuring, the APB Committee will add value to the campus-wide planning and budgetary processes and will, in turn, facilitate greater implementation of the Regents’ charge for shared governance between the administration and faculty.

By appointing the Senate Chair and Vice Chair and the APB Chair to the Executive Budget Committee, the Chancellor has already taken positive steps toward increasing the Senate voice in UCSF planning and governing processes. The APB Committee proposes the following additional structures that will utilize faculty expertise to further integrate the Senate voice into these processes.

III. PLAN

A. Long-Range Planning Involvement

When the Chancellor or any of the Vice Chancellors plan to create a campus-level committee that could have an impact on the academic planning or budget at the campus level or of more than one school, they will notify the Senate Chair and offer APB the opportunity to have representation on the committee. The Senate Chair will notify the Chair of APB of the creation of the new committee. APB will nominate three members to join the new committee as the APB representative. These names will be transmitted to the Chancellor through the Senate Chair, and the Chancellor will select one of these individuals to serve as APB’s representative. (In the event that APB does not feel such representation is necessary, it will so notify the Chancellor through the Senate Chair.) Where policy crosses into the domain of other Senate Committees, the APB Committee will form working relationships with those Committees as appropriate. (For example, hospital/clinical issues that have an academic impact should be part of the purview of the APB Committee working in conjunction with the Clinical Affairs Committee.) APB will work with those committees to ensure that APB reviews all proposals that use campus resources.

The Senate will add the Vice Chancellor for University Advancement and Planning as an ex officio member on APB.

B. Short-Range Budget and Planning Involvement

APB, the Faculty Councils and the Deans have agreed on the following structure for increased faculty involvement in the budget process.

1. SCHOOL-LEVEL BUDGET/SHORT-TERM PLANNING INVOLVEMENT

   a. Who Will Be Involved

---

1 Proposed as a two-year pilot program
i. Faculty Councils: Faculty Councils themselves and/or through a Faculty Council Academic Planning and Budget subcommittee (optional) will be responsible for the development and review of budget issues at the individual School level.

ii. Senate Academic Planning and Budget Committee (APB): Senate APB Member(s) will participate in the Faculty Council budget development and review process for the School from which he or she is a faculty member.

iii. School Dean and Financial Officer: The Dean and School financial officer will meet with the Faculty Council during the development and review of the school budget.

b. Information Requested For Faculty Council Review

i. Dean's proposed strategic priorities for previous, current and proposed year without specific itemized dollar amounts.

ii. Description of the financial requirements for meeting the proposed strategic priorities.

iii. Analysis of School budget from School financial officer.

iv. Regular reporting to the Faculty Council from the Dean/School financial officer regarding issues presented at the Chancellor's Executive Budget Committee (EBC.)

v. Reporting from the Senate Clinical Affairs Committee to Faculty Council re: Medical Center budget issues affecting School.

vi. Notification of the Chancellor's final budget decisions as they affect the School after the budget review process is completed.

c. What Feedback Is Given

i. Faculty Council recommendations re: proposed strategic priorities will be recorded and discussed w/ Dean.

ii. Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance discusses with Faculty Council representatives in conjunction with APB (see below) the rationale for the Chancellor's final budget decisions.

2. CAMPUS WIDE-LEVEL BUDGET PLANNING INVOLVEMENT

a. Who Will Be Involved

i. Senate Academic Planning & Budget Committee (APB)

ii. Faculty Councils - Chair or Designated Representative

iii. Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance.

b. Information Requested For Campus Wide Review

i. List of Deans' strategic priorities with brief description/rationale (without specific itemized dollar amounts.)

ii. Analysis by the Office of Budget Resources and Management of the Deans' strategic priorities (without specific itemized dollar amounts.)

iii. Notification of the Chancellor's final budget decisions after the budget review process is completed.
c. What Feedback Is Given

i. APB provides written recommendations to Deans, Faculty Councils and Chancellor regarding the campus-wide implications of the strategic priorities proposed by the schools.

ii. Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance discusses with APB the rational for the Chancellor's final budget decisions. This may be done in conjunction with the Faculty Councils.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Academic Planning and Budget Committee submits this integration plan with the belief that it will increase Senate and faculty contributions to shared governance and add value to the UCSF planning and budget processes. Increasing the Senate voice in the UCSF academic planning and budget processes, without disruption of critical schedules, honors the Regents’ intent for shared governance. An increased Senate voice also utilizes the expertise of the faculty to assist UCSF’s Administration in sustaining our national and international reputation as a leading Health Sciences institution. These activities will proceed incrementally toward full implementation as rapidly as feasible.
**Academic Senate Annual Review of UCSF Budget Recommendations**

*Internal Senate Process*

**September/October**  
SVC Barclay/AVC Vermillion attend APB to provide budget overview for the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

**September – July**  
APB Chair attends all Executive Budget Committee/Contingency Planning Committee meetings. APB Chair reports EBC issues to APB, and informs EBC of relevant APB discussion.

Chair’s Report at APB should include a report from EBC. If APB Chair cannot attend, Vice Chair or other APB member should attend in his/her place.

**September – July**  
Deans and financial officers provide quarterly updates to Faculty Councils on School budgets, including expense and revenue budgets, changes to strategic plans, school priorities, and projections for the future. Faculty Council chairs attend APB and share this information.

Throughout the academic year, budget presentations or presentations by programs requesting funds given to the EBC follow up with a presentation to APB.

**May**  
Governor releases annual revised budget

VC Barclay/AVC Vermillion provide specific timeline regarding when control points receive budget parameters, when control points will report back to EBC, and when Senate recommendations are to be submitted to Chancellor

**Late May–Early June**  
EBC informs control points of their budget parameters.

Deans work with Faculty Councils to prepare their budget recommendations. Dean or financial officer attend Faculty Council meeting to summarize recommendations when completed.

The Finance Office prepares a Matrix of Budget Issues for the upcoming fiscal year and provides it to APB for review. SVC Barclay/AVC Vermillion attend APB meeting to summarize recommendations when completed. APB reviews the presentations throughout the year and on behalf of the Senate faculty, evaluates the merits, feasibility, and priority of these requests to the Chancellor’s discretionary funds.

APB prepares formal communication with Senate recommendations for the Senate Chair to forward to the Chancellor.
COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET
Patricia Robertson, MD

June 16, 2007

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

RE: APB Review and Priority Ranking of FY 2007-08 Budget Issues

Dear Chancellor Bishop:

During the 2007-08 academic year, the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) heard presentations and discussed at length various projects and initiatives seeking campus funding. On June 7, 2007, the Committee met to review the items listed on the Summary of FY 2007-08 Budget Issues prepared by the Office of Budget and Resource Management. During its evaluation of priorities, the Committee paid close attention to three main principles: (1) proposals should be reasonable in expectation and consistent with the requirements set forth by the Executive Budget Committee, (2) proposals should be thoroughly planned with detailed investigation and assumption of accountability, and, perhaps most importantly, (3) proposals should be consistent with the values and goals which are expected to be set forth in the soon-to-be-released Strategic Plan.

After careful deliberation, Committee members individually ranked the priority level of each proposal on a scale of one to five (1=Low and 5=High). These evaluations were averaged to produce an overall recommendation of the Committee. In evaluating these proposals, three clear strata appeared. Items which are the most significant priorities for the faculty are those items which directly relate to the quality of academic life of UCSF are essential to the present and future success of the University and are directly related to the goals of the Strategic Plan. The top priority items for faculty are the Classroom Improvement Initiative, Academic Information Systems and Campus Transportation.

The second-tier items are those which the Committee considered to be important, but also had reservations regarding appropriateness of funding source or accountability. The Committee recommends support of these proposals, but with enough qualifications to reduce their priority level below the first-tier proposals which the Committee considered absolutely essential. Proposals supported by the Committee, but ranked slightly lower in priority, are the Science and Health Education Partnership (SEP) and the Administrative Information Systems.

One item fell in the third tier, which is not supported by the Committee. The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget considers the proposal regarding Campus Core Research Facilities to be incomplete and premature. As such, the Committee does not recommend funding for this proposal.

The A-21/CAS Relief is an important funding item, now in its third and last year as a new model. The Committee supports as much ICR as is possible to the department and the principal investigator. However, this model needs to be re-examined with the input of the Academic Senate to be sure that “off campus breaks” are
appropriate in all situations with an increased return of ICR. Also, there needs to be more transparency in the actual rate and amount of ICR to the department and to the principal investigator.

Details regarding the assessment of each item by the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget are here presented:

**Item 1: Campus Transportation Plan**

APB rating: 4.71

The Committee makes an important distinction between funding for parking projects versus shuttle/transportation concerns.

The Committee maintains that such a vital infrastructure as the shuttle system (the horizontal elevator of the multi-site UCSF campus) should be included in the University budget and should not rely on discretionary funds. The Committee would like to request a supplement to the proposal to cover the cost of the shuttle from BART to Mission Bay which has been replaced by light rail but requires students, staff and faculty to pay out-of-pocket.

Minimizing parking rates is important for recruitment of faculty and staff. Comparisons to the other University of California campuses document that UCSF has one of the highest per-month charges for parking. For recruitment purposes, competitive parking rates cannot be derived by comparing to other commercial parking facilities in the area, as UCSF is competing for talent against other universities with better benefits, not against the community.

**Item 2: Science and Health Education Partnership (SEP)**

APB rating: 4.25

The Committee believes the Science and Health Education Partnership is an important program that is consistent with the educational and community involvement aspects of the strategic plan. This program is also core to the mission of the University of California (particularly as seen by the legislature) to educate California citizens, their communities, and their educators. Funding this program would not only benefit the community, but may also be politically advantageous to the University. It is hoped that with continued support, this program will ultimately receive UCOP, state funding, and additional grants for its support.

At the same time, the Committee recognizes an accountability issue that has been raised in the past and recommends that if funding for SEP is continued, the program should design an instrument to measure the effectiveness and success of the program. Assessment should include longitudinal studies so long term outcomes can be documented. Our Committee also recommends that all UCSF schools become involved in the program (not just the School of Medicine). Finally, to better avoid redundancy it is important to ensure that SEP is evaluated in connection with all of the community projects going on at UCSF.

**Item 3: Academic Information Technology (OAAIS)**

APB rating: 4.92

**Item 4: Administrative Information Technology (OAAIS)**

APB rating: 4.50

Faculty recognize the need for these proposals, but question why such an essential infrastructure as information technology must request discretionary funds, rather than receive funding completely through the University budget. During the discussion of these items, there was a mention of possible stratification of information services with differential charge-backs to faculty depending on the service. The consensus of the Committee on this potential stratification was to emphasize again that information technology is essential to all faculty at UCSF, and should be provided by central funding. This is a core, essential resource to the mission of the University and should be given top priority.
It was noted that the campus currently utilizes an obsolete, inefficient, and ineffective faculty database, and much of the academic administrative affairs is conduced solely via paper forms (The School of Medicine continues to use carbon paper.). Faculty management, faculty operations, and the processes for academic advancement would greatly benefit from the expansion of administrative information technology, and the design and implementation of such electronic systems is of high importance to the faculty.

Training in how to use these systems should not only consist of informational in-person trainings, but also include on-line programs so that members of the faculty can proceed with the training at their own pace.

Item 5: Campus Core Research Facilities (CCRFs)  
APB rating: 1.33

The Committee is not convinced that campus faculty members are eager for this initiative. The Committee believes that this proposal represents a large expense not for facilities, but for a re-organization of administration. This proposal also seems designed to suit particular interests, and did not investigate the needs of the campus-wide faculty. The Committee believes that the CCRF initiative has not done sufficient investigation of the opinions of the faculty currently using core research facilities, nor of faculty who might also benefit to determine which cores should be selected for the future. The Committee recommends a needs assessment before any formal or permanent funding, as well as a users’ assessment of current faculty, staff, post-docs, and graduate students. With any future proposal, a fiscal impact statement should accompany it, as during our presentation, it was mentioned that most of the cores operate at a deficit at UCSF, as well as a projection of the volume that is likely to be involved.

Additionally, the Committee notes that a search for a Vice Chancellor of Research is underway, and the Committee recommends that such an initiative should wait until that position is filled. During the presentation of this proposal to APB, it was reported that this organization would form a steering committee including Academic Senate faculty. The Committee recommends that if this proposal moves forward, the steering committee should be formed first, and the budget request should follow.

In summary, the Committee believes that this request is not data-driven and that this request is premature.

Item 6: Classroom Improvement Initiative  
APB rating: 4.92

The Committee maintains that this is a sorely-needed initiative to bring campus teaching facilities up to a necessary baseline. Our Committee believes that this initiative represents a reasonable, one-year proposal and hopes that the future budget for classroom maintenance will be increased to maintain basic classroom quality.

During its review, faculty expressed many concerns regarding sub-standard and embarrassing classroom conditions on the Parnassus campus (and other sites). Inferior teaching facilities impact everything from the quality of the education and the efficiency of teaching, to the recruitment of both students and of faculty. This past year, teaching faculty on the Committee have noted rodents in the classrooms, damaged furniture, no chairs for students, inadequate equipment, damaged ceiling tiles, and peeling paint in the classrooms. The faculty believes that this modest $1M proposal desperately needs funding and that it is not likely to find funding from any other source.

Item 7: A-21/CAS Relief  
APB rating: None

As mentioned earlier, the Committee recognizes that this is an important model in its last year, but that the model needs to be re-examined for the break it gives the off-campus research projects with input from the Academic Senate. Members of the faculty support as much ICR back to the department and the principal
investigator as possible. The Committee would like to know what the rate of return of the indirect costs to the departments and to principal investigators have been in the past 2 years under this model.

The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget appreciates the opportunity to review and make recommendations regarding the FY 2007-08 Budget Issues, and we enthusiastically present these comments for your consideration.

We respectfully request a timely response to this letter once the funding decisions have been made. This will allow the Committee to discuss them in detail at their first meeting in September of 2007.

Yours sincerely,

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

cc: Deborah Greenspan, UCSF Academic Senate Chair
Steve Barclay, Senior Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance
Members of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
Identification of UCSF Academic Senate Committees Involved in Campus Reviews for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (Per Compendium*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATTER FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>ORIGINATING BODY</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL UCSF COMMITTEES TO REVIEW**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five Year Perspective</td>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Graduate Council - Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Committee on Education Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Committee on Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment Of New Graduate Degree And/Or New Program</td>
<td>Individual departments propose and Graduate Dean initiates reviews</td>
<td>Graduate Council - Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget (proposals which require new or a redistribution of campus resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Committee on Education Policy (proposals which require changes in curriculum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Committee on Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Changes Of Graduate Degree Programs</td>
<td>Individual departments propose and Graduate Dean initiates reviews</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget (issues relating to campus resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Committee on Education Policy (issues relating to curriculum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer, Consolidation, Or Discontinuance Of Graduate Degree Programs</td>
<td>Individual departments propose and Graduate Dean initiates reviews</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget (issues relating to campus resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Committee on Education Policy (issues relating to curriculum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate And Graduate Programs With Unique Titles</td>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Education Policy - Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation Of New Schools And Colleges</td>
<td>School’s Executive Committee, Dean of the School, or the Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Education Policy - Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Changes Of Schools And Colleges</td>
<td>School’s Executive Committee, Dean of the School, or the Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Education Policy - Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer, Consolidation Or Disestablishment Of Schools And Colleges</td>
<td>School’s Executive Committee, Dean of the School, or the Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Education Policy - Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstitution Of Academic Programs And Academic Units</td>
<td>School’s Executive Committee, Deans’ Offices for Professional Academic Programs, the Graduate Council for Graduate Academic Programs, or the Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Education Policy OR Graduate Council – Lead (as appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate Council or Education Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment, Disestablishment, Renaming And Five-Year Review Of ORUs And MRUs</td>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Committee on Research - Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment, Disestablishment, Renaming And Five-Year Review Of Non-ORUs</td>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Committee on Research - Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* http://www.ucop.edu/acadaff/accomp/  
**Academic Senate Chair may request other Senate committee review
DESCRIPTIONS of the STANDING COMMITTEES of the UCSF ACADEMIC SENATE

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM
The Committee on Academic Freedom reviews policies and issues as they affect the academic freedom of UCSF faculty. The Committee consists of eight members and meets nine times per year for approximately one and one half hours with nominal time required for preparation.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
This Committee makes recommendations to the Vice Provost, Academic Affairs regarding appointments, promotions, merit advancements (accelerated or decelerated more than one year, or merit advancements to Step 6 or Above Scale), changes in series, appraisals, appeals of personnel actions and related matters. The Committee reviews academic personnel policy issues from the divisional and the systemwide Academic Senate. Meetings are held every Wednesday for two and one half hours throughout the academic year. The Committee consists of nine members and serve for a term of three years. Preparation time varies according to the number of files under review with an average of five hours required for each meeting. Only faculty at the full Professor rank may serve on CAP.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET
This Committee focuses on the assessment of campus-wide planning and budgetary decisions that directly impact the future academic well-being of UCSF. This Committee provides oversight on long- and short-range academic planning issues, including campus budgets and resource allocations. The Committee reviews issues brought forward by the Division, Systemwide, and campus administration. The Committee consists of nineteen members, plus ex-officio members from the administration and the Chairs of each school’s Faculty Council. APB meets monthly for 2 hours throughout the year. Only senior faculty are eligible for service on this Committee.

COMMITTEE ON CLINICAL AFFAIRS
This committee is charged with the review of all policy and matters regarding the clinical enterprise that relate to or affect the academic mission of the University. It consists of 17 members and meets monthly for one and a half hours. Preparation time is dependent on current issues under review on campus, but is likely one to one and one half hours.

COMMITTEE ON COURSES OF INSTRUCTION
The Committee has responsibility for approving all courses offered at the UCSF campus. Annually, it adjudicates approximately 300 applications for institution, modification, or deletion of courses in all Schools and identifies courses where interdisciplinary instruction could be facilitated. Prior to the seven meetings per year, each of which is two hours in duration, members receive materials to review to ascertain whether proposed courses satisfy University standards. One of the Committee’s meetings is held to rank applications for funding Instructional Improvement Project grants. The Committee consists of four members appointed by the Committee on Committees and four members from each Schools’ curriculum committee.
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
The Committee addresses campus-wide matters involving establishment and disestablishment of curricula, schools, institutes, departments as well as legislative or administrative policies involving questions of educational policy. The Committee consists of eleven members and five permanent guests, and meets monthly for one and a half hours with approximately one hour preparation time for each meeting.

COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
This Committee routinely reviews the status of underrepresented groups in those areas in which the Senate has jurisdiction and reports annually on the policies and the progress of the Division toward achieving equal opportunity for underrepresented groups. The Committee reviews proposals for the Faculty Development Awards originating out of the Chancellor’s office. Other activities depend on the consensus of the Committee. The Committee consists of six members and meets six times a year for one hour with nominal time required for preparation.

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
This Committee reports on the general welfare, housing, parking, health and retirement benefits, and intra-group relationship of the members of the Academic Senate, clinical faculties, professional research, staff, and students. The Committee also initiates memorials for deceased members of the Division. The Committee consists of seven members and meets 8 - 9 times a year for 1 - 2 hours with approximately 1/2 - 1 hour preparation time for each meeting.

GRADUATE COUNCIL
The Graduate Council makes recommendations to the systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs concerning new UCSF programs for existing graduate degrees and the establishment of new degrees, reports to and makes recommendations to the Academic Senate on existing graduate academic programs and confering of such degrees, and advises the Chancellor concerning graduate academic matters. The Graduate Council awards all University Fellowship and Graduate Scholarships to students enrolled in the Graduate Division and sets standards for the appointment of postdoctoral scholars. The Graduate Council consists of 13 members and meets nine times per year for two hours. Time is required outside meetings for reviewing fellowship applications (15 to 20 per year), assisting with 2-3 program reviews annually, drafting reports, serving on ad hoc committees for student and postdoctoral grievances, and swing on committees for other projects as needed.

COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY
The Committee advises the campus and library administration regarding a wide spectrum of campus library issues and policies including acquisitions, circulation, facilities, and special projects. The Committee consists of seven members and meets nine times a year for one hour with nominal time required for preparation.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE
The Committee is a group of peers to whom Academic Senate members can approach if they believe their rights or privileges have been violated. The Committee hears cases involving grievances, disciplinary actions, and early termination of faculty appointments. The Committee, as a whole, meets for all pre-hearing activities. The Committee, as a whole or a subset (minimum two members) with additional Academic Senate faculty, will constitute a formal hearing committee. The Committee attends approximately 3 - 4 pre-hearing activities per year for 1 - 3 hours each with approximately 1 - 2 hours preparation time. Formal hearings occur 1 - 2 times per year and can be time consuming with frequent meetings. Additionally, the Committee reviews policies brought forward by the Division or systemwide. The Committee consists of five members.
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
The Committee reviews and funds applications for individual investigator and shared equipment grants. The Committee selects the annual Faculty Research Lecturer and Distinguished Clinical Research Lecturer. The Committee reviews and makes recommendations on division and systemwide policies, proposals, and legislation pertaining to research. The Committee also funds applications for research travel grants. The Committee consists of 23 members and meets approximately eight times a year for 1 - 3 hours with 1 - 3 hours preparation time required for each meeting.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
This Committee exercises formal supervision over all modifications in divisional legislation proposed by the Faculty Councils of the four schools, and by the standing committees or members of the Division. The Committee reviews and certifies that the proposed legislation is consonant with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate prior to submission to the Division for approval. The Committee also reviews and certifies all modifications to school-level legislation proposed by the Faculties of the Schools prior to approval by the Faculties. Additionally, the Committee reviews policies brought forward by the division or systemwide. The Committee consists of nine members and meets only when modifications to legislation are proposed or formal interpretations of legislation are requested.
During the 2006-07 academic year, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) met as a Committee 13 times. The Committee’s primary foci this year were issues pertaining to proposed changes to the retirements plan, campus development and new construction/reconstruction, campus strategic planning reviewing and evaluating proposals to the Chancellor’s Executive Budget Committee, and the annual review and recommendations regarding programs requesting Chancellor’s discretionary funds. In addition, members of APB served on various UCSF committees and participated with members of other Academic Senate committees on Academic Senate task forces reviewing campus-wide or system-wide initiatives. Such external committees or task forces included:

- The Chancellor’s Strategic Planning Board
- The Chancellor’s Western Associate of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accreditation Steering Committee
- The Academic Senate task force reviewing and recommending comment to the “Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees”
- The Academic Senate task force reviewing and recommending comment to the “Recommendations of the Joint Academic Senate/UCOP Workgroup on Recycling Multi-campus Research Unit Funds.”
- The Academic Senate task force reviewing Systemwide proposed modifications to APM Section 620 regarding policy on off-scale salaries.
- The Academic Senate task force reviewing and recommending comment to the UCAP Documents “Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation” and “Proposed Modification to Academic Personnel Policies (APM) 220-18b, (4) {Advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale}.”
- The Academic Senate task force reviewing and recommending comment to the Systemwide Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students In University Instruction
- The Academic Senate task force reviewing and recommending comment to Draft Proposal on the Relationships Between (Pharmaceutical) Vendors and Clinicians
- The Academic Senate task force reviewing and recommending comment to the Systemwide Report on Institutional Review Boards (IRB)
- The Academic Senate task force reviewing Proposed UCSF Institute For Human Genetics
The Committee benefited from a variety of informational presentations given throughout the year pertaining to academic planning, academic research programs, academic facilities, academic financial programs, and UCSF budget issues. These presentations included:

1. Ongoing updates and responses to the year-long development of the UCSF Strategic Plan
2. Updates regarding the progress of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accreditation Steering Committee by Harold Bernstein, APB Representative (Appendix 1)
3. Orientation to the University of California and UCSF Budget Process, by Eric Vermillion, Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance
4. Campus Demolition and (Re)Construction Projects, by Lori Yamauchi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning (Appendix 2)
5. Campus Safety and the Parnassus Heights Security Workgroup Recommendations, by Pamela Roskowski, Chief of Police, UCSF (Appendix 3)
6. CORO Faculty Leadership Initiative Update, by Sally Marshall, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
7. Campus Transportation Services by Stella Hsu, Associate Vice Chancellor, Campus Life Services and Jonathan Gledhill, Director of Transportation Services (Appendix 4)
8. Presentation from the Science and Health Education Partnership by Rebecca Smith, Co-Director of the Health and Science Education Initiative (SEP) (Appendix 5)
9. Update Regarding Ongoing Activities and Budget Allocations for the Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems by Jonathan Showstack, AVC and Co-CIO of OAAIS
10. Classroom Improvement Initiative by Joe Castro, Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Affairs (Appendix 6)
11. Campus Core Research Facilities by Teri Melese, Director, Research Technologies and Alliances, School of Medicine Dean’s Office (Appendix 7)

Issues reviewed and acted on by the Committee included:

1. Suggested Priorities for the Strategic Plan (Appendix 8)
2. Review of the final allocations of Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds for FY 2006-07
3. Panel Discussion of Faculty to Student Ratios at the UCSF Schools
4. Brainstorming of Possible Faculty Proposals for FY 2007-08 Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds (February 2, 2007)
5. Faculty Housing and Child Care Services with Stella Hsu, Associate Vice Chancellor, Campus Life Services
6. Review and of the Proposed Masters Degree in Global Health Sciences (Appendix 9)
7. Review and Evaluation of FY 2007-08 Budget Issues: Requests to Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds (Appendices 10 and 11)

**Systemwide Issues**

Norman Oppenheimer served as the UCSF APB representative to the systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). N. Oppenheimer gave regular reports to UCSF APB regarding issues at the systemwide level. The following issues were of particular interest to APB.
1. The Futures Report, available from the UCOP Web site at the following link (PDF). (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/futures.report.0706.pdf)
2. Transparency and the “Compensation at the University of California” Web Site
3. Systemwide Proposed Principles for Professional School Fees

These items did not require or result in a formal action by the Committee.

---

**UCSF Committee on Academic Planning and Budget**

The Committee worked on many issues at the Division level:

**Participation in the Strategic Planning Process**

At the September 21, 2006 meeting Jack Rodnick, APB Representative to the Strategic Planning Board, gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the progress of the Strategic Plan design. The Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor Eugene Washington distributed the document “UCSF – Strategic Planning Phase III, Strategy Development” to various points on campus for comment, including the Academic Senate. Academic Senate Chair Deborah Greenspan distributed this document to the Academic Senate Committees for comment to be included in a comprehensive response from the Academic Senate.

The Committee then discussed the evaluations of the smaller teams and discussed constructive criticism to be included in the Communication from the Committee to Division Chair Greenspan. The final Communication to Division Chair Greenspan summarizing the discussion and recommendations of the Committee is attached as Appendix 8.

**Panel Discussion on Faculty-to-Student Ratios of UCSF Schools**

For the December 12, 2006 meeting, Chair Robertson invited representatives of all four schools to participate in a panel discussion regarding the issues of faculty-to-student ratios at the four UCSF schools. At the beginning of the meeting, the Committee reviewed issues they would like to discuss, including relationship to professional school fees, definitions of faculty included in these ratios, and historical determination of ratios. N. Oppenheimer provided a brief summary of the history of faculty ratios for programs of the School of Pharmacy, where ratios were set during the 1960s when there were only Masters programs, and only slightly altered in the 1970s. Jack Rodnick spoke of the School of Medicine, department limits, and residents-to-faculty FTE ratios in the 1970s and 1980s. It was also noted that post-docs and fellows do not count as students in faculty-to-student ratios.

The following faculty comprised the panel:

**School of Pharmacy**
- Brian Alldredge, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
- Rob Duca, Associate Dean of Finance and Administration

**School of Nursing**
- Dorrie Fontaine, Associate Dean of Academic Programs
School of Medicine
Maxine Papadakis, Associate Dean for Student Affairs

School of Dentistry
William Bird, Interim Chair, Department of Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences
Carolyn Damsky, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Each School briefly spoke to their current situation and historical issues, then the floor was opened up to questions from the Committee. Topics addressed by the panel and the Committee included the following:

- For the School of Pharmacy, the question was asked if there is any way to calculate the student-to-faculty ratio for clinical components? The answer is that SOP is primarily clinically driven and has three departments, basic science, basic/translational science, and clinical science. Basic science student-to-faculty ratios and clinical science ratios would be very different. The burden of didactic teaching falls mostly to non-FTE/non-state-supported faculty. Additional problems have arisen as new FTEs are not necessarily allocated to newly mandated programs.

- The “faculty” in faculty-to-student ratios refers only to FTEs. UCOP is reluctant to address this issue as alleviating one school’s burdens with have a knock-on effect of all school’s soliciting funds from the chancellor. The Committee noted that UC needs a new approach to secure FTEs and addition funding. In the opinion of some Committee Members, the FTE system has not worked. Perhaps the model for educational funding should be based on number of students, not FTE.

- On the subject of enrollment, student-to-faculty ratios is also an issue with facilities. Finding rooms for small groups is difficult and fitting large classes into too-small lecture halls is also problematic. The Strategic Planning groups have spent some time focusing on educational space. What could the campus build to address and serve educational needs of all four schools? Small rooms? Lecture halls and auditorium? Clinical aspects? Simulation space?

- K. Chelsa suggested that APB could produce a list of principles that might aid the process to produce a more equitable situation for students-to-faculty ratios. For example, Clinical education should have a different student-to-faculty ratio than basic science. For UCSF, student-to-faculty ratios should be based on students being Health Science students, and provide/allocate student-to-faculty ratios based on number of years student expects to be enrolled, but by discipline. UC could build in similar principles for academic and administrative support. Programs need to be designed for student-to-faculty ratios as well as appropriate funding levels for support.

Discussion items raised after the panel was released:

- Clearly UCSF needs more money for clinical education, but without a binding agreement to make sure the money goes to such education, Deans and the Schools will continue to allocate resources too enhance their school as they see fit.

- It was noted that absent from this discussion has been the need/basis for securing administrative support necessary for the educational mission.
Possible avenues to address these issues include challenging legislature to change how they approach graduate educational funding—but the legislature primarily seems interested in undergraduate education. Another avenue is to go to the Chancellor, but the feeling is that he does not want to assume this responsibility. Faculty could raise issues with their Schools and departments, but they not likely to fundamentally alter their standard and practices for the allocation of resources.

Administration in the School of Pharmacy has been assuming additional responsibilities because there is not enough faculty to cover teaching responsibilities.

Chair Robertson noted that it may be frustrating for the Committee, but APB needs to address the fact that the funding model of FTEs is outdated and no longer efficient nor effective, nor appropriate to the endeavor. There is a disconnect between actual teaching and how money is allotted. Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Sally Marshall noted that while APB may make recommendations or suggestions to the Chancellor, actionable recommendations may not be likely.

Money is supposed to be allocated for teaching, but those in allocated FTEs are required to research and publish to an extent which is detrimental to the mission of teaching and education. If the FTE is to be intended for teaching, then it should be for teaching.

Discussion of Faculty Housing and Child Care Services with Stella Hsu, Associate Vice Chancellor, Campus Life Services

Chair Robertson invited Stella Hsu, Associate Vice Chancellor, Campus Life Services, to attend the March 1, 2007 meeting of APB. S. Hsu gave an informal, informational presentation regarding the history, development, and current status of UCSF child care services, parking, and faculty housing.

Discussion points of the Committee included the following:

- While the child care services are about to meet the expansion goal set three years ago (goal set in 2004 for 2007), demand has doubled during the interim period, and currently there are almost 300 names on the waiting list.

- The possibility of reserving space on the child care wait list during the recruitment process.

- The University has researched partnerships in the city, but comparable services also have significant wait lists. The University has not researched partnerships or the idea of creating child care sites near where faculty live rather than where they work (i.e. creating facilities or partnering with centers in Marin or the East Bay).

- As a graduate campus, UCSF is not eligible for Pell grants, and as such is not eligible for other associated funding which might apply to child care services.

- The question was raised “Can UCSF partner with other parking services as the campus lots are full?” UCSF has in fact partnered with other parking facilities across the city, particularly the UC Extension lot at 55 Laguna near Oak, which has vacancies and is near a UCSF shuttle stop. UCSF has partnered with the Kezar lot near the Parnassus campus, but the allotted units are full.
also partnered with a lot at 17th Street & Folsom, also near a UCSF shuttle stop, which is near the MCB site. For China Basin, UCSF is seeking partnerships with nearby lots, and faculty may park at the Mission Bay lot and take the shuttle to the China Basin site.

- S. Hsu will provide to the Committee information regarding parking at Mount Zion and reciprocity options with the Parnassus campus. There is also interest in parking reciprocity between Mount Zion or Parnassus and SFGH. Increased frequency of shuttle service may alleviate the need for faculty to drive between campuses during the day.

- Housing at Mission Bay has a set aside for faculty, and currently has 36 faculty-occupied units. More units will be coming online. In the past three years, Mission Bay housing has expanded from 15 faculty residential units to 55 faculty residential units.

- Expansion of the MOP loan program to non-Senate faculty. These mortgages are valuable on the mortgage investment market and benefit the University as well provide local housing opportunities for faculty. B. Spaulding, S. Hsu, and the Committee supported expanding the eligibility of MOP loans to faculty in non-Senate series. As this is a University-wide constraint, change would have to be made at the UCOP level. N. Oppenheimer will bring this up at UCPB. (It was also noted that this initiative may meet resistance similar to that encountered by UCSF’s attempt to include additional series in the Academic Senate.)

The Committee also discussed issues of quality, location, and safety of local public and private schools and the impact on faculty recruitment and retention. There is a plot of land at the Mission Bay site which was parceled for potential SFUSD school use. Catellus ceded development authority to UCSF during development and UCSF’s wishes for the public educational use for this site will supersede that of the SFUSD. In the past, the SFUSD has advocated postponing purposing this site until the demographics of the emerging neighborhood population indicate what sort of facility would be needed (elementary school, high school, science magnet school, etc).

### Review of the Proposed Masters Degree Program Global Health Sciences

At the request of Academic Senate Chair Greenspan, a Subcommittee of the APB was formed to review in detail the lengthy proposal for a Masters Degree in Global Health Sciences. The subcommittee consisted of Chair Robertson, Vice Chair Rodnick, and UCPB Representative N. Oppenheimer. N. Oppenheimer provided the Committee with a brief review and summary of the program, and the concerns expressed by the Subcommittee. Ultimately, the Subcommittee recommended Academic Senate support for the proposed program and expressed the Subcommittee’s primary concerns in a Communication to Academic Senate Chair Greenspan (Appendix 9).

### Review and Evaluation of FY 2007-08 Budget Issues: Requests to Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds

The Committee reviewed the matrix Summary of FY 2007-08 Budget Issues prepared by the Office of Budget and Resource Management (Appendix 10). These represent the requests for Chancellor’s Discretionary Funds. The Committee reviewed each item and members ranked priorities on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 being low and 5 being high). Priority rankings were recorded and averaged, and summaries of
the Committee’s discussions and concerns were included in a Communication to the Chancellor expressing the recommendations of APB (Appendix 11).

**Issues for the 2007-2008 Academic Year**

1. Continued monitoring of system-wide changes to the retirement plans.
2. Continued monitoring of system-wide modifications to salary scales.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Committee on Academic Planning and Budget**

Patty Robertson, MD, Chair  
Jack Rodnick, MD, Vice Chair  
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Harold Bernstein, MD, MPH  
Nancy Boudreau, PhD  
Kit Chesla, RN, DNSc, FAAN  
Steven Cheung, MD  
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Daniel Fried, PhD  
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Lisa Kroon, PharmD  
Norman Oppenheimer, PhD  
William Seaman, MD  
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