MINUTES
Thursday, February 19, 2009


ABSENT: S. Barclay, F. Brodsky, E. Fuentes-Aflick, S. Hwang, H. Lipton, R. Lopez, W. Max, L. Yamauchi

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) was called to order by Chair Chesla on February 19 2009 at 1:30 p.m. in room M 1486. A quorum was present.

The minutes of January 22, 2009 were approved.

Chair’s Report
Chair Chesla reported that the Chancellor has sent allocation letters to the control points (Attachments 1 & 2), detailing the total 6% total budget reduction in state funds.

Report from the University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB)
N. Oppenheimer, the new Vice Chair of UCPB, summarized current activities of UCPB. UCPB discussion included the Task Force for Planning for Professional and Doctoral Education, and that National Laboratories will not be producing PITs (triggers for nuclear weapons).

Agendas and minutes are posted to the UCPB Web page.

Reports from the Chancellor’s Budget Work Groups
Chair Chesla invited the representatives to the Chancellor’s Budget work groups to report from their particular groups, and invited committee members to banter cost-saving ideas for each of these approaches.

Chair Chesla addressed concerns of this discussion, and stressed that names should not be paired with suggestions so that there should be no fear of repercussions. The Chair also noted that some may be reluctant to suggest ideas in their own areas for fear that their organization or unit will bear the brunt of the cuts while others lay silent and possibly escape the budget axe.

The Committee discussed methods of soliciting ideas from the front line with a low barrier to participation. Ideas included an anonymous online survey with a chance to win a gift certificate. It would also be helpful not to break the idea solicitations into the different work group charges—just a call general cost saving or revenue generating ideas.
It was noted that it would be helpful to learn what is happening at the other Universities, private and public. Or ask the question: what is the barrier to getting your work done? What can be done to help the front line be more efficient.

A. Revenue Generation and Innovation—Steven Cheung
The work group identified sources of revenue and engaged in a free-flowing discussion and encouraged out-of-the-box, creative thinking. One issue raised is that current revenue sources do not necessarily generate non-obligated income. The Committee discussed their own ideas.

Discussion topics and ideas included the following:

- Leasing UCSF space to non-UC entities to raise money (a work group topic).
- New educational programs such as bio-entrepreneurship, DDS/MBA, pay-as-you-go programs (a work group topic)
- Depending on outside health insurance vendors for in-house care. UCSF is paying a large amount to an external source for a low-risk population (i.e. UCSF employees). What about insuring our own employees? This would require a pilot program and some sort of contracting out of primary care. This could be a cooperative effort with other UC campuses with medical centers to increase efficiency and reduce organizational costs.
- What about selling/privatizing the hospital or certain clinics as private Universities do?

B. Administration and Business Efficiencies—Warren Gold
The work group has discussed items such as a 1% salary cut for executives making over $100,000 per year, automating time and attendance reporting (underway) and possible work furloughs. (If everyone in the UC system took a single, one-day furlough it would save $30 million.)

This work group will not make recommendations regarding specific programs, but rather of processes.

APB discussion topics and ideas included the following:

- The idea of self-insuring health care for UC employees is also considered a cost-cutting measure.
- Publication and prizes to the campus community soliciting ideas
- Halt expansion of new initiatives in the UC system
- Possible delay of building the new hospital for one year
- Is there room in the retirement policies to increase efficiency?

C. Academic and Clinical Programs Efficiencies—Daniel Weiss and Charles Marmar
The work group discussed ideas including partnering with other campuses, and planning focus groups combining populations from all schools in the hope of cross-explaining will generate ideas for efficiencies.

APB discussion topics and ideas included the following:

- Negotiating with unions and represented classes for salary freezes and such
- Inefficiencies in academic and administrative procedures and advancement locked in by the APM. There might be room for a one- or two-year waiver of these requirements to increase efficiencies and save costs.
- Possible redress of accreditation-required but money-losing programs

The Committee opened for free discussion not specific to any particular work group. Additional ideas and discussion included:
• Possibility of campuses charging different fees.
• Efficiencies in not only purchasing, but surpluses that occur in offices, labs, technology, equipment etc. Oyster point and University surpluses are being discussed in the Business Efficiency work group.
• Slowing sections down is more likely to be able to be implemented that cutting groups completely.
• The need for explicit descriptions of cost and benefits of programs, and analyzed as such with a direct connection to the mission of the University.
• Sustainability efforts are in fact moving forward and have a near-term impact on savings.
• The importance of being very selective regarding growth with limited resources. Growth may come at the expense of excellence or maintenance in other areas.
• The difficulty in self-supporting programs do actually have costs the commons but do not contribute the campus commons.
• Breaking down the wall between clinical administrative support and academic administrative support
• Combining campus and medial center IT (under discussion)
• The lack of electronic patient organization/care management is expensive and inefficient.
• The issue of “credit creep,” and the possibility of capping the total credits students can make before they graduate.
• Faculty efficiency. What about departments that may have too many faculty members—these issues are tough to identify and even tougher to act upon.
• Auctioning off select UCSF assets.
• Corporate sponsorships
• The importance of tying University priorities to the priorities of our community and the state of California. The need for a systematic way to acknowledge the priorities and missions of the state and the University.
• Negotiating with unions regarding the limits and restrictions by unions against the use of volunteers.
• Not filling vacant 19900 FTEs but filling faculty positions by other mechanisms.

APB representatives will present topics and ideas discussed in this meeting at the next meeting of their respective work groups.

**Old Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.

Chair Chesla adjourned the meeting at 3:35 p.m.