The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) was called to order by Chair Chesla on April 23, 2009 at 1:27 p.m. in room M 1486. A quorum was present.

The minutes of March 19, 2009 were approved.

Chair’s Report
Chair Chesla reported on the following from the Executive Budget Committee, including:

- An overview on budget proceedings for the rest of the fiscal year
- Chancellor’s request to have the eight control points (four schools plus EVCP, UAP, FAS, and the Medical Center) present business plan proposals to APB for 2009-2010. The Chancellor is creating a pocket of funds that will be up for bid ($12MM over three years). The deadline for proposals is June 19, 2009. Undetermined at this point is the mechanism for review of or for voting on the proposals. The foundation of APB’s review is to be the Principles of Budget Reduction and the UCSF Strategic Plan. Executive Budget Office is establishing a website to post the detailed budget aspects of the proposals, so they can be reviewed in advance. APB is to have additional meetings through the end of fiscal year to review these proposals.

After discussion, the Committee decided they would divide into sub-specialties such that those with expertise in particular schools or areas could review relevant proposals. The Committee decided to give preference to academic- and research-oriented proposals. The Committee would like to provide feedback to the Chancellor in the form of succinct comments (up to five) or a list of pros and cons rather than a simple numerical ranking by vote.

Report from the University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB)
N. Oppenheimer summarized current activities of UCPB. UCPB discussion included the forthcoming stimulus package. UCPB’s conclusion has been that receipt and managing of such funds will require diligent recordkeeping in-house, such that additional staff will need to be hired.
Additionally, the history of differential student-faculty ratios was reviewed. At present there is no process to review or revise those ratios. N. Oppenheimer will explore ratios as a system-wide agenda issue next year.

The UCPB committee is working hard to determine guidelines to handle implementing the budget cuts. When finalized, the guidelines will go to the Academic Council for approval, after which the guidelines will be disseminated to the divisions.

Agendas and minutes are posted to the UCPB Web page.

**Reports from the Chancellor’s Budget Work Groups**

Chair Chesla presented the Committee with an Executive Budget Committee Summary of Campus Efficiency Proposals and Ideas (working draft, confidential). Committee discussion included concerns regarding near-term cuts offsetting long-term cuts demanded of schools and departments, and if the near-term proposed cuts will be realized across the campus as whole.

Chair Chesla invited the representatives to the Chancellor’s Budget work groups to report from their particular groups.

**A. Revenue Generation and Innovation—Steven Cheung**

S. Cheung could not attend this meeting but did provide a copy of the final report from this work to the Committee. This report was distributed to APB members electronically prior to the meeting. Further discussion of this report will be held in future meetings.

**B. Administration and Business Efficiencies—Warren Gold**

The report of this work group was also distributed to APB members electronically prior to the meeting. It focused on the changes recommended for 09-10 and which would cost money to implement. Next, proposals that could be implemented immediately, or were already in process and which required no capital investment, were reviewed. Finally, proposals that would generate large savings, but would have unacceptable adverse impacts on staff morale as well as recruitment and retention, including pay cuts, furloughs, and layoffs were also reviewed. These latter proposals were not recommended.

Proposals requiring investment and probably competitive for the stimulus funds:

1) IT such as single vendor for pagers and cell phones, single vendor for maintenance contracts, and software. Estimated benefit: $4.6 million through 2011-2012.

2) Electronic-sourcing and automatic purchases. This web-based system gives the lowest price on large quantity items it is designed to complete processing within the discount period (saving 2% more campus-wide). This system also tracks orders in one location, which previously would be logged separately in a variety of systems. Est. benefits: $2.0 million through 2011-2012

3) Award set-ups and efficiencies: Current contracts & grants office is not organized to handle the high volume of grants and contracts at UCSF. Currently, an interim manager is attempting to change the culture, personnel, and adopt new electronic tracking systems. Estimated benefits: $0.5 million through 2011-2012 These three proposals will cost $1.6 million over the three years under consideration by the Chancellor. None of these business plans examine specifically those projects and expenditures that are dependent on state funds.

Chair Chesla proposed asking Eric Vermillion to address APB on the state funds issue.
C. Academic and Clinical Programs Efficiencies—Daniel Weiss
The report of this work group was presented by Sally Marshall as Daniel Weiss was unable to attend this
meeting. The work group’s report focused on short term successes first, then long term foci were the
remainder of the eleven-page document. It was noted that the amounts indicated were provided by the
budget office and therefore represent real-time cost and not an estimate.

The most significant analysis focused on service contracts as they relate to the overall campus. If such
contracts were handled campus-wide, i.e., large research equipment or photocopy equipment, rather than
thousands of individual contracts, savings could be substantial.

Old Business
None.

New Business
None.

Chair Chesla adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.