



Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

Annual Report 2002-2003

Arnold J. Kahn, Ph.D.
Chair

During the 2002-03 academic year, the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) met as a Committee twelve times. In addition, members of APB served on Joint Task Forces with other Senate Committees to review programs or memoranda of understanding between UCSF and outside entities. E-mail discussions were also conducted when needed to facilitate quick review of proposed new Academic Personnel Manual sections or revisions to existing sections, or to discuss other issues.

Issues reviewed and acted on by the Committee included:

University – System-wide

- Proposed New Academic Personnel Policy Relating to Postdoctoral Scholars – Academic Personnel Manual (APM) section 390
- Proposed Revisions to APM sections 310 and 311
- Memoranda of Understanding
- 15-Year Reviews of Multi-Campus Research Units (MRUs)

UCSF Division

- Proposal for a Joint CSUSF and UCSF Doctorate in Physical Therapy (DPT).
- Update to UCSF Five-Year Perspective.
- Proposal for Institute for Global Health.
- APB Involvement in the Budget Process and Contingency Planning for Proposed Budget Cuts.
- Consideration of a Campus Review Process for Academic Programs, Academic Units and Research Units
- Allocation of New Faculty FTEs
- APB Involvement in Campus Budget and Planning Issues, and Future Planning for the New UCSF Hospital
- Campus-wide Unified Class Schedule
- Indirect Costs

Systemwide Issues

Stanton Glantz served as the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) representative and reported to APB on matters considered by UCP&B during 2002-03.



A primary focus for UCP&B this year was the UC budget in light of the declining state revenues and projected and actual budget cuts. This report addresses only those issues where the UCSF APB provided comment to UCPB on specific matters.

Proposed New Academic Personnel Policy Relating to Postdoctoral Scholars – APM

390: APB was asked to comment on a proposed new academic personnel policy relating to postdoctoral scholars – APM 390. The purpose of this system-wide policy is to provide a general framework and the core requirements for Postdoctoral Scholar appointments. APM 390 would allow individual campuses to develop campus-specific policies, procedures and programs to meet individual campus needs. The new policy was intended to apply to postdoctoral employees, who are typically funded by research grants, as well as postdoctoral fellows and trainees, who are typically funded by extramural agencies. The proposed new policy addresses new title codes, appointment duration, salaries and stipends, 100% time appointments, written appointment notices, annual reviews, grievances/corrective action/dismissal, leaves, and benefits. The UCSF APB had a very short time to address this issue, but circulated the proposal by e-mail and prepared a response based on the comments received. Comments received were generally in agreement with the proposed policy. Both support and concern were expressed regarding the general principle that this job title be used for those who are working 100% time. The concern related to the ability to retain highly qualified postdoctoral scholars who may elect to work 50-90% time while raising small children if the title goes only to those working 100% time. APB noted that under current UCSF policy, a person should only be in a postdoctoral position for a maximum of three years. While this policy would be allowed under proposed APM 390, it was suggested that the allowance for this policy be made specific. It was also suggested that the Postdoctoral scholars receive the same family leave benefits that medical students or faculty receive. ([Appendix 1](#))

Proposed Changes to APM 310 and 311 Relating to a New Proposed Project (Scientist)

Series and Revisions to the Professional Research Series: APB was asked to comment on proposed changes to APM 310 and 311. Last year, the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) considered a preliminary proposal to split the Professional Research series into two series. The first would be for independent researchers, while the second would be for project scientists whose work is more collaborative in nature, as part of a team. This year, the President's Office sent out an official proposal to revise APM 310 and 311 and create the new Project (Scientist) series. APB did not reach a consensus on whether the revisions should be implemented. APB raised questions, including whether individuals in the Professional Research series are generally successful in receiving timely merit increases and promotions, whether those in the Professional Research series have salary parity equal to that of the faculty, and whether Professional Researchers participate in the compensation plan. The concern is that if many women or underrepresented minorities are in the Professional Research series as compared to faculty series, there could be inequities in pay for these groups. APB also indicated that the APM guidelines for the



Professional Research series may need to be revised so that individuals in this series have an equitable chance for promotion. ([Appendix 2](#))

Memoranda of Understanding Between UC Regents and Outside Entities: APB representatives participated in two joint Task Forces which were charged with providing comment on Memoranda of Understanding between the Regents and two different outside entities. The first Task Force consisted of representatives from the Committee on Research, Graduate Council and APB, and commented on a memorandum of understanding (Pharmastart Agreement) between UC and SRI International. ([Appendix 3](#)) The second joint Task Force consisted of representatives from the Committee on Research and APB. This Task Force commented on a memorandum of understanding between UC and IBM. This memorandum of understanding was substantially revised while the Task Force was performing its review.

Reviews of Multi-Campus Research Units (MRUs): APB representatives participated in coordinated Academic Senate reviews of three MRUs: the fifteen-year review of the UC Institute for Mexico and the United States (UC Mexus) ([Appendix 4](#)); the fifteen-year review of the UC Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation (IGCC) ([Appendix 5](#)); and the UC Linguistic Minority Research Institute (LMRI). The review of the LMRI is ongoing.

UCSF Academic Planning & Budget Issues

The Committee worked on several issues at the Division level.

Proposal for a Joint CSUSF and UCSF Doctorate in Physical Therapy (DPT)

APB was asked to review and comment on the budgetary aspects of a proposed joint CSUSF and UCSF Doctorate in Physical Therapy (DPT). This program would allow students who have completed a Masters in Physical Therapy to spend one additional year in classroom and clinical training leading to a Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT). The DPT is a clinical, as opposed to research-oriented degree, and would be self-supporting for the third year. APB recommended approval of the proposal, with several caveats, including several issues that should be addressed in a revised proposal. These include the details of the plan, securing agreement from campus units outside the Department of Physical Therapy that may be impacted by the new program, faculty space needs, and faculty and staff computer needs. APB noted that in light of the current budget climate, this program had to be developed as a self-supporting program. APB suggested that it was important to confirm that the special student fee generated by the new program will go directly to supporting that program, and not be used to offset decreases in other State funding. Since UCSF offers the only physical therapy program in the UC system, APB recommended that funds should be committed to this program when they become available, and that the program should be reviewed to see if it should remain self-supporting in no more than five



years. Finally, APB suggested that the Dean of the School of Medicine consider a commitment to fund the Physical Therapy program into 2003-04 and beyond. ([Appendix 6](#)) The proposal was subsequently approved by the Academic Senate Division on March 5, 2003 and by the Chancellor and was forwarded to UC Office of the President (UCOP) and Coordinating Committee for Graduate Affairs (CCGA) for review.

Update to UCSF Five-Year Perspective

UC Provost and Senior Vice President C. Judson King made the annual request in December 2000 to each campus for updated campus five-year perspectives for new academic programs for years 2001-2006. UCSF administration asked the Senate to review UCSF's draft update to the campus five-year perspective and provide any suggested edits or additions. A coordinated Academic Senate review was provided by a Task Force that included representatives from APB, Graduate Council, the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Committee on Research. The overall review was positive, but several recommendations for further questions were presented. The Task Force expressed approval for the creation of new graduate programs in the Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy, and the creation of new programs initially proposed in earlier years. The Task Force suggested that priority should be given to self-supporting programs, programs that train graduates for a demonstrated need at community, state or national levels, and innovative programs that train individuals to meet future health care needs. ([Appendix 7](#))

APB Involvement in the Budget Process and Contingency Planning for Proposed Budget Cuts

Last year, APB and the Chairs of the four Faculty Councils finalized a plan for integrating the Academic Senate into the campus budget and planning process. The budget portion of the plan has two components: (1) increased involvement of the Faculty Councils with their respective Deans in formulating the Schools' budget requests; and (2) APB's involvement in the budget process after the Schools have submitted their budget requests to the Chancellor. ([Appendix 8](#)) The Deans and the Chancellor approved the plan. Although implementation of the plan was to begin in the 2002-2003 academic year, APB had the opportunity to provide some budget recommendations to the Chancellor, many of which were accepted.

This year, APB began a 2-year pilot program to implement the plan. To this end, the Chair of APB was a member of the Contingency Planning Group (CPG). In addition, the Chair of APB and the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Senate were members of the Executive Budget Committee (EBC). The CPG was chaired by Eric Vermillion, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget and Resource Management. This group worked on responses to proposed mid-year budget cuts, and on developing a framework for defining functions and activities that are "core" or essential to the academic mission of UCSF. The CPG reports to the EBC, which is advisory to the Chancellor. The EBC is charged with reviewing, evaluating, prioritizing, and making funding recommendations to the Chancellor for



resource requests proposed in the operating and capital budgets submitted through the Campus Resource Call process. The EBC is co-chaired by Steve Barclay, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, and Regis Kelly, the Executive Vice Chancellor, and is composed of the Medical Center CEO, the Vice Chancellors, the Deans, as well as the Academic Senate members listed above. A full list of attendees can be found under "Chancellor's Executive Committees" at <http://chancellor.ucsf.edu/>.

This year, each School and each Vice Chancellor (referred to as "control points") submitted "budget templates" to the EBC which identified programs, current resources for those programs, proposed reductions, the rationale for the proposed reductions, and the impact of the proposed reductions on UCSF. The proposed reductions for each control point went through a process of discussion, analysis and revision. APB received reports on the activities of both the CPG and EBC.

As part of implementing the plan for increased faculty input into the budget process, APB regularly invited the Faculty Council Chairs to its meetings so the Chairs would be apprised of the information which was available to APB. The Faculty Council Chairs also reported to APB on the involvement of the respective Councils in the budget process in each School.

In June 2003, APB met several times to work on recommendations to the Chancellor regarding the budget cuts proposed by the various control points. APB identified eight areas which it believed were vital to the functioning of the entire campus, and which it used to guide its recommendations to the Chancellor:

1. Infrastructure of UCSF campus-wide Research Support Programs including Contracts and Grants
2. Graduate Student recruitment and support
3. Funds and infrastructure supporting Professional Student Aid
4. Instructional/educational infrastructure resources (i.e. Library and Information Services)
5. Resources that support Faculty Retention and Recruitment
6. UCSF Senate Office, including funds that support Research Grants and Campus-wide Senate Committees
7. Funds that contribute to supporting the Campus financial, physical safety and security efforts.
8. Special campus-wide programs, such as the Sexual Harassment Prevention Program.

APB recommended to the Chancellor that several of the cuts proposed by the control points be restored. With regard to budget cuts which were mandated by UCOP, APB recommended that UCOP be strongly urged to restore proposed cuts to the Student Health Services and Graduate Division Mentorship and Fellowship Programs, both of which are within the purview of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (Graduate Division and



Student Academic Affairs). APB also commented on the percentage of indirect costs returned to originating units, which did not increase over last year. The Committee renewed its past recommendation that the percentage of indirect costs returned to the originating units should continue to increase in the future to reach a previously established goal of 20%. APB supported the use of Chancellor's funds to support IT infrastructure and the initiative of the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance to undertake a comprehensive review and improvement of the ITS-ENS system next year. APB also acknowledged that the Chancellor had asked Dean Debas to lead the development of the Institute for Global Health along the general lines that had been recommended by APB last year. APB encouraged the development of this Institute as a campus-wide program, and encouraged the inclusion of representation from all of the Schools on the steering committee. Finally, APB enthusiastically supported the Ambassador Program, proposed by the Academic Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity, to help search committees attract diverse pools of outstanding faculty candidates. ([Appendix 9](#)) The Chancellor accepted two of APB's recommendations, agreeing to restore certain funds to Reg Fee units and to fund the Ambassador Program. ([Appendix 10](#))

Proposal for the UCSF Institute for Global Health

APB participated in a coordinated Academic Senate review of the proposal for a new ORU, the UCSF Institute for Global Health. A joint Task Force comprised of representatives from APB, Graduate Council, and the Committee on Research was formed. The Task Force enthusiastically supported the establishment of this ORU, but also identified several areas of concern, including a lack of projection of the anticipated number of students, concern whether adequate funding for the Institute would be available if the level of extramural funding were reduced, the lack of a statement justifying why the mission of the Institute cannot be accomplished within the existing campus structure, and the need for an indication that there is sufficient space for a proposed 50% growth of the program. ([Appendix 11](#))

APB Consideration of Campus Review Process for Academic Programs, Academic Units and Research Units

APB reviewed a draft document distributed by the UCSF Coordinating Committee, entitled "Campus Review Process for Academic Programs, Academic Units." ([Appendix 12](#)) This document identifies matters requiring Senate review, the originating body for each review, and the UCSF committees who are responsible for performing the review. In several instances, multiple committees are identified as having responsibility for a review. APB and Faculty Council Chairs were asked to provide Committee input. APB reviewed the document and noted that this year, APB had been asked to review and comment on several issues on very short notice. Graduate Council is identified as the lead committee for several issues that also include comment from APB, and APB agreed to ask Graduate Council for more notice of issues that would be coming to APB for comment. The Chair of APB made this request to the Chair of Graduate Council.



Allocation of New Faculty FTE

The issue of allocation of FTE and the Senate's role in that process was raised at the end of academic year 2001-02. UCSF receives FTE based on an 18 to 1 ratio of students to faculty (an undergraduate ratio) even though the ratios for graduate studies are dramatically different than those for undergraduates. Last year, APB agreed that the Senate should be involved in all future FTE allocation decisions, and discussions were held with Regis Kelly, Executive Vice Chancellor, to identify the best way of coordinating this type of review. This year, 12 new FTE were allocated among the four schools by an advisory committee to the Chancellor, which included the Chair of the Committee on Research, but did not include members of APB. These FTE were made available to hire faculty for new programs, such as bioinformatics and biotechnology. EVC Kelly discussed the process of allocating and distributing the FTE at an APB meeting. ([Appendix 13](#)) APB agreed to continue working on the goal of having programmatic FTE allocations come before the APB, which would then make recommendations to the Chancellor. This work will likely carry forward into academic year 2003-04.

APB Involvement in Short-and Long-Range Campus Planning Issues

The second component of the plan to increase faculty participation in the budget and planning process relates to APB involvement in short- and long-range campus planning issues. APB received reports on the following issues:

QB3 Institute: The California Institute for Quantitative Biomedical Research (QB3) is a cooperative effort among UCSF, UCB, UCSC and private industry to harness the quantitative sciences to integrate understanding of biological systems at all levels of complexity. (More information is available at: <http://www.qb3.org/>.) QB3 Director Marvin Cassman attended the October APB meeting and discussed QB3 issues with the Committee. Dr. Cassman offered to present a review annually to the Committee. He noted that QB3 is an anomaly with the normal academic structure at UC as it is neither an MRU (Multi-campus Research Unit) nor an ORU (Organized Research Unit). ([Appendix 14](#))

Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for the New Hospital:

APB received reports throughout the year from members of three subcommittees of the Long Range Development Plan Amendment Committee (LRDP Committee), including the Subcommittee on Financing and Implementation, the Hospital Replacement and Operations Subcommittee, and the Academic Planning Subcommittee. The report from the Academic Planning Subcommittee noted that planning for the physical plant of the new hospital has been separate from planning for the hospital's functions. In addition, APB member Bruce Spaulding, Vice Chancellor for Advancement and Planning, updated the Committee on the overall progress of the plans for a new hospital. It is anticipated that decisions regarding the LRDP Amendment will be made by the summer, written up in the fall or winter, and will be brought to the Regents for approval in 2004. APB agreed that planning for future practices at the hospital should begin. This work will likely be continued in 2003-04.



Other Issues

Campus-wide Unified Class Schedule: APB discussed the issue of instituting one schedule of classes for the entire campus, including potential cost savings, potential benefits for students in multidisciplinary programs, and possible mechanisms for obtaining feedback from the Schools. This work will likely be carried forward to 2003-04.

Indirect Costs: UCPB and UCORP have been conducting a joint review focusing on indirect cost recovery and use of indirect costs. An APB member is a UCPB representative to this joint review. On several campuses, the administration has treated indirect cost dollars as unrestricted discretionary funds. The joint review is continuing the effort to ensure that indirect costs are used to support the research infrastructure which generated them. UCSF has been doing better than other campuses in this regard. APB will continue to work toward increasing the percentage of indirect costs that are returned to the originating units at UCSF.

Issues for the 2003-2004 Academic Year

- Provide APB members with training and orientation relating to budget issues.
- Continue to improve communication between the Executive Budget Committee and APB.
- Continue to work on improving communication between the Faculty Councils and APB on budget issues.
- Issue budget recommendations for 2003-04.
- Continue to improve communication between APB and APB members and liaisons serving on long-range planning committees.
- Follow-up on ensuring that the Senate plays an integrated role in future faculty FTE allocation decisions.
- Review transmittals from all standing Senate Committees and Senate Officers relating to policy or other recommendations with a potential fiscal impact.
- See that appropriate campus procedures for QB3, including an operating budget, are developed in concert with Systemwide UCPB
- Consider Planning and Budget implications of Mission Bay plans
- Follow-up on creating a Campus-wide Unified Class Schedule
- Follow-up on Indirect Costs

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

Arnold J. Kahn, Chair
John Kane, Vice Chair
Lisa Bero



Dorothy Bainton, *ex officio*
 Steve Barclay, *ex officio*
 Marguerite Engler
 David Gardner
 Stanton Glantz
 Warren Gold
 Harold Goodis
 Deborah Greenspan
 Susan Janson
 Norman Oppenheimer
 Richard Price
 Jonathan Showstack
 Bruce Spaulding, *ex officio*
 Len Zegans, Division Vice Chair, *ex officio*

Prepared by:
 Melanie Fisch
 Senate Analyst
 (415) 476-4245
 www.ucsf.edu/senate

APPENDICES

- [Appendix 1:](#) Letter from APB to Daniel Bikle, Chair, Academic Senate, Burt Feuerstein, Chair, Graduate Council, and Jon Levine, Chair, Committee on Research Regarding Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 390 (1/30/03)
- [Appendix 2:](#) Letter from APB to Dorothy Bainton, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs Regarding Proposed Changes to APPM 310, 311 (4/15/03)
- [Appendix 3:](#) Letter from Task Force Reviewing Proposed Pharmastart Agreement to Daniel Bikle, Chair, Academic Senate Regarding Pharmastart Agreement (6/5/03)
- [Appendix 4:](#) Letter from Task Force Reviewing the Fifteen Year Review of the UC Institute for Mexico and the United States (UC Mexus) Regarding 15-Year Review (7/11/01)
- [Appendix 5:](#) Letter from Task Force on Review of the Fifteen Year Review of the UC Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation to Daniel Bikle, Chair, Academic Senate Regarding 15-Year Review (7/15/03)
- [Appendix 6:](#) Letter from APB to Daniel Bikle, Chair, Academic Senate, Regarding Proposal for Joint CSUSF and UCSF Doctorate in Physical Therapy (DPT) (2/3/02)
- [Appendix 7:](#) Letter from Task Force Reviewing Campus Five Year Perspective to Daniel Bikle, Chair, Academic Senate Regarding Review of Five Year Perspective (2/14/03)
- [Appendix 8:](#) Proposed Integration of the Academic Planning & Budget Committee into Campus Short- and Long-Range Planning and Budgeting (6/4/02)



- [Appendix 9](#): Letter from APB to J. Michael Bishop, Chancellor, Regarding Budget Recommendations (6/27/03)
- [Appendix 10](#): Letter from J. Michael Bishop, Chancellor, to APB Regarding APB's Budget Recommendations (7/16/03)
- [Appendix 11](#): Letter from Task Force on Review of Proposed UCSF Institute for Global Health to Daniel Bikle, Chair, Academic Senate, Regarding ORU Review (7/7/03)
- [Appendix 12](#): Draft Campus Review Process for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (2/13/03)
- [Appendix 13](#): Minutes of May 1, 2003 APB Meeting
- [Appendix 14](#): Minutes of October 3, 2002 APB Meeting