

Minutes of Meeting**June 14, 2013****I. Chair's Announcements***Dan Hare, UCFW Chair*

Update: Chair Hare welcomed Mary Gilly, incoming Academic Council Vice Chair, and the members introduced themselves to her. Chair Hare reported that the Academic Council has heard more about the liquidity study and the potential impact to UCRP's funding status, but some campus leaders are persuaded that more short-term flexibility is more important. The proposed changes to Senate Bylaw 55 from the San Diego division were unanimously opposed by the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP); the proposal will go for wider review in the fall with both committees' positions enclosed. The governor's proposed performance metrics have been severed from budget increases, but they remain under discussion as general goals.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Minutes of May 10, 2013 UCFW Meeting

Action: The minutes were approved as noticed.

III. Health Care Task Force (HCTF) Update*Robert May, HCTF Chair*

Update: Chair May reported on several items of interest from the task force's May 29 meeting:

1. A clarification memo from Vice President Duckett regarding funding for the Health Care Facilitators is expected soon.
2. The UC Care program has new stewards following personnel changes at the Office of the President. The final decision-making time frame is still unclear.
3. Human Resources and their external consultants will work closely with HCTF to develop clear messaging regarding the changes for Open Enrollment. Changes from the Affordable Care Act will also need to be communicated.
4. Former UCFW Chair Bill Parker will chair HCTF next year.

IV. Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) Update*Shane White, TFIR Chair*

Update: Chair White reported on several items of interest:

1. UCFW members are encouraged to lobby local decision makers about the wisdom of fully funding UCRP as soon as possible.
2. The Regents approved a new asset allocation for UCRP investments; the broader categories are designed to allow the treasurer greater flexibility.
3. How to integrate employees from the UCSF acquisition of Oakland Children's Hospital into UCRP is being deliberated.
4. The UCRS Advisory Board will meet next week.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President – Academic Personnel

Susan Carlson, Vice Provost

1. Faculty Salaries

Issue: Chair Hare encouraged VP Carlson to continue advocating for faculty salary increases; retroactively applied increases should also be considered.

2. Faculty Departure Data

Issue: The data do not reveal motive or commitment. The reasons for departures remain unclear, as do the reasons for denials of tenure. “First choice” recruitments are thought to be exaggerated due to academic culture.

Discussion: Chair Hare inquired if normative data were available, and VP Carlson indicated no, the uniqueness of each institution prevents meaningful data acquisition. Members asked if there were clear differences by discipline, or data regarding retention vis-à-vis outside offers. VP Carlson reminded members that data is time-lagged, but that usually 80% of faculty who receive outside offers are retained; comparator rates are unknown. VP Carlson added that “first choice” recruitments may be better captured with the new UC Recruit tool, but that additional funds would be needed to capture exit survey information. Members observed that not all decision makers want to know this information, so central leadership will be necessary.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Budget

Patrick Lenz, Vice President

Update: VP Lenz noted that it had been a difficult year in Sacramento, and he thanked the Senate for its support, especially in crafting the messages regarding online education and the performance outcome measures. Many bills in Sacramento seem to be punitive rather than collaborative. The state still does not include unfunded students and over-enrolled students in its reports and calculations, which disadvantages UC and the students. UC also received approval for additional debt restructuring; of the \$80M realized, \$62 can be used for UCRP funding and \$15M for the UCR School of Medicine. Negotiations continue regarding a multi-year funding plan, mandatory increases, salary growth, tuition rates, etc.

Discussion: Members asked if VP Lenz was happy with the budget, and he indicated that the UCRP set aside was significant. He added that the debt restructuring agreement was also a victory. Members asked if UCRP funding will grow, given its new location. VP Lenz indicated that the addition of bond revenue to the University’s base budget would increase overall funding proportionately, growing next year’s 5% increase. Members then asked how enrollment management played into funding discussions, and VP Lenz said it was framed within the context of the Master Plan, but no details have emerged. Members finally asked about the new bond strategy, and VP Lenz suggested that it was still being formulated.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Human Resources

Dwaine Duckett, Vice President (via phone)

1. Total Remuneration Study Update

With Dennis Larsen, Executive Director, Compensation Programs and Strategy

Update: Director Larsen reported that he had presented the planned remuneration study to the Council of Chancellors, who had concerns about the resources and time involved, as well as the utility of the study. It was thought that the deans know the market well enough already, and that OP could simply revalue the retirement plan.

Discussion: Members noted that total remuneration should not be cut into component parts, and Council Chair Powell observed that President Yudof was supportive of the study, despite the misgivings of some chancellors. Members then discussed whose responsibility the study was, and decided it was a system responsibility and that the Office of the President should pay. Next, members discussed the level of cooperation needed from the campuses to conduct an effective study. Director Larsen noted that the level of cooperation needed was dependent upon the level of detail desired from the study; for ladder-rank faculty only, the process should be straightforward. Council Chair Powell observed that the Regents need to know this information, as will the new president; if a faculty-only study must be pursued due to complexity or resource limitations, that is acceptable, but not ideal. Members then sought assurances that this and subsequent studies would be methodologically cohesive. Director Larsen agreed with the importance of having consistent longitudinal data collected at a regular period.

Action: Chair Hare will draft a letter to the Academic Council calling on President Yudof to support and direct completion of the study.

2. 1990 Retiree Health Tier Eligibility Calculation

With Gary Schlimgen, Executive Director, Pension and Retirement Programs (via phone)

Discussion: Chair Hare asked if the decision to round-up half-years of age was final, and VP Duckett said yes. Director Schlimgen added that as a result of the new calculation, 670 additional staff were grandfathered into the 1990 retiree health tier, which is 1% of the impacted population. Further rounding is still being discussed, but savings goals are firm. Also, any changes to the calculation of service credit would involve Regental action. The fact sheet and webinar slides have been updated to reflect the change.

3. Health Care Facilitator Funding and Messaging

Discussion: Chair Hare asked about the status of the clarification memo regarding protected central funding for the health care facilitators. VP Duckett replied that the memo had been sent and campus chief human resource officers had been reminded. HCTF Chair May asked if there would be a funding increase, and VP Duckett indicated that no decision had yet been made. Members asked for a copy of the memo, and VP Duckett will forward it.

4. Health and Welfare Rebid Update

Update: VP Duckett reported that the bids are coming in. The cost increases are expected to be modest, but final design decisions have not yet been made. Middle to late July is the final decision time frame.

VIII. Systemwide Review Items

1. Negotiated Salary Trial Program Evaluation Metrics

Discussion: Members noted that the metrics conflate individual goals with departmental measurements. Members also noted that partial instruction and research appointments disappear. Some added that unclear implementation guidelines preclude effective evaluation. Many members were concerned that several important program goals will not be identified until after the trial has been running, further impeding development of evaluative metrics.

Action: Chair Hare will report these concerns to the Council.

2. Revised Open Access Proposal

Discussion: The revised proposal has adjusted targets, but many previously articulated concerns regarding copyright remain.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a memo summarizing the committee's concerns.

IX. Faculty Salaries

Note: Item occurred in executive session; other than action items, no notes were taken.

X. New Business

1. July UCFW Meeting

Update: The decision of whether to meet in July will be made after the June Academic Council meeting.

Adjournment at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Dan Hare, UCFW Chair