

**Minutes of Meeting**  
**March 11, 2011**

**I. Chair's Announcements**

*William Parker, UCFW Vice Chair*

*Bob Anderson, Academic Council Vice Chair*

**UPDATE:** Vice Chair Parker reported that Chair Dimsdale is attending a previously scheduled professional obligation. Council Vice Chair Anderson provided a summary of the February 23 Academic Council meeting: (1) WASC is looking to streamline its accreditation processes, and may create tiers of accreditation. (2) The budget rebenching process may require a 2-3 year phase-in period due to its complexity and the need to educate stakeholders; a steering committee with Senate representation is being formed and will convene soon. (3) The Council approved the charge and membership for the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR); the charge is similar to that of ACSCOLI. (4) If the Governor's ballot efforts fail, UC could expect another \$500M cut, which could cripple the academic and research enterprises if the decision-making priority remains access, rather than quality.

**II. Consent Calendar**

*Note: Item not addressed.*

**III. Update: Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR)**

*Helen Henry, TFIR Chair*

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

**ACTION:** UCFW echoes the TFIR position, and will recommend that the Academic Council support allowing faculty representatives to the UCRS Advisory Board to serve their full term, even if they become emeriti during their term.

**IV. UCB Emergency Back-Up Care Pilot Program Report**

*Angy Stacy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Equity, UC Berkeley*

*Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office, systemwide Office of Research and Graduate Studies, and Chair, Office of the President's Advisory Council on the Status of Women (PACSW)*

*Elly Skarakis, Director of Strategic Planning for Office of Talent Management and Staff Development, systemwide Human Resources*

**ISSUE:** The Berkeley campus has completed a successful pilot program that offered emergency back-up care to adjunct professors. The service, provided in conjunction with Bright Horizons, allows participants to access last-minute or pre-planned emergency care for children or adult dependents. The service was subsidized by the campus, allowing participants to pay \$2/hr for center-based care or \$4/hr for home-based care; this is a significant savings over the standard hourly rate with is nearly \$20. The service does count as imputed income at the full value, however. Further, participants can interview and request particular care providers. The service is valuable not only when regular care

providers are themselves ill, but also when University and community calendars do not align. Lastly, the service is available nationwide, enabling participants to access care while on business travel.

Next steps will include expanding the Berkeley program to all ladder-rank faculty. UCSF is also in negotiations to start a program, but the parameters will be different: copay rates, enrollment fees, and institutional subsidy, if any, are all negotiated independently by each location. UCSB will also start a pilot for associate and assistant ladder-rank faculty. Finally, LBNL is will also pilot a program, which has already been approved by the Department of Energy. The benefits in terms of absences prevented and faculty morale clearly outweigh the fees of the program.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked if the care providers were required to pass background checks, and AVC Stacy answered yes and reminded the committee of the option to personally vet providers. Members also asked if overnight service was available, and AVC Stacy indicated that evening and late night care is available. Members also asked as to the cost of the pilot to the Berkeley campus. AVP Stacy said that the pilot cost about \$30K/yr for 300 assistant professors, and the anticipated cost for the expanded program is \$100K/yr (maintaining the same level of subsidy). Some members indicated that other faculty might prefer a cash option that would allow for greater flexibility and not require participants to use a single company.

Members asked how close to completion the contracts were at the new pilot locations, and estimates are expected in a few weeks. Members also noted that if a location does not provide adequate subsidy, \$20/hr would be cost prohibitive to many. PACSW Chair Croughan observed that despite the cost, having access to pre-vetted care givers is highly valued. Members then inquired if sliding pay scales were possible. Chair Croughan indicated yes, noting that each pilot location is setting different copay rates; some are paying all enrollment fees, while others are merely providing access to the program; some are allowing all faculty access, while others are opening the pilot on a limited basis.

Director Skarakis added that expansion of the program systemwide was likely, but would require a full RFP. Nonetheless, both President Yudof and HR Vice President Duckett are supportive of the effort. Members noted that improved family friendly policies would enhance UC's competitive edge in the recruitment and retention marketplace.

**ACTION:** UCFW will receive a further update when more specific language and parameters for the next pilots have been finalized.

## **V. Divisional Updates**

**IRVINE:** Irvine has conducted a budget survey, and the results are available [online](#).

**RIVERSIDE:** Similar to the Irvine division, Riverside has conducted a budget survey, and the results will be shared as soon as they are available.

## **VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Academic Personnel**

*Susan Carlson, Vice Provost*

### **1. Alternate Compensation Plans:**

**ISSUE:** Adapting the Health Sciences Compensation Plan for adoption in other disciplines, such as business, engineering, and law, is being explored as a means

of maintaining as much local fiscal flexibility as possible. A draft should be available later in the spring for evaluation and comment.

**DISCUSSION:** Members queried whether the inherent instability in grant funding should be codified into University policy, as it might wrongly incentivize faculty or over-empower deans and chairs.

2. Alternate Faculty Profiles:

**ISSUE:** Another measure being explored to meet current exigencies is encouragement of part-time faculty or teaching-only faculty. Phased retirement is being explored in another venue.

**DISCUSSION:** Members warned against creating a faculty cohort that did not emphasize research and service along with teaching: Most UC faculty came for the research opportunities, not the teaching opportunities.

Members asked how likely phased retirement was to be enacted, noting that previous efforts have failed due to lack of administrative support and insufficient monetary incentives. It was noted that previously, phased retirement had only been framed as good for faculty; now, it can be framed as good for budget, too, and thus may be more likely to garner widespread support.

3. LSOE Salary Data:

**ISSUE:** This data was generated following requests to see how LSOE were being paid, and whether expanding their ranks would be a cost-effective option to meet increasing teaching requirements during times of financial distress.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked whether LSOEs were eligible for off-scale compensation, and VP Carlson indicated that policy does not allow for such practices, although a few exceptions have been made. Members noted that it would be difficult to persuade current faculty to move into a lecturer category to teach more and earn less.

4. Recruitment and Retention:

**DISCUSSION:** Members again noted that UC's recruitment and retention statistics were misleading, due to self-selection, targeted recruitments, and the academic culture's practice of only offering positions when acceptance is foregone. VP Carlson observed that retention and recruitment were not discreet events that lent themselves to easy quantification. Members worried, though, that the high rates reflected in the data might convey the wrong message to outside observers: that UC was hiring its first choice applicants, that UC faculty were not seeking alternate employment, and that UC's academic backbone has not suffered during the budget crisis. Others observed, however, that for many in the legislature, "good enough" has become satisfactory for UC. That belief is bolstered by crisis response actions which neglect long-term planning and comprehensive framing. Members asserted that the administration was also contributing to that attitude by emphasizing undergraduate teaching to the neglect of UC's other mission charges.

## **VII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Academic Affairs**

*Larry Pitts, Provost*

**ISSUE:** Discussion continues on how to meet the budget cuts. Unpalatable trade-offs now seem to be the only options. Provost Pitts asks UCFW for more ideas or parameters for decision-making.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked whether the number of non-resident applicants had decreased as fees had increased and state support had dwindled. Provost Pitts indicated that those trends have not been monitored. Members then asked if California enrollment could be capped at the rate of state support, with the remainder of slots going to non-residents. Provost Pitts indicated that the Commission on the Future had recommended a 10% cap on non-resident enrollment, but discussions could re-open. Members also asked whether higher fees could be levied soon, and the Provost stated that the Regents do not want to meet budget on the backs of the students. Members asked whether shortening the time to degree would yield measurable savings, and Provost Pitts indicated that preferential course enrollment would be needed, which could negatively impact the public's assessment of access; also, the cost savings estimates are not significant.

Members noted that enrollment growth plans were divorced from physical realities, like lecture hall capacity and lab space. Perhaps discussion should focus not on campuses that can accommodate growth, but which departments can do so and at what rate of subsidy. The balance between public and private funding has shifted, perhaps irrevocably. UC might consider privatizing some departments and reallocating their state support to impacted majors, for example. The Provost observed that only the UCLA Anderson School of Business currently has a proposal on the table to withdraw itself from state support, and that most units do not feel they could entirely forego state support.

Some members felt that too much emphasis was being placed on undergraduates, and argued that graduate students, who are the faculty pipeline, need more dedicated support or their flight will hasten. It was posited that some return-to-aid funds could be rededicated, and the Provost noted that such plans were already being explored for legality, political feasibility, and possible diversity consequences. Members noted that the budget discussions taking place on the campuses focus on library hours and non-major lab curtailment. Such efforts will be inadequate to meet the expected cuts, but as limiting enrollment to protect quality is not considered a viable alternative, members fear UC will bleed out while tough decisions are not made.

### **VIII. Update: Health Care Task Force (HCTF)**

*Robert May, HCTF Chair*

**UPDATE:** Chair May reminded members that the HCTF will meet on April 6. Chair May also reported that he had just come from the StayWell annual briefing with Human Resources. While StayWell continues to make progress in preventative care and wellness maintenance, the health and welfare budget will not grow, thus making the expected \$150M inflation increase a proportionate cut to services. New design options are being explored, including lower subsidies for dependent coverage.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked whether the pay bands would be adjusted as a design change, and Chair May indicated that no decisions had been made, but that the pay bands are a topic of conversation.

**ACTION:** Members should consult with their home constituencies and send preferences for design options in advance of the April 6 HCTF meeting.

### **IX. Consultation with the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP)**

*Ahmet Palazoglu, UCAP Chair (via phone)*

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

**ACTION:** UCFW will explore further whether the stated purpose for APM 510 remains valid.

## **X. Consultation with the Office of the President – Human Resources**

*Dennis Larsen, Executive Director, Compensation Programs and Strategy*

### **1. Health Sciences Total Remuneration Study Update:**

**ISSUE:** The health sciences total remuneration study is being put on hold due to budget concerns. The external vendors with whom UC contracts to conduct the analyses have returned fee estimates that are cost prohibitive, with the benefits portion estimated to cost between \$350-600K and the cash compensation portion at \$250K. Given the uncertain outcome of the study – UC's HSCP is unique, so apples-to-apples comparisons will not be possible – the provost is reluctant to commit funds to the exercise. Further, no means of remediation exists for any problems that may come to light.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked what an affordable cost for the project would be, and Director Larsen indicated that initial guesses were closer to a total of \$400-500K, making the \$600-900K total unaffordable. Members then asked how much precision would be necessary to enable deans to better prepare offers and counteroffers. Director Larsen noted that the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) collects some data, but only on a voluntary basis and not in all areas of interest, such as dentistry, pharmacy, and veterinary. Members asked if other stakeholders had been approached to cover the funding gap, such as the division of health sciences and services or the medical center deans themselves. Director Larsen indicated that such options were still open; another option might be for UC to start its own survey and solicit external support from others who would benefit from the same data.

### **2. SMG Banding Update:**

**ISSUE:** In 2005, the Regents approved an SMG slotting policy, but the Academic Senate asked for more time to evaluate and comment. In 2007, a revised policy was presented, but again, no final agreement was reached. The current proposal will eliminate stratification by campus in favor of creating standard minimums, midpoints, and maximums for SMG as is currently done for other staff categories, such as PSS. It is expected that many will be in the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile range, but the intent of the project is not to achieve market parity, but to understand how UC compares. Draft language should be available by late spring.

**DISCUSSION:** Members sought clarification on who would benefit from this study, and Director Larsen noted it was for in-house use only, as another evaluative benchmark.

## **XI. Follow-up Discussion and New Business**

### **1. Budget Update**

*Patrick Lenz, Vice President (via phone)*

**UPDATE:** The Governor continues to seek bipartisan support for this budget referendum, but several sticking points remain, such as pension reform and a state

spending cap. Efforts to educate new legislators and improve LAO framing of UC issues and finances continue: new calculations on the marginal cost of instruction overemphasize fee revenue and skew data absent thoughtful contextualization of recent cuts.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked if there was a firm deadline yet for the June ballot initiatives, and VP Lenz indicated that March 15 was the current deadline, but that it may yet change again. Members then asked if a later ballot could occur, and VP Lenz indicated that while a July referendum could occur, impacts to the fiscal year budgets are significant, and turnout could be a significant concern.

2. UC's Academic Quality:

**ACTION:** Vice Chair Parker will draft a statement positioning UC's need to maintain quality as the primary decision-making determinant, not fiscal constraints.

Adjournment 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: William Parker, UCFW Vice Chair