

Minutes of Meeting**May 13, 2011****I. Announcements***Joel Dimsdale, UCFW Chair**Bill Parker, UCFW Vice Chair***1. Connexxus Travel Program:**

DISCUSSION: Chair Dimsdale asked members how UCFW could most productively influence the trajectory and operations of the Connexxus travel program, the effectiveness of which is viewed oppositely by administration. Members suggested that the senior manager involved should be the first contact, and that he should be given advance notice of the types of questions, and compelling answers, the committee anticipates. Others wondered if direct faculty participation on the steering committee would yield results. Some, however, felt that an underlying concept gap needed to be addressed first, given that perceptions of the program are so widely divergent, despite the available data.

Members also wondered whether the Senate should request participation on other efforts under the Working Smarter Initiative umbrella, such as the new personnel payroll system.

2. Academic Council meeting of April 27, 2011:

Update: Vice Chair Parker attended in lieu of Chair Dimsdale, and he reported on the following items of interest to the committee: i) In Sacramento, discussions have begun with the executive branch to explore the option of another IOU from the state for UCRP funding; such would constitute a symbolic gesture and acknowledgement of the state's responsibility to help fund the program; ii) President Yudof reported that he was heartened to hear public statements of support for higher fee limits vis-à-vis budget cuts; iii) impact studies of a 20% fee raise are underway; iv) the online education pilot project is suffering from inconsistent messaging, especially in the funding front where anticipated external investment has not materialized but has been replaced by an internal funding transfer from STIP to be repaid by non-resident enrollment in the program. Long-term fiscal projections are also of concern, as are unresolved issues surrounding intellectual property and copyright; v) the Implementation Task Force, which is charged to help develop means of operationalizing the recommendations of the Powell Committee Report, is currently focusing on framing undergraduate enrollment in the context of both cost and quality; vi) discussion on Senate membership continues, and the campuses with medical centers are caucusing to develop specific areas in need of redress they feel were inadequately addressed by the Task Force.

II. Consent Calendar**NOTE:** Item deferred.

III. Campus Updates

Members

Berkeley: The back-up care program will be rolled out on a wider basis on July 1.

Davis: 1) The local CFW is investigating whether part-time grant-funded employees can recharge full subsidy costs to the grant; 2) An RFP for local implementation of the back-up care program is currently out.

Irvine: Faculty are satisfied with local parking arrangements.

Los Angeles: Work on the mandatory training joint work group has had a fitful start due to a lack of clarity regarding the roles of the various players.

Merced: The divisional Senate continues to gain momentum. Follow-up of implementation of suggested changes to the Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) continues.

Office of the President: Last week was Ethics and Compliance Week; representatives from that unit staffed an informational table.

Riverside: none.

San Diego: none.

San Francisco: 1) Local implementation guidelines for APM 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan) are being revised; 2) a resolution on marriage equality and its impacts on health care disparities is under consideration.

Santa Barbara: none.

Santa Cruz: none.

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

Susan Carlson, Vice Provost

1. Faculty Profiles

i. Salary Task Force

ISSUE: This group is charged to develop recommendations for implementing the projected 3% salary increase; recommendations are due in June.

DISCUSSION: Members again favored applying the increase directly to the scales. Vice Provost Carlson noted, however, that local actors want more autonomy in determining the precise allotments. Members asked how public perception was being factored into the decision making, and VP Carlson indicated that the group had not been charged to discuss those aspects of the proposal. Council Chair Simmons added that work in Sacramento on this topic continues, and minor progress has been made. Members also asked whether faculty at ½ steps were being considered as on-scale or off-scale by the task force, and VP Carlson answered that they were categorized as off-scale.

ii. Part-time Faculty Task Force

ISSUE: The group continues meeting to devise methods of better advertising and implementing the favorably-reviewed guidelines already in place. Analysis so far indicates while only a small percentage of general campus faculty are on part-time appointments, the history of the practice remains opaque. Preliminary findings suggest no clear relationship between gender and part-time status. Phased retirement and recall practices are the next topic of focus.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired whether the work of the task force was considering the impacts of proposed cuts to benefit subsidies to part-time employees. VP Carlson indicated that the group had not yet considered them, but would add them to the discussion docket. Members also inquired whether prohibitions on split FTE were being considered, but others noted that the practice may be a localized one. Members asked whether the allotment of benefit subsidies was slated for discussion, suggesting that some departments fund a disproportionate amount; VP Carlson will investigate further.

iii. Academic Personnel White Paper

ISSUE: Academic Personnel has drafted a white paper on the history and evolution of faculty profiles at UC. Academic Personnel now ask UCFW for feedback on the draft.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that the increased disallowance of multiple funding sources contradicts claims that the University supports flexibility in funding faculty salaries; the UCSF campus is revising its guidelines on outside professional activities to combat this trend. Other members noted that some disciplines do not have external funding sources to turn to.

Members suggested that the salary scales could be cast better as an agent for career management, positing that the utility of barrier steps might be more fully explored. Others thought that the strength of the scales lies in their reliance on peer review for promotion should be highlighted more prominently. The scales' uniformity across the system is also a laudable characteristic and practice. Despite this, that the scales lag competitors makes mid-career recruitments and retentions especially difficult. Members noted that the philosophical determination of whether to stay at a public university was not one the scales could influence meaningfully.

Members also noted that the associate professor scales were particularly woeful, leading to retention difficulties. The only recourse open to faculty is to cajole the matching of external offers. Members agreed, though, that market brinksmanship was a dangerous game, for both the individual faculty member and the institution. Worse, the loyalty penalty and gaps in new hires start-up packages exacerbate the inadequacy of the scales. One member noted that his current dissertation advisees' first job salaries are in excess of Step IX salaries, but that practice may be discipline-specific.

2. Family Friendly Policies

ISSUE: The committee discusses whether dependents' tuition fee waivers would be an acceptable alternative for a salary bump in the current environment.

DISCUSSION: Members observed that given the salary lag, a tuition remission program would be a less costly alternative and could be significantly more helpful with mid-career retentions. Others reminded the committee that both UCFW and the Academic Council have previously endorsed these proposals, but that local officials did not sign-on to the programs. More recently, even UCFW has recommended that other programs be prioritized above fee waivers given the persistent zero-sum funding environment. Nonetheless, it was noted that staff constituencies would also benefit from such a program, and it was speculated that staff partnership in a proposal could be secured.

Members requested updated information on the number of faculty presumed to be eligible for the program, while others suggested that the University would be better served by directly addressing the root recruitment and retention problem: salary scale inadequacy.

3. APM Reviews

i. 668 (Negotiated Salaries)

DISCUSSION: Members objected to inclusion of a “good standing” criteria, citing unrefuted arguments made during previous APM 670 revision discussions (see, *inter alia*, [January 2009 UCFW minutes](#), p6). Members also objected to the removal of negotiated salary components from merit review processes, linking such a move to a further erosion of academic authority. Members noted that grant funding availability was also not actually negotiable with administrative personnel. VP Carlson indicated that the language was purposefully broad to include both professional degree fee money and endowment funds. Members then sought clarification regarding the limits of the prohibition on the transfer of negotiated rates between campuses.

Members inquired whether external funders had agreed to the proposed pooling of funds. VP Carlson responded that the investigation to date has only included soliciting the opinions of contracts and grants officers, who did not object. Members indicated that such pooling would not be workable in some disciplines, and questioned the wisdom of codifying such limited-application processes in the APM. Others added that such off-the-top fund collection had been voted down in other discussions, too. Interim Executive Director Price clarified that only 19900 funds would be pooled, not contract and grant overheads.

Members also asked on which components health and welfare benefit contributions would be calculated, and it was answered that those rates would continue to be tied to a faculty member’s pay band. Members noted that previously identified pitfalls in the model APM (670)’s proposed revisions were repeated here, and that the loss of peer review left only fundraising success as a metric for merit.

ii. 200 and 205 (Recalls)

DISCUSSION: Members asked for a summary of specific changes to the policy, and VP Carlson indicated that there were none, only repackaging to improve clarity. Members asked how the Z-component was being calculated, and VP Carlson answered that it would be optional on recall, leaving outside professional activities uncapped. Members also asked how the 43% was to be calculated – by year, quarter, etc – and whether it would be set at the APU level as opposed to the department level, or other. VP Carlson asked for submission of the question in writing.

Members also noted that the 43% cap was non-negotiable as it is a federal limit, not an internal one. VP Carlson indicated that the limit does not apply to pre-65 retirees since it is a Medicare limit, and thus only an exception to policy is required, rather than a separate policy. Members then questioned the threshold of “extreme exigency” for such exceptions to policy.

Members reminded VP Carlson that this project needed to be integrated with the phased-retirement investigation (see above), and wondered whether the regulatory pendulum were swinging too far in favor of risk mitigation at the expense of academic fulsomeness. Risk should be balanced, not eliminated at all costs.

iii. 510 (Intercampus Recruitments)

ISSUE: HCTF Chair May outlined the two options for revision: one would eliminate the rank barrier, and the other would remove the salary barrier, although a combined removal could also be drafted. Neither version retains the cap on start-up expenses.

DISCUSSION: Members supported the move to allow for greater internal competition, but were wary of removing the start-up cap due to concerns of “double-dipping”. Members then suggested adjusting the cap upward to reflect current realities. Members noted that administrative opposition to either proffered emendation would be inconsistent with their stated support for increased off-scale authority and salary autonomy at the local level.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft correspondence to the Academic Council asking that they request Academic Personnel to begin drafting revisions for full review.

iv. 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan)

UPDATE: VP Carlson reported that a new draft revision should be available for circulation next week.

V. Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership

UPDATE: (See Item I.2.vi. above.)

**VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Human Resources:
Health Science Total Remuneration Study Update**

Dennis Larsen, Executive Director, Compensation Programs and Strategy

ISSUE: Mr. Larsen reported that the cost estimates for conducting the study were significantly higher than anticipated, and that, as a result, the deans were unable to fund the study. The deans contend that currently available market data are sufficient, but not all stakeholders are as certain. Unfortunately, the other stakeholders cannot fund the study, either. External data on competitor institutions is both needed and unavailable. Provost Pitts has suggested that an alternative to a full total remuneration study might be to solicit targeted data only, such as covered compensation and outside income limitations. Vice Provost Carlson noted that her department will soon be able to provide additional payroll data, following the simplification of the title codes.

DISCUSSION: Members observed that non-Senate faculty were disproportionately impacted by the lack of data in this area, but others posited that on a case-by-case basis, recruitments may be easier absent systemwide data. Mr. Larsen wondered if investigating turnover might reveal what the data would suggest, but members cautioned that self-reporting of preferred recruitments is not always accurate and observed that exit interviews are far from common.

Members asked whether Provost Pitts’ had committed to funding his alternative study, , should it be endorsed. Mr. Larsen indicated that funding had not been

preapproved and that the particulars of the request could impact its likelihood of receiving funds.

Members then speculated as to unintended outcomes, should data become available, such as increased calls for a hybrid pension system or increased poaching by showing shortcomings. Members also speculated as to what types of targeted data would be most useful, and how they might be acquired or estimated by proxy measurements. Finally, members wondered whether a policy analysis might suffice to elucidate competitor practices, rather than an incomplete analysis of financial data.

ISSUE: Recent messaging regarding the federal Retiree Reinsurance program needs clarified.

ACTION: Mr. Larsen will relay the request to Gary Schlimgen, Director of Pension and Retirement Programs.

ISSUE: The Davis campus is set to blend some benefits rates as of July 1, but messaging on this effort needs augmented.

ACTION: Mr. Larsen will relay the request to Mike Baptista, Executive Director of Benefits Programs and Strategy.

VII. Online Education Project

DISCUSSION: Members sought assurances that the Office of the President project was not duplicating or pre-empting any local efforts already underway. Members also wondered whether UC should limit itself to one platform at this still early stage in software development. Members recalled previous concerns involving copyright, intellectual property, and overload that have yet to be answered. Members noted that the business plan needs careful evaluation and monitoring.

VIII. Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) Update

Helen Henry, TFIR Chair

UPDATE: The impact on UC of various pension reform efforts under discussion in Sacramento is not yet known, nor is the likely fate of the various proposals. TFIR continues to monitor developments.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired as to the limits of UC's state constitutional autonomy, specifically whether such ballot initiatives could apply to UCRP. Council Vice Chair Anderson indicated that UC's autonomy may not necessarily extend to that area, depending on an initiative's specific wording; any such efforts would surely be subjected to court review by one or another of UC's constituencies. Members wondered whether a pre-emptive statement would be useful, or if it would only invite unwanted scrutiny.

IX. Health Care Task Force (HCTF) Update

Robert May, HCTF Chair

UPDATE: HCTF will meet in three weeks, and issues under investigation include: i) cost savings options, such as eliminating employer-provided COBRA coverage for the month after a separation and reduced subsidy rates for part-time employees, although the precise rates per employment level, as well as the levels themselves, are still to be determined; ii) how Medicare exchange vendors continue to market their service, even though both

CUCEA and CUCRA had the same initial reservations as did HCTF; iii) insurance while on sabbatical abroad, and whether the University needs to offer gap coverage; iv) how the health care facilitators can be better advertised and their services improved; v) whether the pay bands should be retained, amended, or ended; vi) self-insuring.

DISCUSSION: Members asked whether the StayWell program was meeting its goals, and Chair May indicated that at an update earlier in the spring, minimal impacts on lifestyle were suggested by the data, but program outcomes are hard to quantify and require longitudinal study.

X. New Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Joel Dimsdale, UCFW Chair