

Minutes of Meeting**May 10, 2013****I. Chair's Announcements***Dan Hare, UCFW Chair*

Update: Chair Hare updated the committee on highlights from the Academic Council meeting held in Sacramento on April 24. The entire Council spoke in opposition to SB 520, which would require UC to offer academic credit for all massive open online courses (MOOCs). The Council also continues to wrestle with issues involving intellectual property and online education. The governor has proposed new performance metrics, but many question the starting assumptions underlying them. Human Resources has been asked to explore rounding age, in a manner similar to UCRP service credit, for eligibility calculations for the current retiree health provisions.

Discussion: Members asked if the proposal to expand unionization rights to graduate student researchers (SB 259) was moving forward, and Chair Hare indicated that the topic did not arise specifically, but both the University's and the Council's long-standing position is to oppose it. Members also asked if there was any clear indication how the democratic super-majority would impact governance, but Chair Hare said that it was still too soon to tell. (Note: SB 259 was subsequently suspended until the next legislative session.)

II. Consent Calendar1. DRAFT Minutes of April 12, 2013 Meeting

Action: The Consent Calendar was approved as noticed.

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

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

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

Update: Chair White reported on two items: First, the office of the Chief Financial Officer has completed a liquidity study, and discussions about how best to use any excess liquidity are underway. Some recommend a direct infusion to UCRP to lower the unfunded liability and shrink the repayment horizon, but campus administrators see short term uses as being more important as present. Second, the California Actuarial Advisory Panel (CAAP) is charged to develop public pension system best practices. Recent discussion at the UCRS Advisory Board centered on the differences between level percent and level dollar funding practices. UC's unique retirement system and workforce needs can probably justify any UCRP deviation from recommended practices.

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

Susan Carlson, Vice Provost

1. Presidential Policies and APM 190s:

Issue: Most of the policies in this area apply to all employee groups: non-discrimination, whistleblower protections, etc. As relevant federal regulations change, UC must amend its guidelines, too. Should these policies be kept in the APM, or is there a better location for them?

Discussion: Members suggested that examining the issues one-by-one, rather than as a lump, would lead to better outcomes. VP Carlson agreed; noting that the whistleblower policy is time sensitive, but that other sections would be addressed in turn.

2. Salary Data:

Issue: VP Carlson presented comparative updates on UC faculty salaries, including hires and departures.

Discussion: Members asked whether the younger strata of new hires might usefully be collapsed, due to small totals. VP Carlson indicated that the reporting structure matches other reporting models, such as the age of first NIH grant, but there may be other, better models. Members also inquired how many of the 65+ faculty had 40 years of service credit, and VP Carlson indicated she would research the answer; revised data was circulated following the meeting. Members asked if high profile departures were captured differently, and VP Carlson indicated no. Members then asked how many recruitments and retentions were competitive. Unfortunately, academic culture often obscures the “competitiveness” of recruitments. Members also wondered what the underlying causes were of the observed decline in younger faculty/increase in older faculty, and whether competitive salaries might adjust the trend. It was speculated that besides being “cheaper”, older faculty may also enable departments to retain FTE funds.

3. Stop the Clock Expansion:

Issue: In response to a request from the Riverside division, VP Carlson’s office continues to develop revised language. A draft should be ready for evaluation in the fall.

VI. Systemwide Review Items

1. Senate Bylaw 55 (Departmental Voting Rights):

Issue: The San Diego division has submitted a proposal to expand departmental voting rights in some instances to non-Senate faculty, such as for personnel reviews. As the proposal indicates, it is felt that an over-emphasis on undergraduate teaching disadvantages faculty whose research, service, and graduate student training would otherwise qualify them for this privilege. Chair Hare noted that while the proposal specifically highlights the health sciences, the committee should consider whether other disciplines could benefit from similar action. He also reported that at Riverside, it is long-standing practice to record and report separately advisory votes from non-Senate Agronomists and Cooperative Extension Specialists.

Discussion: Members asked how advisory vote reporting was regulated and considered, and others asked how common was the practice. Other members

asserted that Senate faculty research and scholarship should not be evaluated by those with different conditions of employment. Members asked how lecturers were treated, and whether lessons could be learned there. Members also discussed the annual renewal of voting privileges and what behavior that would incentivize.

Action: Chair Hare will draft a response and circulate it electronically for approval.

2. APM 600 Series (Salary Administration):

Discussion: Members again asked if a “normal teaching load” had been defined, noting that some departments have written guidelines for all, while others seem to have unwritten, individual thresholds. It was noted that informal practices have a corrosive impact in this sensitive area.

Action: The draft response was approved as noticed.

3. APM 241 (Faculty Administrators):

Action: The committee elected to endorse the proposed revisions; Analyst Feer will draft a memo for electronic approval.

VII. Divisional Updates

Berkeley: 1) The new chancellor will officially start soon. 2) Child care affordability and capacity continues to be an issue: some consider it a benefit or perk, while others consider it a right and a shared obligation.

Davis: 1) The local CFW has questioned the impetus for the recent avalanche of APM revisions. 2) Enrollment management discussions need to include academic English preparation for international students.

Irvine: 1) Implementation of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program is still being defined; the number of participants is still unknown; creative accounting may mask the overall impact of the program. 2) Internal administrative divisions regarding composite benefits are surfacing, but the outcome is unclear. 3) Department chairs have begun receiving training in faculty mental health issues.

Los Angeles: 1) The local CFW discussed the possible ramifications of increased benefits assessments on summer salaries.

Merced: 1) The local CFW met with the provost recently, and discussion focused on a junior faculty mentoring program involving senior faculty from other campuses and on funding UCRP as quickly and fully as possible.

Riverside: The search for a new chancellor is proceeding; the hope is for an August announcement.

San Diego: The fate of the faculty welfare resource page/clearinghouse, especially for retirement transition resources, is under discussion.

San Francisco: 1) Changes to the retiree health benefits eligibility calculation are also being noticed anew at UCSF. 2) The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs recently announced his retirement. 3) The impacts to PI budgets of benefits pass-throughs are not yet known.

Santa Barbara: 1) Investigation has revealed inconsistent rules regarding active service modified duties, such as for the birth of twins versus a single child. 2) Charges for research resources are now proposed to extend to library carrels.

Santa Cruz: 1) Health care cost and choice are again issues. 2) Eligibility for the current provisions of retiree health has come into question as the change deadline looms. 3) The salary gap between Santa Cruz and the sister campuses makes competitive salary discussions more urgent. 4) Funding commitments for local housing projects are not being met.

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

Dwaine Duckett, Vice President

1. Retiree Health Eligibility:

Issue: With the change now imminent, many are realizing that their years of service and age will not add up to 50. For some, they will have fractional years of both age and service; for years of service, fractions are considered, while for age, fractions are not. Should similar counting rules be used on both sides of the equation?

Discussion: VP Duckett reported that individual exceptions were being reviewed, and a new rule was under discussion. The goal is not to be punitive or capricious, but to have a clear line of demarcation between the two packages. Members asked if decisions could be applied retroactively, given how soon July 1 will arrive. VP Duckett speculated that retroactivity could be an option, especially as the decision horizon may be extended. Chair Hare noted that the proposal submitted by UCFW has clear rules. VP Duckett indicated that the proposal had been received and was being vetted.

2. 2014 Open Enrollment:

Discussion: Members noted that recent coverage disruptions and/or realized price changes have had negative impacts on some campuses. VP Duckett noted that the goal each year is to minimize service disruption while providing adequate coverage.

3. Health Care Facilitator Funding:

Update: VP Duckett reported that incumbent funds of \$1.5M were approved, and that he has requested an additional \$1M. Questions about workload have arisen, though, and will need to be answered before final approvals are given.

Discussion: HCTF Chair May noted that overwork of the facilitators has impeded their ability to keep records. He added that the significant changes in health care coverage for 2014 should be messaged alongside notices about the Facilitators' and the service they provide.

4. Clinical Staff Support:

Update: Vice President Duckett reported that some service workers at the medical centers will strike. The situation seems likely to go to impasse and require 3rd party intervention.

5. Total Remuneration:

Update: VP Duckett reported that the project is moving forward, even though some chancellors seemed to balk at the expense of the study. Members asked if a draft proposal was available for vetting, and VP Duckett indicated that it would be made available when ready.

6. Upcoming Changes to the Retirement Administration Service Center (RASC) and UC Path:

With Joe Lewis, Director, RASC

Gary Schlimgen, Executive Director, Pension and Retirement Programs

Michael Waldman, Director, Customer Service, RASC

Anne Wolf, Director, Internal Communications, University Affairs

Issue: Several local CFWs have resources available for faculty transitioning into retirement, and several of the resources are targeted to specific geographic regions or to subpopulations with specific needs. As RASC moves to UCPath, and this type of resources is centralized and consolidated, members wonder where local resources can be preserved and how much local knowledge centralized RASC representatives will have. It was noted that several of the local resources are not currently “owned” by HR, so they may be unknown.

Discussion: Director Lewis reported that each location would retain its own benefits office that will work closely with the central hub. Director Waldman added that several UCRP education sessions have been scheduled, both for retirement counselors and for employees. Director Wolf noted that the retirement section of At Your Service was being rewritten, too, and it will be easy to include links to specific local resources; please forward them. Members noted that retiree and emeriti associations may have additional resources that should be included. Executive Director Schlimgen said that local resources will be included to the extent they are accurate and consistent with the University’s larger messaging on this topic; the Davis resource page seems to be a good model.

Members then asked how support budget and staffing would be impacted, and ED Schlimgen reported that it would vary by location. Some will pay for access to central support while others plan to use vacancy control to protect local resources. Members also asked about call protocols and dedicated service representatives either by issue or by employee. Director Waldman indicated that there would be a phone tree to help callers find the right specialist, but once initial contact had been made, the first counselor would be assigned as lead for the duration of the inquiry. ED Schlimgen noted that user feedback survey data will be available after July 1.

IX. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

1. Composite Benefit Rates

2. Faculty Salaries

3. Liquid Capital

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

X. New Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Dan Hare, UCFW Chair