

**Minutes of Meeting
November 8, 2013**

I. Chair's Announcements

Gayle Binion, Vice Chair

Update: Vice Chair Binion convened the meeting as Chair Hare and a few members were experiencing travel-related delays. The Academic Council letter on Composite Benefit Rates is still being edited. President Napolitano has issued a 60-day deadline to the strike force investigating the findings of the "Moreno Report"; they are also to issue recommendations within the same time-frame. Members are encouraged to check with their divisional leadership for guidance regarding next steps for the Innovative Teaching and Learning Initiative (ILTI). Changes to the MOP program do not seem to have significantly impacted eligibility.

II. Consent Calendar

1. DRAFT Minutes of October 11, 2013

Action: The minutes were approved as amended.

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

Jim Chalfant, TFIR Chair

Update: Chair Chalfant reported on two items of interest:

1. Public Pension Initiative: San Jose Mayor Reed is spearheading an effort to allow the state of California and municipalities alter pension obligations, in what some see as a violation of the "vested rights" doctrine. Signatures are being gathered, and a media campaign is underway. During UC's PEB process, it was determined that such action could not legally be taken, and so the 2013 Tier was developed to lower costs going forward without harming accrued benefits. The University's official response to the initiative is still being developed, and TFIR is helping to draft it.
2. UCRP Funded Status: TFIR has requested additional modeling on the plan's funded status in order to better determine the impact of delays in reaching the Regent's funding plan and to better explain the long-term implications of such delays.

IV. Divisional Reports

Berkeley: 1) UC Care coverage and access have been discussed at length. 2) Child care services on or proximate to campus still need to be increased. 3) The use of Extend Health has many concerned that active employees will soon be forced into a similar arrangement.

Davis: 1) UC Care coverage is an issue here, too. 2) Retirement counseling services are being centralized under UCOP, but many do not have high levels of confidence in UCOP, given their trouble leading other benefits changes.

Discussion: Members are reminded of the difference between transactional retirement services and pre-retirement counseling services; the former may be easily centralized.

3) The local CFW is monitoring hiring and discipline practices at the medical center.

Irvine: 1) Many questions about the rates to be charged for child care and other contracted services under UC Care have arisen, rather than access issues. The complexities retirees face,

especially with a user-unfriendly website, are also of concern. 2) Local efforts to enhance faculty mental health programs continue.

Los Angeles: (absent at this time)

Merced: (absent at this time)

Riverside: (absent at this time)

San Diego: 1) The local CFW is developing a survey of Open Enrollment information and processes. 2) The local division has submitted a resolution objecting to the process by which UC Care was developed and communicated. 3) Recently retired faculty have been subject to email purges as a result of a payroll coding change.

San Francisco: The impacts of rebenching are being felt by individual faculty members as several costs have been pushed to the departmental level, rather than being funded from a central reserve.

Discussion: Members noted that similar impacts were being felt elsewhere. Schools are receiving bills for their benefits, and some external funders have capped benefits spends, leaving faculty and departments to cover the gap; impacted units and individuals are being encouraged to develop “creative ideas” to meet the shortfall.

Santa Barbara: Significant local attention has focused on UC Care and its differential impact to the Santa Barbara area. Public fora were acrimonious, and changing information during open enrollment exacerbated uncertainty and tensions.

Santa Cruz: 1) Although the major provider network in Santa Cruz is part of Tier 1 in UC Care, concerns about migrating nearly half the campus to another program remain; communications and information accuracy and accessibility are high priorities. 2) Faculty salaries at Santa Cruz continue to lag the rest of the system. 3) There is much speculation about the future financial and pedagogical value of online education efforts.

CUCEA: 1) CUCEA has met with the Health Care Facilitators to review talking points on Medicare supplemental coverage. 2) At a joint meeting with CUCRA, the administration made its case for selecting Extend Health to administer retiree health benefits, but the evaluation metrics remain undefined. Questions about cost, ease of use, and comprehensive support remain. 3) The reconfigured wellness program also still lacks evaluative metrics.

V. HCTF Update

Bill Parker, HCTF Chair

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

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

Dwaine Duckett, Vice President

1. UC Care and Open Enrollment Communications

Issue: UC Care is a new program, and the roll-out has encountered several significant obstacles. At this point, attention should turn to improving the program and the process for next year. Out-year cost increase pressures will likely mirror those that made the ABC plans too expensive. The incorporation by all involved parties of lessons learned this year should improve the process next year.

Discussion: Members asked if UC’s roles as insurance plan provider looking to profit, health care provider looking to profit, health care customer looking to contain costs, and employee advocate looking to ensure equal access and care, factored into the difficulties developing and implementing UC Care. VP Duckett indicated that his office approached

the process as the benefits plan fiduciary. Members noted that hidden costs, gaps in coverage, and the like, must be monitored and factored into design changes for next year. Members also noted that success for UC Care was undefined: how much cost overrun or employee reverse migration in future years would prove the plan unworkable is undetermined. Members asked who the UCOP administration stakeholders in UC Care are, and VP Duckett indicated that CFO Taylor and SVP Stobo are the executive sponsors. Members voiced concern over how little shared governance was incorporated into the process, noting that information clarity and decision-making opacity are the concerns. Members noted that the timing of information also must be improved, and that information of comparable quality and accessibility must be developed for all plans and all constituent groups.

However, late changes to the program parameters and participants may have led to decisions that were made on inaccurate or now-outdated information; employees impacted by this failure must be given notice that they should re-evaluate their elections, and they must be given adequate time to do so. VP Duckett indicated that flexibility regarding changes to elections made during Open Enrollment will be encouraged. Members asked when the written communications of that message will be developed and sent. VP Duckett replied that it remains in the best interest of most employees to make their decisions during the scheduled OE period, so the option to change is not being pre-advertised. Members asked how long flexibility would be encouraged, noting that the impacts of a poor election may not be known for many months. VP Duckett suggested that changes could probably be made through the end of January, but a final decision has not been reached. Members noted that web postings, FAQs, etc, should be dated and searchable in case of future disputations.

Members had several specific questions of coverage under UC Care, such as are prescription costs included in annual out-of-pocket maximums? Members also asked if all the negotiations were final, and VP Duckett stated that formulary costs are finalized, but that providers can join or leave the network at any time.

Action: Members should submit specific questions regarding coverage, continuity of care, billing, etc, in writing for response by systemwide Human Resources.

2. Benefits Satisfaction Survey

Issue: VP Duckett reported that his office is working with external consultants to develop an RFP for a survey administrator. Bids will be sought after the first of the year. The survey will be sent to all enrollees, and the survey will be developed by multiple stakeholder groups.

3. Public Pension Initiative

Issue: VP Duckett indicated that the response to this was being handled by State Governmental Relations.

4. Retirement Counseling Services

Issue: VP Duckett noted that this service was being centralized at the request of several of the campuses and helps ensure consistency of information.

VII. Further Discussion

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

Action: Chair Hare will draft a memo summarizing the committee's concerns about UC Care development and messaging for transmittal to the Academic Council.

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

Susan Carlson, Vice Provost

1. APM 133 “Stop the Clock”

Update: VP Carlson shared UCFW’s feedback with the Academic Personnel directors and with OP stakeholders. Current thinking is that a two-year limit on submitting a request for extension should suffice. The goal is to use flexible language to accommodate intricate specifics. Management review is planned for early 2014.

Discussion: Members asked why guidelines, not rules, were being developed and how much flexibility faculty members could expect in interpretation; the underlying concern is that significant life events do not happen on a predictable academic calendar.

2. Total Remuneration Study

Update: VP Carlson reported that bids had been received from two consultants, and that interviews were being scheduled for mid-December. This is slightly behind the original time line, but care is being taken to ensure that the study is conducted correctly.

Discussion: Chair Hare noted that the working group is developing questions to ask the bidders, and that the working group will meet to discuss the interview process. Members added that the new retiree health care tier will differentially impact assistant professors since 91% of their ranks (as opposed to 25% of full professors) are in the less generous tier; consequently, careful planning and analysis will be needed.

IX. Systemwide Review Items

1. APM 600 series (Salary Administration)

Discussion: Members wondered who decided not to incorporate previous UCFW feedback, and why no movement has been made regarding amending APM 510 (Intercampus Recruitments).

Action: UCFW has no new comments; its previous comments stand.

2. SBL 55 (Departmental Voting Rights)

Discussion: Members wondered what the pros and cons of amendment would be in practice. Members from Health Sciences campuses suggested that a lessened sense of discrimination and disenfranchisement could result. Other members questioned whether non-ladder rank faculty might bring different values to bear on reviews, but others countered that the goal is not to undermine tenure reviews but to empower individual faculty to negotiate better with deans and chairs. Chair Hare noted that other population groups that suffer similarly are outside the scope of SBL 55.

Action: Discussion will continue at the December UCFW meeting. Members are to consult with their campus counterpart committees and report back.

3. APMs 670, 671, and 025 (HSCP Conflict of Commitment)

Discussion: Members noted that the impetus for the proposed changes is not clear. The comprehensive review of APM 670 two years ago left some loose ends, but these changes do not close all the loops. Indeed, some of the limitations seem arbitrary, and members wonder if sections have been moved but not recontextualized.

Action: Discussion will continue at the December UCFW meeting. Members are to consult with their campus counterpart committees and report back.

X. New Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Dan Hare, UCFW Chair