

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

**Minutes of Meeting
December 11, 2015****I. Announcements**

Calvin Moore, UCFW Chair

Update: Chair Moore reported to the committee on several items of interest. From the Academic Council meeting of November 23: 1) President Napolitano will receive the Retirement Options Task Force (ROTF) report on December 15, and issue the report for public review on January 15, 2016. 2) The Regents committee on health science is amending its bylaw, and the Senate is working to ensure shared governance is enshrined in the revision. 3) The Regents passed the Merced 2020 capital plan. 4) The Regents passed the 2016 operating budget, which includes the negotiated first year of UCRP funding from the state. The state is also auditing UC, and the audit is expected to focus on enrollment, non-resident metrics, expenditure, executive compensation, and rebenching outcomes. The audit is expected to be released in April, on the eve of the May budget revision from the state. Many in the state government seem more focused on access than excellence. From the Academic Assembly meeting of December 9: 1) Applications for both freshman and transfer enrollments are up this year. 2) UC will request from the state an additional \$6M for graduate student enrollment growth. Finally, UCFW's Health Care Task Force (HCTF) will renew its efforts to assess and improve mental health care and delivery.

II. Consent Calendar**1. Minutes of Meeting of November 13, 2015**

Action: The minutes were approved as amended.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Dan Hare, Academic Council Chair

Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Vice Chair

Update: Vice Chair Chalfant reported that 1) the ROTF will meet for the last time today before sending its recommendations to the president. (See also Item IV below.) 2) A task force to examine the APM guidelines for lecturers with security of employment (LSOEs) should have a draft for management review in the spring. 3) The APM sections governing health sciences clinical professors are also being revised by Academic Personnel and may be ready for review in the spring, too.

Chair Hare reported that the work group preparing a statement against intolerance continues its efforts. Many competing interests are in play, and many unsuccessful precedents are being considered. Training, deterrence, and other modes of achieving success are being assessed, and expectations regarding success and timing must be managed carefully. This issue has received significant attention from both internal and external groups. The socialization and intellectual challenge inherent in university settings is also a factor being weighed.

Chair Hare also reported that the joint work group on faculty discipline continues its work. Data are being collected regarding previous filings, hearings, and outcomes. Data on local practices and processes are also being analyzed for consistency.

Note: The remainder of the item occurred in executive session, and no notes were taken.

IV. Retirement Options Task Force

Gary Schlimgen, Executive Director, Retirement Programs and Strategy, Human Resources

Issue: Director Schlimgen reported that the task force report is nearly finished. Additional data from the university's actuary and external consultants are still forthcoming. Additional analyses may be requested by President Napolitano before she issues her recommendations in the new year.

Discussion: Members asked about possible design features, such as revocability, noting that faculty often have years-long "probations" in the academy. Director Schlimgen indicated that the task force has considered various lengths for both the period of initial eligibility elections and for vesting. The direction of any possible change and the default enrollment would need to be considered carefully to protect the financial integrity of the plan. General Counsel and the IRS are also being consulted; current IRS regulations prohibit vesting changes after 5 years, but a private letter ruling could be requested. Members also suggested that employee contributions should be consistent across the various plan designs, but any supplements available to more highly compensated employees could upset that principal. The timing and amount of employer contributions to any supplement could be controversial. Members worried about adverse selection impacts on the plans funded status and how portability would be valued by future applicants.

V. Executive Session

Note: Other than action items, no notes are taken during executive session.

VI. Campus Updates

Berkeley: The local CFW has been discussing parking and the perceived failure of the shared services efforts which have not generated any cash savings to date.

Davis: (absent)

Irvine: A recent incident involving faculty housing includes racial overtones and child safety concerns. Community meetings regarding relations with campus police will occur.

Los Angeles: A new middle and high school, made possible through gifts from the Geffen family, has been approved. CFW is monitoring tuition levels and other fee structures, as well as admission processes for the school. About half the enrollment slots are to be dedicated to children of faculty and staff. Staggered enrollment will begin with the 6th and 9th grades.

Merced: Administration of the 1.5% discretionary salary funds has yet to occur; a recommendation has been submitted to the provost. CFW is pressing the administration to take action regarding the negative campus climate surrounding sexual harassment and violence.

Riverside: CFW continues to focus on pre-tax remuneration and benefit options, such as tuition remission.

San Diego: CFW is still determining its list of priorities for the year.

San Francisco: Space usage is a recurring theme, especially in newly constructed and planned buildings.

Santa Barbara: CFW has been made aware of differential treatment in cases of reasonable accommodation, both in the short and the long term. Conditions such as partial hearing loss are not consistently handled as disabilities. CFW will meet with Academic Personnel and Human Resources to explore remediation options.

Santa Cruz: (absent during this item)

VII. Consultation with Academic Personnel

Susan Carlson, Vice Provost

1. Adoption Benefits

With Karie Frasch, Director, Faculty Equity and Welfare, UCB

Issue: VP Carlson reminded members that her office has endorsed the concept of expanding adoption benefits as summarized in the proposal, and the proposers are now asking for UCFW's support before beginning the process of policy amendment. Academic Personnel received the recommendation from the Systemwide Advisory Committee on the Status of Women (SACSW), which worked with other stakeholder groups to prepare the item. Director Frasch indicated that the proposal would authorize the reimbursement of up to \$5K for approved adoption expenses. The proposal was based on a survey of peer offerings, potential utilization rates, and system finances. Adoption support has been identified as a gap in UC's family friendly policy suite. Although relatively few individuals may be impacted, it is significant to them, and an important symbolic action.

Discussion: Members asked why a tax credit rather than an exclusion was proposed, and suggested possible changes to the text of the draft. The funding source is still to-be-determined, but costs are estimated to be less than one-half of one percent of the total annual health care expenditure by the university. Staff would also be eligible for the program. Members asked how this effort would merge with similar concerns regarding child care, but child care is a separate and more expensive problem to address.

Action: UCFW will communicate its support for the proof of concept of expanded adoption benefits to Academic Personnel and Human Resources.

2. Negotiated Salary Trial Program Update

Issue: VP Carlson reported that her office is finishing the year 2 report. Los Angeles, Irvine, and San Diego are the three campuses in the pilot. The number of participants has increased in year 2, but LA extended the pilot to its College of Engineering this year, too.

Discussion: Members asked if the metrics for success had been determined yet, and VP Carlson said they remain unresolved. The joint task force overseeing the pilot will reconvene soon to consider that and other outstanding questions.

3. Salary Actions

Issue: Provost Dorr is reviewing a draft template in which the campuses will report their actions and outcomes. Campus reports are due to UCOP on February 1. The impact to four groups will be analyzed: ladder rank faculty, health sciences compensation plan, other faculty and academic titles, and deans and academic administrators.

Discussion: Members asked if the report will highlight variances between the campuses, and VP Carlson said that could be one conclusion from the data. The funds for this were part of the Reinvestment in Quality bucket; campuses had to identify their own internal sources as there was no earmark from UCOP. No demographic breakdown is expected for the various areas of action, such as equity, exceptional merit, etc.

4. Exit Survey Update

Note: Item not addressed.

5. UC Recruit and Search Waivers

Issue: VP Carlson reported that the advisory board for UC Recruit had several ideas regarding the appropriate use of search waivers, but there are compliance issues and unique concerns in academic institutions as opposed to other markets. A proposal should be available for review in the spring.

VIII. Consultation with Office of Loan Programs

Ruth Assily, Director, Office of Loan Programs

Gordon Schanck, Director, Capital Programs

Allen Meacham, Assistant Director, Endowed Real Estate, Capital Programs

Issue: UCFW has inquired whether campus housing concerns could be alleviated by expanding the MOP to duplexes, re-sales, and other properties and transactions. Many campuses have individualized programs, in addition to the systemwide MOP. Specific campus needs, local markets, and availability of land all underscore the need for flexibility in this area. The MOP goal is to offer prices 20% below market, and chancellors must take the lead in efforts to convert existing real estate to a different purpose.

Discussion: Members asked if housing demand data by campus can be generated, and Director Assily indicated that it could be. Members also asked if underutilized properties could be converted to residences, and Director Schanck indicated that it could be possible, depending on state processes and the campus long-term plan.

Director Schanck also floated some alternate design options that the committee could consider, such as fixed rate loans and resales and ground leases. External financing is more difficult to secure for such options. Donor properties are often far afield, oddly unique, subject to home owners associations, or in need of significant renovation.

Action: Members will investigate options being considered by local development offices, and UCOP personnel will report back on alternative design possibilities.

IX. New Business and Further Discussion

1. Total Remuneration:

Discussion: Members noted that total remuneration will likely continue to decrease relative to competitors. Drastic action may be needed to reverse the course.

2. Retirement Counseling

Discussion: Members observed that local practices and support vary; some have recalled specialists to supplement systemwide efforts. Members wondered if there should be a mandatory seminar at age X, or other directed efforts. Phased retirement was suggested as another method of facilitating this transition.

Meeting adjourned at 3:10.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Calvin Moore, UCFW Chair

Attendance:

Calvin Moore, Chair (UCB)

Mark Gergen, Berkeley

Jean-Daniel Saphores, Irvine

Megan Sweeney, Los Angeles (phone)

Rudy Ortiz, Merced (Alternate) (phone)

Victor Lippit, Riverside

Sheila Gehagan, San Diego

Roberta Rehm, San Francisco

Stan Awramik, Santa Barbara (phone)

Jim Zachos, Santa Cruz (phone)

Ex officio members:

Roger Anderson, Chair, CUCEA (SC) (phone)

Henning Bohn, UCRS Advisory Board Faculty Representative