Minutes of Meeting
November 16, 2016

I.   Chair's Announcements
Lori Lubin, UCFW Chair
Update: Chair Lubin reported on several items of interest from the October 26, 2016. 1) Several campuses were concerned about automatic travel registration through the iJet program, and sought assurances regarding cyber-security and data usage. Chief Risk Office Cheryl Lloyd will join UCFW to help answer these questions (see Item IV below). 2) The UCRP liability and retiree health obligation are under scrutiny. 3) Enrollment increases per the agreement with the state. Graduate student growth is planned, but funding is not guaranteed. 4) The Regents continue to debate internally how to implement a cap on non-resident enrollment. 5) A "positive tuition adjustment" planned expected to be approved in the spring is already being protested by students. 6) The proposed Regents budget includes a 3% merit pool for faculty.   7) The Council met with the campus EVCs and commiserated over enrollment challenges, marginal cost projection calculations, and academic quality. No clear alternative revenue strategies were lit upon. 8) UCAADE is leading an investigation into cross-campus consistency in the treatment of diversity statements, diversity officers, and peer review committees for sexual misconduct.

II.   Consent Calendar
1. DRAFT Minutes of October 14, 2016
   Item deferred.
2. DRAFT Response to Proposed Amendments to APMs 015, 016, and SR 336
   Action: The memo was approved as noticed.
3. DRAFT Response to Proposed Presidential Policy on International Activities
   Action: The memo was approved as noticed.

III.   Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership
Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair
Update: Chair Chalfant reported that discussion around the proposed Regents budget included focus on expenditures and revenue, with particular attention being paid to an anticipated tuition increase in the spring. Per the agreement with the state, tuition increases must be tied to the CPI; a 2.5% figure is being floated. Student protests and legislator misgivings are not allayed by UCOP calculations.
       A draft charge for the proposed Senate task force on health sciences is being developed by UCSF and Council Vice Chair White.

IV.   Consultation with the Office of the President – Risk Services
Cheryl Lloyd, Chief Risk Officer
Gary Leonard, Executive Director, Liability and Property Programs

Issue: CRO Lloyd referred members to Regents item C.3 for an overview of the iJet program and its goals. Per President Napolitano, one goal is to increase utilization of registration in case of emergency, not to track the movements of individuals. Necessity for such registration is illustrated in events of the summer, in which UC students were abroad in areas that were victimized by terror attacks and the death of a graduate student researcher in Ethiopia. If travelers book through Connexxus, registration in iJet is automatic. The Education Abroad Program usually submits a list for entering, rather than relying on students to register. For faculty-led travel, where registration with campus risk officers is expected, iJet registration is intended to serve as a safety net. iJet registration methods are being improved.

Discussion: Members asked if travel insurance was dependent upon iJet registration, and Mr. Leonard indicated that registration will ensure coverage. Non-registration will not block receiving assistance abroad, but it will delay or slow such assistance. Reimbursements and even direct payment can be slower, too, if a traveler is not registered. Members asked if non-UC travel companions should be registered separately, since UC offers them travel accident insurance, too. CRO Lloyd said that submitting a total number of travelers is adequate. She added that UC travel accident insurance can be purchased for non-UC travel. The coverage is available to emeriti and students currently being paid by UC, as well.

Members then asked how the third parties used the traveler information they received. CRO Lloyd indicated that the information collected is basic in nature (name, phone, destination and date) and the UC contract includes a confidentiality clause that prohibits iJet from sharing traveler information. Members asked about the Critical Track feature, which seems to be designed to pin-point individual cell phones. CRO Lloyd indicated that it is a voluntary feature, and members noted that language on this point should be clarified as the current verbiage suggests registration in the tracking feature is also mandatory. Members suggested that a comprehensive employee cyber privacy policy is needed. Members also noted that travelers use various portals and wondered if iJet buttons would be added or how registration would be facilitated. Members also wondered about registration for research in dangerous domestic areas, and CRO Lloyd indicated that her office was working with ANR and others to improve extant domestic registration programs. CRO Lloyd added that her office is in regular contact with global health programs.

Action: CRO Lloyd will provide to UCFW the preferred travel registration link, a list of local risk managers, and information on how to register for domestic field research. She also agreed to revise registration verbiage on the central and campus websites and to engage further with students before promulgating additional tracking measures.

V.   Update: Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR)
Bob Anderson, TFIR Chair

Update: Chair Anderson reported that regular employee and employer contributions to UCRP fall short of the Actuarially Determined Contribution (ADC), which is the amount needed to cover benefits accrued this year, interest on the unfunded liability, and an amortization of the unfunded liability. However, the additional contributions borrowed from STIP bring the total contribution reasonably close to the ADC. Because the return on the portfolio fell short of the assumed 7.25% rate of return in 2015-16, the funded status by market value of assets declined somewhat. The returns earned by the CIO's Office were slightly short of the benchmark for the

asset allocation. 2) Pre-funding retiree health is a good idea, but this is a bad time to explore options.   3) Web information for the retirement service program (RSP) fee structure is inaccurate, and TFIR has contacted HR and OCIO to amend the language. TFIR has also asked OCIO to present an analysis of comparator programs, their fees, and the support given to employees; TFIR has also asked for a comparison of different universities target date funds. UC uses the RSP fees to support OCIO fund management and to pay Fidelity for record-keeping, site maintenance, and the education program. How best to assess the fees, on what funds, and at what rate are under scrutiny. Complications are due to the complex nature of 403(b) and 457(b) funds.

VI.   Update: Health Care Task Force (HCTF)

Robert May, HCTF Chair
Update: Chair May updated the committee on several items of interest: 1) Next steps in achieving benefits equity for domestic partners include monitoring HR actions. A revised handbook has been posted, and the question of when to start PIE has been resolved. 2) UC Care changed its maximum out-of-pocket calculation to an aggregate total, rather than separate totals for medical on the one hand and pharmacy and behavioral on the other. No data have been provided to illustrate any anticipated cost savings nor have any data been provided to illustrate the impact of this change on vulnerable employees. HCTF has asked that this change be rescinded pending the provision of conclusive data. See also Item VII below. 3) Members are encouraged to double-check their disability elections, given the new options. 4) The future of the Affordable Care Act under a prospective Trump administration is unclear. 5) UCOP management of the system's health care enterprise is changing: Strategic and fiduciary responsibilities are being given to an executive committee; a steering committee will oversee day-to-day activities. The Senate expects to be involved in both. 6) Details for the new UC Health strategic vision are eagerly awaited.

VII.   Consultation with the Office of the President – UC Health

Laura Tauber, Executive Director, UC Self-funded Health Plans
Issue: Ms. Tauber reported that data supporting the decision to aggregate out-of-pocket expenses is owned by Blue Shield, and they have still not shared the data since they have changed their system and UC has dropped their contract. Nevertheless, UC Care costs continue to increase as PPO plans are inherently more expensive and the UC Care pool has higher risk factors. The projected costs and rates were based on the work of two actuaries, Alliant and Milliman. The overall UC Care increase for 2017 was projected to be 11%, 6% medical and 13% pharmacy. UC's "risk adjustment" process and use of some UC Care reserves lowered the increase, but the projected increase still exceeded the UC Care commitment not to exceed a 5% annual increase. OOP charges stood out compared to other plans, and based on 2015 data, the change, when taken together with other cost abatement efforts, is expected to keep the UC Care operating cost at a reasonable level. Nevertheless, the data do not indicate individual versus family expenditures, pharmacy versus medical totals, or tier, payband, or PMPM costs.
Discussion: Members asked what the cost would be to extend the 2016 parameters, and what employee groups would be most impacted.
Action: Ms. Tauber will research and present more data next month.

VIII. Systemwide Review Items

1. <u>Proposed Amendments to SBL 182 (University Committee on International Education)</u>
   Issue: This proposal should be considered in conjunction with the newly proposed Presidential Policy on International Activities.
   Discussion: Members asserted that the revision gives too much authority over research, and that such language should be softened.
   Action: Analyst Feer will draft the committee response.

2. <u>Proposed Revised Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition</u>
   Issue: The Regents have stated their intention not to approve PDST requests since the entire policy seems outdated. The revised policy asks proposers to specify the use of additional tuition dollars.
   Discussion: Members wondered how this would impact university finances given other financial restrictions being imposed externally. Members also noted that consultation requirements and time lines are unclear.
   Action: The committee will return to this topic at its December meeting.

3. <u>Proposed Revised Presidential Nondiscrimination Policy and APM 015</u>
   Issue: The current draft includes unpaid members of the university community, such as interns and volunteers.
   Discussion: Members noted unclear language regarding training programs. Members were unclear on the impetus for including new language regarding "Free Speech and Academic Freedom."
   Action: The committee will return to this topic at its December meeting.

4. <u>Management Review: Proposed Changes to the LSOE Program</u>
   Issue: The proposal would rename this category to Professor of Teaching X. It is felt that the term "lecturer" diminishes the academic impact of these individuals and obscures their pedagogic contributions. The goal is to standardize use of the title across campuses and clarify scholastic expectations.
   Discussion: Members asked how many departments stress the pedagogy of teaching.
   Action: The committee will return to this topic at its December meeting.

IX. Consultation with the Office of the President – Academic Personnel and Programs
Susan Carlson, Vice Provost

1. <u>Exit Survey Next Steps:</u>
   Issue: Before the project can be extended, it may be necessary to illustrate the value added to administration decision-makers. The pilot data largely supported suppositions, but reliable data will require a longitudinal study. To continue the partnership with the pilot hosts, Harvard's Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), funds must be identified. When measured against the cost of failed searches and frequent start-up packages, the price of continuing the exit survey seems small.
   Discussion: Members noted that the salary gap between those who stay and those who leave is relatively minor, especially when considered in the context of local cost of living calculations. Members also noted that the status quo practice of securing an outside offer prior to receiving a retention offer not only drives up the cost of retentions but

also often leads to unintended departures if UC cannot match the outside offer. VP Carlson noted that COACHE will expand its survey to other institutions, thereby increasing the validity of the data generated. Salary is always a factor, but it is seldom the only factor.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a memo of support for the survey for transmittal to the Academic Council.

2. Health Sciences Climate Survey:

Issue: The systemwide climate survey of 2014 did not include all non-ladder rank faculty, especially in the health sciences and the campus federations. Cost and survey design are immediate obstacles, and securing an executive sponsor would also be necessary.

Discussion: Members wondered if other surveys could be used as a proxy, such as that employed by AAMC, for example. Some campuses have local surveys that could also be adapted for systemwide use.

3. SBL 335 (Privilege and Tenure):

Issue: Revisions to SBL 336 (see Item VIII above) seem to require conforming amendments in SBL 335, especially regarding language around the 3 year cap for administrative action (as opposed to the unlimited time frame for submitting a complaint).

Action: Academic Personnel and Programs will investigate next steps and report back.

4. Diversity Statement and Officers:

Issue: The role of diversity statements and officers during the appointment and promotion processes is unclear. A clearinghouse of resources and best practices could be helpful in many local instances.

Discussion: VP Carlson cautioned against over-prescribing roles and duties for these individuals due to local variations. Clear guidance would need to be issued, too, along with any best practices that perhaps should not be adopted wholesale. Additional guidance will be added to UC Recruit in this area, but local practices may be stricter than the systemwide baseline. UC Recruit regularly surveys search committee chairs, but in-depth longitudinal data is not yet available since the program is still relatively young.

X.   Campus Updates

Berkeley: 1) Child care, parking, and housing costs continue to increase unabated. 2) Many are worried about the impact of the new pension tier on recruitments. 3) Many have voiced concern regarding the possible changes a President Trump would impose in the health insurance arena.

Davis: 1) "Dreamers" have requested Davis be named a sanctuary campus. 2) Many on campus are worried that decisions are made on a dollar basis, not an academic basis. 3) Local transportation and parking are strained and redress is required.

Irvine: 1) Local child care is adequate; on-campus and a nearby Montessori facility are both accessible. 2) Police accountability concerns have arisen after reports of racist and sexist interactions. 3) The discrepancy between step and salary seems to be undermining review efforts.

Los Angeles: Child care administration has been impugned on many fronts: Title IX violations, financial abuse, and inadequate delivery of services to children have all been alleged. Parents are being interviewed, and interim leadership is being sought. A report is due in January.

Merced: 1) Police oversight and accountability have arisen as concerns on the 1-year anniversary of a deadly incident on campus. A campus community review board or community policing alternative are being discussed.   2) Child care affordability and availability is an increasing concern. 3) Many in the campus community have requested "sanctuary" status for UC Merced students. 4) Access to start-up funds has become a concern as some humanists do not require their funds until after an arbitrary 3-year spending deadline has passed. Systemwide best practices are requested.

Riverside: 1) Child care on and near campus is nearing a crisis point. Changes to campus funding jeopardize the meager support that is currently available. 2) Shared governance is being given short-shrift. Demands on the administration to solve immediately emerging issues regarding student services and faculty facilities have led to executive actions that omit faculty consultation.   The likelihood of unintended consequences due to inadequate consultation worry many.

San Diego: (absent during this item)

San Francisco: 1) Child care access and affordability are recurring concerns. 2) Faculty on "soft-money" are concerned about new NIH regulations and their impact on remuneration.

Santa Barbara: 1) The campus housing situation is reaching crisis proportions. For faculty and staff, cost containment is the top priority. Duplexes are disallowed by policy, but this seems unworkable in the current and projected housing markets. 40-year MOPs are discouraged, and the workings of the wait list are not transparent. 2) Child care remains a concern. A local working group to explore costing mitigation has been requested. 3) Accommodations for faculty with disabilities, viz. hearing and vision, need improvement; existing resources are out-dated and complex.

Santa Cruz: 1) There is no campus child care at all on campus. The local CFW is working with the VCA to include new facilities in a planned faculty housing expansion proposal. 2) A new provost is coming to campus. 3) The cost of living in Santa Cruz is making available UC wages non-viable.

XI.   New Business
Not addressed.

Adjournment 3:40 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst
Attest: Lori Lubin, UCFW Chair

Attendance:
Lori Lubin, UCFW Chair
Roberta Rehm, UCFW Vice Chair
Caroline Kane, UCB
Mike Hill, UCD

Jean-Daniel Saphores, UCI
Areti Tillou, UCLA
Sean Malloy, UCM
Victor Lippitt, UCR
Gedeon Deak, UCSD (phone)
Margot Kushel, UCSF
Stan Awramik, UCSB
Stefano Profumo, UCSC
Bob Anderson, TFIR Chair
Robert May, HCTF Chair