UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Minutes of Meeting

May 10, 2019

I. Chair's Announcements

Sean Malloy, UCFW Chair

- Vigorous discussion surrounding the possible affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Health continues on many fronts. Some are unclear on how the proposed affiliation differs from extant partnerships, and others suggest that a differently defined affiliation should not be objectionable. Many have called for transparency regarding the terms of the proposed contract. The Regents Health Services Committee will discuss the topic at their June meeting, and the full board may discuss it in July.
- The state did not allocate additional funds for faculty salaries, but President Napolitano remains committed to calling for a 5% increase to the scales. The multi-year salary plan may now be 4 or 5 years, rather than 3.
- A newly constituted UC Employee Health Benefits Advisory Committee has been charged and populated, and met for the first time this week. The first meeting was organizational, and future meetings will cover possibly hiring an external consultant and the development of recommendations for long-term employee benefits coverage.
- The proposed memorial to the Regents calling for divestment of the endowment will go for a full faculty vote now. A pro/con document is being prepared.
- The legislature has requested the state auditor investigate UC admissions, and UCOP is working to limit the scope of an external investigation. FOIA requests are being filed by media outlets, and FBI personnel were at UCLA recently conducting their investigation.
- UCAP and UCEP are working to assess implicit bias in student-submitted teaching evaluations.
- The Standardized Testing Task Force will continue its work into the next academic year.
- The Regents meeting next week will include discussion of the UCOP budget, non-resident tuition, and approval of the next chancellor for the Santa Cruz campus.

II. Consent Calendar

1. <u>Draft Response to UCOLASC Open Access Principles</u> Action: The response was approved as noticed.

III. Report: Health Care Task Force

Lori Lubin, HCTF Chair

HCTF next meets May 24. Topics will include discussion of the: 1) Medicare Advantage PPO RFP process and next steps, 2) charge and composition of the new UC Employee Health Benefits Advisory Committee, 3) survey techniques employed by HR and others and whether they achieve the stated goals of the inquiry, and 4) protocols for investigating and redressing misconduct by medical center faculty and staff.

IV. Report: Task Force on Investment and Retirement

David Brownstone, TFIR Chair

- Because of projected changes to mortality rates, which will now be calculated on a cohort basis, the projected funding ratio of the pension plan will decrease. Additionally, because inflation assumptions will also likely change, the funding ratio will be reduced further. The Regents will be presented with a plan to increase either borrowing and/or contributions to off-set these changes.
- A proposal in the legislature to outlaw some forms of pension plans was voted down. UCOP's office of state governmental relations did a good job of explaining to the legislature why the proposal was unhelpful to the stated goals. Unanticipated consequences to union-represented employees throughout the state, regardless of employer, were persuasive arguments.
- UC has already divested significantly; only 3% of holdings are in implicated fossil fuel companies. Efforts by the Office of the Chief Investment Officer to craft a sustainable portfolio have been recognized by national professional groups, but awareness within UC is still lacking.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Loan Programs

Ruth Assily, Director, Office of Loan Programs

- 1. Proposed Changes to the Mortgage Origination Program (MOP)
 - An increase to the minimum interest rate for MOP is proposed. The current rate of 2.75% is too low to sell loans in the market, so an increase to 3.25% as of July 1 is suggested for new loans. UCOP's goal is to sell at par while maintaining a competitive rate for faculty. Members inquired about shared equity loans as an alternate model, and Ms. Assily noted that previous efforts in shared equity loans have encountered trouble at the end of the loan. The current maximum loan is \$1.72M, but the average is only \$700K.

VI. Systemwide Review Items

 Proposed New Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 011 (Academic Freedom Protection of Professional Standards and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees) Members also suggested that perhaps too much onus was being placed on graduate students and teaching assistants to recognize violations and to take action, and so additional guidelines and training may be needed for them. The intersection with union contracts and protocols should also be explained more clearly.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a response.

- 2. <u>UC Center Sacrament Current State Assessment Report</u> Action: The committee elected not to opine on this item.
- Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 636.E
 Action: The committee elected not to opine on this item.
- 4. <u>Research Grants Program Office (RGPO) Current State Assessment Report</u> **Action**: UCR Representative Jeske will serve as lead reviewer.
- 5. <u>Limited Review of Interim policy on Responding to Immigration Enforcement Involving Patients</u> on UC Health Facilities

Members agreed with the policy's goal of philosophically opposing and thus preventing UC health facilities from functioning as arms of the federal government immigration enforcement efforts.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a response for electronic approval.

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

1. <u>Health Sciences Faculty Morale and Turnover</u> *Note: Item deferred.*

2. <u>Teaching Professor/LSOE Workload Concerns</u>

Members report that on some campuses, faculty hired under APM 285 are being used as stopgaps for tenure-track faculty. Where APM 285 restricts teaching loads to a level between LRF and Unit 18 lecturers, this stricture is not being followed. Written guidance is needed to help convince deans and chairs to lower these teaching loads. Impacted faculty are being set-up for failure, not success, since they will not have adequate time to conduct scholarly activities or engage in creative output. Additional data would help make the case, but action must be taken soon, if possible. Any additional guidance should also include reference to grievance processes. **Action**: Chair Malloy will draft a memo for transmittal to the Academic Council.

3. <u>Dependent Care Support for Academic Travel</u>

The Provost sent a memo to the President requesting implementation of a policy previously circulated that would expand dependent care support for academic travel to conferences and the like. A response is expected soon, especially as HR raised no objections.

4. <u>RFPs for Advancing Faculty Diversity</u>

New RFPs with the goal of advancing faculty diversity have been developed – one for academic climate and retention and one for recruitment. Three types of projects are expected to be proposed: 1) Additional research in this area, 2) Data leadership, and 3) Support actions and interventions. Members were heartened that no preconceived notions about how best to bring about change in this area skewed the RFP. Nonetheless, the definition of success in the area of faculty diversity seems to vary with the observer. Further, externalities should mitigate the loftiness of any goals. The role of faculty renewal is also a factor to be considered carefully.

 <u>Stop-the-Clock Impacts Study</u>
 This effort has been deferred due to a lack of central data and sketchy local record-keeping. Alternate metrics and greater consistency are needed.

VIII. Campus Updates

 Child Care Access and Affordability: This topic is an annual concern for faculty welfare committees, but no one has successfully moved the needle here for years. Members discussed convening a dedicated task force in the new academic year, but given local nuances, the ability of systemwide to help is in question. Best practices for community partnerships and on-campus facilities are needed. Including child care facilities in all new housing proposals could be one step forward. A standard-bearer is needed to keep this issue in the forefront, and graduate students should be invited to join the cause explicitly.

IX. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Robert May, Academic Council Chair

• <u>UCSF and Dignity Health</u>: The Regents will hold an *ad hoc* session of their Health Services Committee on May 16 to discuss this in further detail. Many external stakeholders have publicly opposed the proposal, noting that ethical values should outweigh business considerations in this case. Previous partnerships were "rent a bed" deals, while the current proposal is for joint ownership via a limited liability corporation (LLC); the LLC structure is needed because the state constitution precludes the use of public funds to support any particular religious perspective, which following the care restrictions that govern Catholic hospitals would be tantamount to doing. Other medical center CEOs seem to be poised to pursue similar deals if the UCSF partnership is approved.

Members inquired if a position of opposition to the proposed partnership would preclude UC employees from seeking care at a religiously affiliated provider. Chair May noted that the

individual choice of where to receive care is different from the institution's choice to own and operate a provider jointly with a religious entity.

- <u>APM 011</u>: How best to educate and train non-faculty academic appointees is in question, not the goal of the proposed new APM. Training must include familiarity with APMs 010 and 015, as well. A process map would be helpful.
- <u>UC Employee Health Benefits Advisory Committee</u>: This group is the successor to last year's Retiree Health Working Group. The chair is a CUCRA member and has the Advisory Committee on a good trajectory early on. Any changes to the Medicare Plans should follow these principles: 1) The quality of the benefit must not be eroded, and 2) Any changes to the cost structure should be shared, not foisted exclusively on retirees. The questions before the group are 1) Is this a good idea? 2) If so, can it be done according to the principles above? 3) How can disruption be minimized, if a change a recommended? Senate participants are calling for a slow, deliberative process that stresses due diligence and shared governance.
- <u>May State Budget Revise</u>: The base budget was increased by 6.9%, but the elimination of previous one-time funds yields a *de facto* increase of only 2%, which is unchanged from the Brown era. The legislature has yet to make its response. UC needs the Regents to pass increases to non-resident tuition to ensure cash solvency. UCOP efforts at multi-year budgeting and establishing cohort based tuition are hampered by year-to-year state funding processes.
- <u>Administrative Burden on Faculty</u>: These burdens continue to accumulate, exacerbating a longterm trend of disinvestment in support staff and increasing compliance requirements. Recently, delays in the processing of contracts and grants have been reported on some campuses.
 Members are encouraged to work with UCORP and UCPB, and to frame impacts through the impact on students.

X. New Business

Note: Item not addressed.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst Attest: Sean Malloy, UCFW Chair

Attendance:

Sean Malloy, UCFW Chair Jean-Daniel Saphores, UCFW Vice Chair David Hollinger, UCB Christyann Darwent, UCD Alternate Julie Bower, UCLA Jayson Beaster-Jones, UCM via Zoom Dan Jeske, UCR Shelley Halpain, UCSD Ahmad Atif Ahmad, UCSB Su-Hua Wang, UCSC via Zoom Lori Lubin, HCTF Chair David Brownstone, TFIR Chair Caroline Kane, CUCEA Representative via Zoom