UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Academic Senate

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Minutes of Meeting

December 13, 2024

In attendance: Juan Pablo Pardo Guerra, Chair; Karen Bales, Vice Chair; Nancy Wallace, UCB; Janet Foley, UCD; Ben Lourie, UCI Alternate; Ines Boechat, UCLA Alternate; Jayson Beaster-Jones, UCM; Salman Asif, UCR; Julie Bykowski, UCSD Alternate; John Sauceda, UCSF; Laurie Freeman, UCSB; Yat Li, UCSC; Jill Hollenbach, TFIR Chair; Zoran Nenadic, UCRS Advisory Board Faculty Representative; Joel Dimsdale, CUCEA Chair

I. **Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

Steve Cheung, Academic Council Chair
Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Council Vice Chair

- The Regents discussed several items of interest at their November meeting: 1) The 25-26 FY budget was approved, including a 9.9% increase to non-resident tuition for new cohorts, a renewed commitment to Return to Aid, and 3.7% range adjustment to faculty salary scales. 2) The employer contribution to the UC Retirement Plan will increase to 15% with policy projections to increase by 0.5% annually up to 18% for all tiers and contributions to the Savings Choice option will increase from 6.5% to 10% over the same time period; employee contribution rates are projected to remain flat. Current projections show full funding in 17 years. 3) Several personnel changes have occurred: Meredith Turner was appointed as the new Vice President for External Relations; Regent Perez resigned, and the governor nominated Bob Meyers to replace him; Regent Sherman also resigned, but no nomination has been submitted yet. 4) The Health Services Committee received reports on financial growth of the health enterprise and on COVID after-action outcomes, wherein UC performed better than the state average. 5) The outcomes and timelines of campus protest-related and other disciplinary actions are under scrutiny. A full report will be made in January.
- The UAW-represented academic employees ratified their contract through the next calendar year.
- The Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) was oversubscribed this year due to market interest rates and higher than average faculty acceptance rates. As a result, most campuses ran out of funds before the fall. The Office of the President has confirmed that an additional $200M will be made available

systemwide in the new year. Allocations by campus will be for outstanding but unfulfilled loans, rather than by formula.

- The Davis division is conducting a vote of No Confidence in President Drake. The petition identified several areas of concern, including the MOP situation and recent increases in chancellor compensation.
- The Academic Assembly met December 12, 2024, and approved the UC Quality statement prepared by the University Committee on Education Policy. Action on proposed amendments to SR 424.A.3 (Ethnic Studies) was deferred until the April 2025 meeting to allow for clarification of state funding support and articulation concerns. A special Assembly meeting has been scheduled for January 17, 2025, to discuss the new information security plan, salary administration, and health plan premium increases.
- The Academic Planning Council has convened several joint Senate-administration work groups focusing on 1) Consideration of a single systemwide academic calendar for undergraduate instruction. A report is expected in March that will be sent for systemwide review. Cost considerations and impacts to educational delivery and research practices are under evaluation. 2) Consideration of Academic Personnel Manual (APM) sections 015 (Faculty Code of Conduct) and 016 (Discipline); the former is in response to a budget rider imposed by the state legislature calling for an investigation in University policies related to expressive activities; the group has submitted its report which contained no recommendations, but updated implementation guidelines seem likely. The 016 investigation will look into simultaneous merit reviews and disciplinary actions and submit its report in the spring.
- Senate participation in implementing the upcoming Total Remuneration study and Benefits Survey is progressing. Three faculty members have agreed to serve on the Benefits Survey panel, and recruitment for the Total Remuneration study continues as negotiations with systemwide Human Resources regarding the total number of Senate participants and the scope of work continue.
- Members noted that concerns about the policies and guidelines for Return to Active Duty (RTAD, or rehired retirees) remain. Systemwide Human Resources does not seem to be following traditional shared governance procedures in the development of the policy and associated communications. Both CUCEA and CUCRA have representatives on a new joint group developing FAQs, but the clarity of the draft is in question. How to integrate other enterprise systems to conform to policy is still to be determined.

II. Chair's Announcements

Juan Pablo Pardo Guerra, UCFW Chair

- As noted, additional MOP funds will be made available in January 2025, but out-year funding levels are still to be determined. Some have called on the University to extend MOP eligibility to staff beyond senior managers, but doing so would be complex and expensive. Internal funding trades between MOP, the

Short-Term Investment Pool (STIP), the Total Returns Investment Pool (TRIP), and Fiat Lux remain unclear to many. The University's ability to sell it's $1.5B in loan holdings has been hampered by low market rates, reflecting the widespread inversion of short-term returns being higher than long-term returns. Members also seek clarity on the allocation formula used by the Office of Loan Programs and whether the practice of basing amounts on the previous year's averages should be revisited. Representatives from OLP and the Chief Financial Officer will be invited to subsequent meetings.

- The Regents did approve a 3.7% range adjustment to the faculty scales, but many are concerned about the time of implementation being in October, rather than July. Some suspect the lag disadvantages faculty over time.
- Senate advisors to the upcoming Benefits Survey have been approved. Senate advisors for the upcoming Total Remuneration study are still being identified. Concerns regarding the Total Remuneration study involve methodological consistency with previous studies as well as the number of competitor institutions to include. UC has traditionally relied on the Comparison 8, but there are now calls to use a larger number of institutions such as the AAU database (minus Canadian institutions). The clinicians will again be excluded from the Total Remuneration study, but faculty in the medical schools need carefully selected comparators. Getting access to full competitor data is increasingly difficult. Benchmarking medical fields has always been difficult. Exit survey data may indicate who is poaching from UC, which might indicate which comparators to include. COLA factors vary, but should be studied, as should starting salaries versus rate of salary growth. Valuing benefits, not just salary, leads to more methodological questions. Significant turnover in systemwide Human Resources may have unintended consequences.

III. HCTF Update

Vickie Mays, HCTF Chair

Note- Item not addressed.

IV. TFIR Update

Jill Hollenbach, TFIR Chair

A. <u>TFIR of November 25, 2024</u>

- TFIR met with the Office of the Chief Investment Officer and received clarification that MOP administration is under CFO division. OCIO is not planning allocation changes at this time.
- The OCIO bonus compensation plan is under scrutiny as it was discussed recently by the Regents.

V. Campus Updates

UCD- 1) The campus is conducting a no confidence vote in President Drake. 2) Greater explanation of price increases in health care premiums and delivery is sought. 3) The new expressive activities policy is under review. Many are concerned about possible freedom of speech impacts.
UCSD- 1) The campus is reviewing updated safety policies, with some focus on non-affiliates. 2) Quiet hours and campus access concerns have been raised in opposition to liability positions noted by administrators.
UCM- 1) The campus is concerned by the expressive activities policy parameters. 2) How to reinforce principles of community is under discussion. 3) Understaffing in the sponsored project office is negatively impacting faculty. 4) Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom will become two committees next year.
UCR- 1) The expressive activities policy has received similar feedback as noted above. Implementation guidelines will be critical to the policy's success. 2) Discrepancies between the Senate's charges committee recommendation and the administration recommendation for the same infraction are causing issues, specifically regarding probable cause standards. Confidentiality and disability policies are also implicated.
UCSC- 1) The expressive activity policy has been viewed with wary eyes, but analysis is continuing. 2) Salary compression and inversion and overlapping steps are starting to cause new challenges. Long-term salary analyses are being conducted. The off-scale loophole adds to concerns.
UCLA- 1) A new working group to assess childcare needs and options has been formed. 2) The campus police chief has stepped down.
UCB- 1) MOP issues are exacerbating general budget constraints. 2) Faculty welfare issues are not well known on campus; a pulse survey had a poor response rate. 3) The expressive activities policy is being received differently, probably due to new leadership and their response last spring. 4) The disabled students' programs are under the faculty welfare umbrella, and they are suffering from staffing shortages. A new training module for disabled student services was voted down, but it may be proposed again. Accommodation requests are increasing, and financial impacts need to be studied.
UCI- 1) Many have raised concerns about the calendar conversion study. 2) Budget changes seem to reflect short-term priorities, so calls for greater transparency in decision making are being issued. 3) A subcommittee on housing has issued its recommendations for review.
UCD- In addition to issues outlined above: 1) Possible changes to federal funding options are concerning many, especially those on soft money. Contingency planning is needed.
UCSF- 1) Some have recently encountered trouble receiving survivor benefits, particularly when trusts are involved. 2) Return to work policies are being weighed against faculty autonomy optimization.
UCSB- 1) Allegations of lack of compliance with family bonding/parental leave policies are being investigated.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs (FAAP) and Systemwide Academic Personnel (SWAP)

Doug Haynes, Interim Vice Provost, FAAP
Amy Lee, Deputy Provost, SWAP
Kelly Anders, Executive Director, SWAP
Jean Chin, Academic Data and Compensation Director, SWAP

A. <u>Comparison 8 Salary Analysis</u>
Anti-trust laws allow comparators not to share certain compensation information. This version of the study is in its second year, and it shows a 3.1% lag this year in a high-level analysis of average salary at each rank, but not by discipline. It is not intended for salary equity evaluations. Despite coding variations among institutions, year over year consistency validates the process. Exit surveys show individual data, not averages and are intended to answer different questions. SWAP considered the last 10 years of data, and despite certain tweaks in data availability, overall trends are consistent.

B. <u>Upcoming APM Actions</u>
- APM 015, 016 (Faculty Discipline)- The expressive activities policy and violation sanctions are out for review. Real-time consistent implementation may be difficult because every situation is unique. It is hoped that any sanctions can be administered evenly, though, and in a similarly timely fashion at each location. A second phase of the workgroup will focus on concurrent reviews and disciplinary actions. A report is expected in the spring.
- APM 360 (Librarians) revisions will be circulated in January. Collective bargaining is implicated, so a careful review is important.
- APM 675 (Veterinary Medicine) revisions will offer the Negotiated Salary Program with the policy.
- APM 036 (Recruitment) revisions will reflect new state law requiring greater background checks when SVSH allegations are disclosed. Guidelines are being developed to clarify differences between employment checks and academic checks. Student employment is implicated, but faculty merits and academic reviews are excluded.

C. <u>Recalled Retirees</u>
The exact number of recalled retirees is not known. Insurance transitions raise concerns regarding continuity of care and possibly regarding contract obligations. Employee training is also needed, despite external deadlines.

VII. Further Discussion and New Business

None.

Adjournment 2:45pm

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Juan Pablo Pardo Guerra, UCFW Chair