

Coordinating Committee Report

November, 2015



In Academic Council and the Academic Planning Council, several initiatives are worth comment:

- UC is working on developing an **International Activities Policy** this academic year. The policy will broadly include educational, experiential, research and joint initiatives involving collaborators or activities outside the U.S. The policy will provide guidance regarding the level of review and approval needed for various types of activities related to student involvement, risk of the setting, and security of intellectual property, as well as other possible criteria. The effort results from concern that UC has had a fairly laissez faire approach to forming international programs, and UCOP sign off has been viewed as a routine outcome. UCOP and the Regents reviewed some of the programs finding that some may produce risk to members of the campus community, and risk to UC intellectual property. A task force has been formed to draft a policy which will then receive multi-campus and senate review.
- The **UC Retirement Plan Task Force** is working to a goal of having a new plan in place July 2016. This 2016 tier would apply to new hires, with a goal of ensuring sustainability. The task force goals may have also extended to cost savings. A higher employee vs UC contribution ratio is being considered, as well as a reduced salary cap (pension would be based on a lower salary ceiling). Another option is to reduce support for employees, and have a higher level of support for faculty; the senate opposes this change. Many Universities feature retirement plans that provide less support than UC, however since most of these, like UC's are based on a percent of salary, and since salary compensation for UC competitors is higher than UC's, the retirement benefit in dollars may be comparable to UC's current plan. The System-wide Senate is actively engaged in this planning.
- The Academic Planning Council is also interested in **self-supporting programs** in terms of faculty burden and whether these activities compete with academic activities that relate to core curricular teaching.
- Issues concerning the Legislature's interest in **expanding undergraduate enrollment**, with limited financial support, continues to be discussed, with UCOP destined to make a decision on this by the end of the year. Each campus has also proposed growth over the 8 year planning period (outside of the targets the Legislature requested). **For UCSF the proposed growth** includes at least 615 students, including at least 145 graduate students, at least 60

professional students and at least 410 residents and house staff. It is possible post docs are included in the 410.

- The sexual harassment episode at UCB has prompted UCOP to initiate a Task Force to review of policies that relate to faculty conduct, which will be led by UC Senate Chair Dan Hare. UC does have excellent policies in this regard, so the task force may make recommendations to increase awareness of existing policy across the campuses.



We submitted suggestions for faculty representatives for **5 UCSF Building**

Planning Committees including representatives of bench, non-bench researchers, educators and clinicians. We are now waiting to see if those representatives are appointed to the committees. We have heard concerns from faculty based at Laurel Heights about the design of space at Mission Bay they may be relocated to. Hopefully having active faculty representation on these committees will result in more functional space, and better communication about the tradeoffs involved with space options.



Our question of the month generated 34 responses so far, which appear to have emanated from a wide variety of faculty in terms of seniority and focus of their UCSF work. A great deal of interest in mentoring was expressed, including perceptions that mentoring is broadly available to early career faculty. Some gaps and needs are mentioned, and some of these indicate that existing resources are not uniformly recognized. We can discuss these and how we might address some via the Chancellor's fund at our meeting this week.