



**Committee on Faculty Welfare**  
**Sharmila Majumdar, PhD, Chair**

## ANNUAL REPORT 2007-2008

**Primary Focus Points for the Year:**

- UCSF Child Care
- Health Sciences Compensation – Retirees and Recall
- Roth 403B

**Task Forces, Special Committees, and Sub-Committees:**

- SMG Policy Review
- Cell Phone Policy Review
- Review and Comment to Proposed Changes to APMs 710, 711, and 080
- Backup Care Work Options Group™
- Grant Overruns
- Catastrophic Leave Sharing

**Issues for Next Year (2008-2009)**

- Recruitment and Retention
- Child Care
- Child Care Backup

---

**2007-2008 Members**

---

**Sharmila Majumdar, Chair**  
**Tina Raine-Bennett, Vice Chair**

Abe Rudolph  
Don Kishi  
Carmen Portilla  
Suzanne Mueller

David Rempel  
Caroline Shiboski  
Candy Tsourounis  
Jacque Duncan

**Permanent Guest**

Pamela Hayes, Principal Benefits Coordinator,  
Human Resources

---

**Number of Meetings: 5**

**Senate Analyst:** Kathleen Dargan

---

The Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare took up the following Systemwide issues this year:

### **Review of the Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group (SMG) with underlying academic appointments...**

Office of the President (OP), at the request of The Regents is reviewing all policies as they related to members of the SMG. This proposed policy provides for three options. The first option would be to “Maintain current policy for SMG members with underlying academic appointments (APM 740 and APM 758):” the second option would, “Establish separate Transitional Leave policy (proposed draft developed during the SMG Policy Review Process): and the third option would be to “Apply standard faculty sabbatical leave policy;”

The Academic Senate Faculty Welfare committee indicated that the second option, to establish a separate Transitional Leave policy, with the addition of the word “faculty” (in red) in the last sentence, clearly separates the two functions of the SMG member and the types of leave they are entitled to in these functions. The activities that a faculty member has to pursue during a translational leave (refreshing of old skills, updating of knowledge) are different than the activities pursued during an academic sabbatical leave (acquisition of new knowledge and skills.) A clear distinction between the translational and academic leave makes it easier to account for this. Since the leave is taken in preparation for the resumption of the academic position, payment during this period should correspond to the payment for this position. [Appendix 1](#)

### **University of California Proposal to Revise Cell Phone Policy (G-36)**

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has proposed a tax assessment related to the personal use of cell phones furnished by the University to its employees. In addition to paying the tax assessment, the University must agree to change its policy to bring it into compliance with the regulations governing employer-provided cell phones. This proposal includes the recommendation of the campus Controllers to revise Business and Finance Bulletin G-46, Guidelines for the Purchase and Use of Cellular Phones and Other Portable Electronic Resources, in response to the IRS exam.

The Controllers recommend that the University phase out the practice of purchasing cell phones and similar devices for use by employees. Instead, employees would be provided with a **taxable cash allowance** that they would use to purchase such equipment needed for University business purposes.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare decided not to respond this policy change.

### **Review and Comment to Proposed Changes to APMs 710, 711, and 080**

In 2004-05 and 2005-06, the Systemwide Assembly of the Academic Senate sent out proposed amendments to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) regarding medial leave and accommodations to the campus for review and comment. The campuses provided their comments and criticisms, and these amendments were revised by Systemwide Committee on Faculty Welfare, and the Assembly then submitted the revised amendments to the campuses for comment. Senate Chair Gardner asked the UCSF Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Faculty Councils of all four schools to submit their comments to the Senate for a divisional response.

The proposed amendments addressed three points:

- APM 710 was amended to provide medical leave for faculty.
- APM 711 was amended to provide reasonable accommodations to faculty with disabilities.
- APM 080 was created to set forth provisions for medical separation.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare had several comments where were sent to Senate Chair Gardner in a communication dated November 19, 2008 and attached as [Appendix 2](#)

## **Backup Care Work Options Group™**

UC Berkeley requested the review of the Backup Care program, a 24 hour that program enables employees to get to work when they experience breakdowns in their normal care-giving arrangements. UCB has requested the review to determine if this child-care option should be brought up before the UCOP Faculty Welfare Committee. This program has been under discussion for the whole year at various committees. The concern is the expense to the campus. Chair Majumdar requested that committee members review this ASAP to determine whether you are in agreement that this be brought up as an item/issue/benefit to be brought up at Systemwide or feel that this should not be brought up as a potential benefit at UCOP.

## **Divisional Business**

This year, the Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

### **Recruitment and Retention**

- The Committee began the 2007-08 academic year discussing a letter submitted by a UCSF faculty member who focused on the issue of salary on recruitment and retention. The letter read, in part, "*I am trying to recruit a new faculty member in my Department. As usual, it is impossible to make a competitive bid for faculty across the country when you are a small Department with minimal funds. A faculty member that we are very interested in hiring pointed out that she would like to come be part of our team, but she cannot afford to come. She has four offers pending and the salary is a minimum of \$80,000. I am a Department that pays 10% above scale, thus the salary for her would be \$65,000.*" The writer states that without additional income, \$65,000 barely pays for rent and food.

There are a number of factors that account for the lack of acceptance during recruitment:

- Low salaries
  - Housing
  - Tuition remission
  - Childcare
- Larry Pitts requested that the Academic Senate initiate the process to design a UCSF Policy on Recall Salaries for Health Sciences Compensation Plan. He presented the following Draft Proposal regarding UCSF Faculty Recall Practices and Policy:

*There appears to be no policy within the UC system or at UCSF regarding this issue of the health sciences faculty; such a policy was developed and promulgated for general faculty (APM 200 Appendix) in January 2005. Campus or systemwide policy proposals have a mechanism for review before implementation, but no such policy was developed nor did a review occur for recall appointments at UCSF.*

*The Coordinating Committee recommends that the UCSF Division Chair request the Chancellor to convene a working group of faculty and administration representing the four health sciences schools to develop a policy proposal for recall faculty, and that the proposed policy be distributed for appropriate campus review. If such policies do not exist at the other UC campuses and schools with faculty who are members of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, the Chancellor should request that a statewide policy be considered for this important issue.*

The primary issue is the UCSF practice of allying the Health Sciences Compensation plan to recalled faculty, which is not designed for recall faculty and presents significant problems for those at less than 50% time.

Given Medicare and other restraints, the maximum recall faculty can participate is 43% time, and they are given the option of participating in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (at 43% of

pre-retirement of X+Y), but all outside income must be returned to the department/comp plan as when the faculty was at 100%. If a faculty member participates in an external practice (non-patient care) of some sort (in the 57% of free time), and if the faculty member keeps the external income, does not participate in the HSCP, the maximum the university salary will allow is scale zero.

## **UCSF Child Care**

The inability of the current facilities to meet the needs of the campuses for child care and sick-child care has been discussed by Faculty Welfare, The Chancellors Advisory Committee on Status of Women, as well as other groups.

Faculty Welfare invited Diane Wara from the CACSW (Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women) to present their findings in our continued quest to find solutions to this issue.

Diane Wara discussed the work done by the Chancellors Advisory Committee on Child Care. She gave an extensive history and overview of the UCSF Childcare structure, explaining the current policies of wait listing and enrollment for the UCSF child care centers, Lucia at the Parnassus Campus, Laurel Heights Center, and the childcare center at Mission Bay.

The current issues affecting families in need of child-care are:

- More children than available child-care slots.
- There are more than 800 UCSF families on waitlist
- Inadequate holiday and summer options
- No extended hours. Current hours are 7am to 6pm.
- No sick/occasional care @UCSF
- Expense of UCSF childcare exceeds affordability
- The waitlist dynamics are not clear
- Inadequate website/poor information dissemination

## **Going Forward**

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2008-2009:

- Child Care Backup
- Recruitment and Retention

## **Appendices**

[Appendix 1:](#) Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to Chair David Gardner Regarding Review of the Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group (SMG) with Underlying Academic Appointments

[Appendix 2:](#) Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to Chair David Gardner Regarding Review and Comment to Proposed Changes to APMs 710, 711, and 080



## Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare Regarding Review of the Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group (SMG)

**Sharmila Majumdar, PhD, Chair**

March 5, 2008

David Gardner, MD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
Campus Box 0764

**RE: Review of the Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group (SMG)**

Dear Chair Gardner,

The Academic Senate Faculty Welfare committee discussed the Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group (SMG) Leave Policy. The following option was considered most acceptable:

**Policy 2: Establish separate Transitional Leave policy.**

**This policy could be considered acceptable with the addition of the word “faculty” (in red) in the last sentence.**

....with underlying academic appointments become eligible for six months of Transitional Leave after five years in an SMG position (eligible for 12 months after ten years in SMG). SMG members do not continue to accrue Sabbatical Leave credits while in SMG, nor are Sabbatical Leave credits reduced following a Transitional Leave. Transitional Leave is paid at the SMG member's **faculty** rate of pay throughout the leave period.

**Rationale:** This policy clearly separates the two functions of the SMG member and the types of leave they are entitled to in these functions. The activities that a faculty member has to pursue during a translational leave (refreshing of old skills, updating of knowledge) are different than the activities pursued during an academic sabbatical leave (acquisition of new knowledge and skills.) A clear distinction between the translational and academic leave makes it easier to account for this. Since the leave is taken in preparation for the resumption of the academic position, payment during this period should correspond to the payment for this position.

In all cases, the return to duties and payback in case of no return should be clearly documented and clarified prior to the transitional leave. The payback should include salary and benefits.

**Policy 3: Apply standard faculty sabbatical leave policy.**

**The Committee determined that this is a second acceptable option:**

SMG members with underlying faculty appointments accrue Sabbatical Leave credits while working in the SMG appointment, and Sabbatical Leave credits are reduced following the leave. The faculty rate of pay is used during the leave.

Respectfully submitted,

**Committee on Faculty Welfare**

Sharmila Majumdar, PhD, Chair

Tina Raine-Bennett, MD, MPH

Abe Rudolph, MD

Don Kishi, PharmD

Carmen Portillo, RN, PhD, FAAN

Suzanne Mueller, MD

David Rempel, MD, MPH

Caroline Shiboski, DDS, MPH

Candy Tsourounis, PharmD

Jacque Duncan, MD



## Communication from the Task Force Reviewing Proposed Changes to APM 700, 710, 711, and 080

Margaret Walsh, RDH, MS, EdD, Chair

Deborah Greenspan, DSc,BDS  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
Campus Box 0764

June 2, 2006

RE: Proposed Revisions to APM -700, Leaves of Absence/General and APM -710 Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave; Proposed new APM -711, Reasonable Accommodation for Academic Appointees with Disabilities and Proposed new APM -080, Medical Separation

Dear Chair Greenspan:

During the week of May 29, 2006 the Task Force Reviewing Proposed Changes to APM 700, 710, 711, and 080 formally reviewed proposed changes to APM – 700, Leaves of Absence/General and APM – 710 Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave. We also reviewed the proposed new policies APM – 711, Reasonable Accommodation for Academic Appointees with Disabilities and APM – 080, Medical Separation. Due to scheduling challenges this discussion took place electronically. The Task Force consisted of the two members from each school’s Faculty Council and two members from the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). Margaret Walsh, Member of the Committee on Academic Personnel, served as Chair of the Task Force.

The Task Force supports the proposed changes and additions with the following comments or exceptions:

1. APM 700: We understand that, currently, if a faculty member decides not to return without leave approval, he/she can continue to receive salary for up to one year as the process takes about one year to terminate a faculty member, even though failure to show up for assigned duties is cause for termination. The inclusion of the concept of “constructive resignation” is meant to alleviate the costs and frustration experienced by this salary loophole—that a faculty member may continue to be paid but who by choice (not for health reasons or for a family crisis) has decided not to show up for assigned duties and does not formally resign. Given this intent, the Task Force recommends the following:

That the language in the first sentence of APM 700 be modified to specify a set period of time (e.g., no more than 60 days). Without a specified time, this sentence reads as if a faculty member who takes a day off without securing prior approval could risk dismissal. Specifically, the Task Force recommends the following modification (bold) of the first sentence: “If an academic appointee is absent **for more than 60 days from assigned duties** without an approved leave or does not return to assigned duties after an approved leave **for that period of time**, the University may presume that the academic appointee has resigned from his or her appointment with the University.” (Again, “60 days” is only an *exempli gratia* and not an assertion of the Task Force.)

2. As faculty at UCSF are covered by the Health Sciences Compensation Plan and not by the provisions of APM 710, the Task Force makes no comments or recommendations regarding this section.

3. APM 711-0-a Policy, line 4: The Task Force recommends that the University specify at what level it will participate in the interactive process. For example, should it be at the level of Disability Management, Faculty Relations, and/or the Division of Occupational Health? This recommendation also applies to APM 711-5 The Interactive Process, lines 2 and 4.
4. APM 711-80b, line 15: The APM should specify a resolution mechanism in the event that the recommendations of the appointee's healthcare provider are inconsistent with the University-selected healthcare provider.
5. APM 080-0 Policy, line 5: The term "reasonable period of time" needs to be specified. The Task Force recommends a timeframe of three (3) to twelve (12) months.
6. APM 080-1 Basis for Medical Separation Review, Paragraph 1: The Task Force recommends the disability management office be involved early in the process, as opposed to at the end with the medical separation review. The disability management office should to be involved before medical separation is even considered.
7. APM 080-1, Paragraph 3: Regarding the statement, "A medical separation review also may be initiated based on notice of approval of disability income from a retirement system to which the University contributes or approval of University long-term disability insurance benefits": The issue of medical separation initiation and approval of disability income or long-term disability insurance benefits may be a deterrent to individuals deciding to go out on disability. This language should be clarified, as some may perceive these approvals to be a step toward medical separation, even though in some cases it might be warranted.
8. APM 080-1-b, Line 1: The Task Force recommends review by the Chair, Dean, *and* Unit Head. We also suggest oversight by The Committee on Privilege and Tenure as medical separation may involve loss of tenure for a faculty member.

The Task Force appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on these proposed APM modifications.

Yours sincerely,

**THE TASK FORCE REVIEWING PROPOSED CHANGES TO APM 700, 710, 711, AND 080**

Margaret Walsh, RDH, MS, EdD, Committee on Academic Personnel, Chair of the Task Force

Claire Brett, MD, Committee on Academic Personnel

Fritz Fizen, DDS, School of Dentistry Faculty Council

Caroline Shiboski, DDS, MPH, PhD, School of Dentistry Faculty Council

Hugo Quin Chang, MD, School of Medicine Faculty Council

Lawrence Pitts, MD, School of Medicine Faculty Council

Mary Engler, PhD, RN, MS, FAHA, School of Nursing Faculty Council

Jean Ann Seago, PhD, RN, School of Nursing Faculty Council

Matthew P. Jacobson, PhD, School of Pharmacy Faculty Council

Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, School of Pharmacy Faculty Council