



**Committee on Faculty Welfare**  
**Grayson W. (Bill) Marshall, DDS, PhD, MPH, Chair**

## ANNUAL REPORT 2011-2012

**Primary Focus Points for the Year:**

- APM 670 and 668
- UC Changes to Post Employment Benefits
- Response to the Systemwide Task Force on Senate Membership
- Participation in the UCSF Divisional Task Force on Senate Membership
- Review of Changes to Post Employment Benefits and Increasing Costs of Health Care
- Proposed Pilot Program for Emergency Backup Dependent Care
- COLASC Efforts to Support an Open Access Model for Scholarly Communication
- Tobacco-free at UCSF and Tobacco-free Hiring Policies

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

- Task Force on Senate Membership – Paul Green, Representative
- Proposed Modifications to APM 670 Governing to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan to Allow for Greater External Activity

**Issues for Next Year (2012-2013)**

- Senate Membership Task Force
- Health Care Costs
- Open Access Policy
- Increasing burden on faculty to comply with requirements, rules, guidelines and regulations
- Rebenching

---

**2011-2012 Members**

**Grayson (Bill) Marshall, DDS, PhD, MPH,  
Chair**

**Paul Green, PhD, Vice Chair**

Pam Bellefeuille, RN

Carolyn Calfee, MD

Christine Cheng, PharmD

Maria Dall'era, MD

Kristen Greene, MD

Leah Karliner, MD

Octavia Plesh, DDS, MS

Shuvo Roy, PhD

Abe Rudolph, MD (Emeritus Rep)

Lisa Thompson, FNP, MS, PhD

**Permanent Guests**

Brent Lin, DMD (Clinical Rep)

Jae Sevelius, PhD (Adjunct Rep)

---

**Number of Meetings: 4**

**Senate Analyst: Alison Cleaver**

## Systemwide Business

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

### **APM 670 & 668 Update**

UCSF faculty member Ellen Weber substituted for Chair Marshall at the recent the Systemwide Faculty Welfare Committee. In the discussion around APM 670, issues were raised on:

1. "In good standing" being connected to a faculty member's financial standing and their ability to bring in funding
2. Management of APUs through the APU Advisory Board
  - a. Appointment of people to that board seems arbitrary
  - b. Fifty percent of those appointed to that board are done so by the Dean.
  - c. Faculty Welfare members proposed that members of the APU Advisory Board should be representative and selected from the campus-at-large.

Many of the Senate suggested changes were implemented especially with regards to APU Advisory board. However, suggested opportunities for outside practice have not been included in the final and accepted version of APM 670.

In the discussion on APM 668—which is an APM 670 look-alike for non-health sciences professional campuses—most general campuses declined supporting it. Arguments against it included:

1. Generating outside income is separate from the mission of UC Campuses
2. Faculty using outside income to supplement their incomes could askew the opportunity for all faculty to get raises and erode salary equity at non-health science UC campuses.
3. Despite opposition from many campuses, plans for a pilot study are under consideration.

### **Proposed Changes to Systemwide Changes to Post Employment Benefits**

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare had spent a year working with UCOP on proposed changes to Post Employment Benefits for faculty. Chair Marshall made regular reports to the Committee and explained the issues related to the Final Report from the Post Employment Benefits Task Force.

### **Response to the Systemwide Task Force on Senate Membership**

Paul Green, FW Vice Chair and Member, UCSF Academic Senate Membership Task Force, updated committee members on the reception at the Systemwide level and the changes forthcoming at UCSF. He read part of UCSF Academic Senate Chair Bob Newcomer's letter on the next step for proceeding at the Systemwide level. Bob Anderson, Systemwide Chair Senate Council, has asked for an injunction against UCSF from Systemwide Rules & Jurisdiction.

In July 2012, UCSF Academic Senate Chair Bob Newcomer updated faculty on the status of the UCSF initiative. The UC Rules & Jurisdiction (UCR&J) committee rejected UCSF's proposal, resulting in the decision to delay implementing the extension of Senate membership to Health Science Clinical and Adjunct faculty. However, other solutions are actively being pursued and a solution is expected by the end of 2012-13 fiscal year. ([Appendix 1](#) and [2](#))

### **Increasing Costs to UCSF Employees for Health Care Plans**

Chair Marshall reported from UCFW regarding increased cost sharing for retiree health insurance premiums. A Systemwide task force, a subcommittee of Faculty Welfare, was formed to examine these issues. Chair Marshall took feedback from the UCSF FW Committee to UCFW, where most representatives believe that family-friendly health care plans are a priority for faculty. The Systemwide Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) is continuing to meet.

### **Faculty Legal Services**

Recent legal developments at various UC Campuses have revealed the following issues:

1. UC Systemwide has the option to defend faculty in criminal cases – it does defend in civil cases – but its unclear if a faculty member has coverage all matters.
2. A secondary issue arose noting it is undetermined whether or not the UC System would cover expenses of whistleblowers.
3. Unilaterally, no legal expenses are paid in faculty Privilege & Tenure matters (faculty grievances).

### **Systemwide Health Care Task Force**

A Health Care Task Force has been developed to stabilize escalating UC contributions to health care, rather than the anticipated 8% annual increase. Ideas include making Kaiser the standard program for employees, rather than Blue & Gold or using the UC medical centers as a potential primary provider.

New combined contribution plans are also being discussed by UCFW. They have posed the question if support for families is as important as salary increases to faculty. Generally the response from faculty has favored continuation of family friendly policies. Once eliminated such benefits are unlikely to be re-instated.

### **UCOP Funding Streams Model**

With the new UCOP Funding Streams model, all tuition funds generated by each campus are to stay with the respective campus. General 19900 funds are to be renumbered and won't be linked to FTE assignments. This is important because benefits, and salary increases, won't be connected to FTEs. Faculty will need to budget for the inclusion of benefits in their grants. This change could allow campuses to pay faculty off-scale.

However, usually when a faculty member leaves the campus, the open position is reset to an Assistant Professor, Step 3 level of funding. This reset allows for more junior faculty to come to the university. If you hire someone at the Associate level -- that pool of money would normally come back. However now it may not. The unlinking is a done deal, however the money path is still being explored.

## **Divisional Business**

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

### **Proposed Pilot UCSF Backup Child and Elder Care Program**

Family Services Manager Suzie Kirrane updated committee members on the [Pilot Backup Dependent Care Program](#) (which includes Elder Care) that was launched in June 2011. A similar program was launched and successful at UC Berkeley. The proposal was for \$125 annual fee for 15 days of care, with \$6/hour at home and \$15/day in center co-pay. The pilot didn't reach its target number of participants for faculty, so the program was expanded to include residents and fellows. It is still being explored if this can be rolled out to staff as well. Bright Horizons nationwide childcare provider is the UCSF partner in the program. The program faces challenges especially to the current funding gap.

In the Pilot, there were 130 enrollees. Combined there were 158 registrants (some enrollees have 2+ children or dependents).

- Each person paid \$125 annually to use the program. There is no age limit to the dependent but data to date shows that childcare is what is most widely being used.
- Most requests have been to Bright Horizon network centers.
- Most common reason for why backup care is being utilized is that the regular caregiver is unavailable or school isn't in session.
- Use of the program is at 108% of anticipated use
- The first quarter's customer serve satisfaction survey has been completed and scores are all high. Biggest complaint was that Centers didn't seem prepared to receive dependents.

- This program is separate from the January 2012-launched “Sitter City” which provides UCSF employees with access to their portal and a “Craigs List”-style of moderately screen care providers for children and pets. Both programs will run parallel.

Faculty Welfare members drafted a Communication to recommend the UCSF model be modified to more closely reflect how the UC Berkeley campus handles backup dependent care ([Appendix 3](#) and [4](#)). They further recommended the UCSF Chancellor publicly endorse the program or that UC Systemwide adopt it, and assist in funding it.

The Chancellor approved a tiered funding request for the Backup Child and Elder Care program, for financial years 2012-13 (\$60,000), 2013-14 (\$40,000) and 2014-15 (\$20,000). This funding will allow for expansion of the program and enable the program managers to further develop a long term funding model. ([Appendix 3](#))

**Joint Review with the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Proposing Modifications to APM 668 and APM 670 Governing the Health Sciences Compensation Plan to Allow for Greater External Activity**

Mary Gray, Vice Chair of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) and Vice Chair of the APB Subcommittee Investigating Possible Changes to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan to Allow for Greater External Activity presented the APB recommendations for modification to APM sections 025 and 670 governing the Health Sciences Compensation Plan to increase benefits for faculty, particularly in light of the recent reduction in Post Employment Benefits and limited salary increases.

The major issue under examination is regarding external clinical care. There is significant historical evidence and precedent necessitating limiting external practices. Points requiring clarification include the exclusion of the Clinical Professor, Volunteer faculty from the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, the definition and enforcement of the requirement to be a faculty member “in Good Standing,” and the significance of liability issues regarding outside patient care. ([Appendix 4](#))

**Funding Streams and Rebenching Initiative (UCSF Focus)**

Funding Streams and Rebenching is a revised methodology for how the University of California allocates State general funds, tuition, indirect cost recoveries, and other core central funds to the individual campuses. Key components of the Funding Streams phase include:

1. Allows revenue, including student tuition and fees and indirect cost recoveries, to remain at source campuses instead of being pooled together and differentially reallocated by UCOP.
2. One key exception sustains the redistribution of undergraduate financial aid across campuses, though it does eliminate graduate reallocations.
3. Implements a new expenditure tax on campuses, called a “Systemwide Assessment” that will be used to fund central UCOP operations: \$278m total, 1.6% of annual current funds expense
4. Changes the methodology for calculating future campus augmentations and cuts

The new Funding Streams methodology for allocating budget reductions disadvantages UCSF in that:

1. It redistributes UCSF state funds to other campuses
2. In 2011-2012 UCSF will receive a one-time partial relief—“glide path funding”—of \$3.91m
3. UCSF may be subject to another cut of approximately \$4.35m due to the pending 2011-2012 \$100m trigger-based budget cut.

These budget process changes impact UCSF in four ways:

1. Loss of \$38.2m of State educational appropriation
2. Loss of \$18.0m Systemwide Research Funds
3. Gain of \$3.2m from Student Tuition
4. Loss Systemwide of \$8.7m due to Funding Streams and Rebenching Process. (This initiative was implemented during the July 2011.)

In addition to this, UCSF needs to self-cut to pay for another \$12.0m of fixed cost increases including salary, benefits, and retirement costs.

### Rebenching

This UC Systemwide initiative aims to determine the best way to redistribute the existing state funding base. As of June 2012, UCSF was set aside from the Rebenching conversation as its education model and student population differ from that of the rest of the UC System, and as such, would be at a severe disadvantage if included in the general Rebenching plans. More information to follow as available.

Overall UC Systemwide Rebenching Initiative has included:

1. A rebenching budget committee was formed in 2010 and is generating a proposal for redistribution of state funds across campuses;
2. Includes as a goal the identification of the various primary functions of the university (teaching, research, public service, health science) and a goal of determining what the “proper” allocation to those functions should be;
3. There was a strong inclination to use future incremental funding to reach identified goals, rather than redistributing existing funds during a time of budget cuts, but both alternatives are still under consideration.

It is important that Rebenching takes into account UCSF’s unique character as well as some of the outcomes of Funding Streams. Key factors include:

1. High cost of health science education
2. Significant expense to maintain medical education facilities
3. Need for baseline support regardless of student numbers
4. Challenge of a taxation model based on federal expenditure totals
5. UCSF is currently paying a large proportion (18%) of the Systemwide assessment despite accounting for a small portion (5.5%) of the state funds and student fees
6. Many UCOP services are not applicable to UCSF programs
7. The existing Funding Streams allocation methodology hurts UCSF on an on-going basis

### **Tobacco-free@UCSF and Tobacco-free Hiring Policies**

Rita Ogden, Director, Ambulatory Care along with Leeanne Jensen presented on the proposal to only hire tobacco-free employees moving forward. A similar policy is in place in eight states, including hospital systems such as the Cleveland Clinic in Ohio.

The testing will be included in the standard drug testing done of all potential employees in the Medical Center. Drug testing will be new to potential employees at the Campus. It is also being proposed to apply to students. There is no intention to police or enforce this policy beyond the initial hiring phase.

Committee members raised issues of:

1. Tobacco dependency being listed in the DSM.
2. What else could be added to a no-hire list, e.g. obesity.
3. Successful implementation could change the health care costs at UCSF over time. Insurance companies could grant a lower health care cost per employee and for the institution if both could be shown to be smoke-free.

Separately, members asked about obtaining data from other hospitals or institutions who have implemented this policy already, in particular as it pertains to affecting the hiring of low-income job applicants. Statistics regularly show that long-term smoking is more prevalent in those communities. As of June 2012, this hiring policy is still being explored, and hasn’t been implemented.

### Tobacco-free at Work

This would be separate and independent of the hiring policy. It would be implemented ahead of the Tobacco-free Employee Hiring model and would be included as part of the Dress Code Policy that includes no alcohol at work, and modified wearing of strong perfume.

Both issues need significant further discussion at campus and perhaps Systemwide level since they raise important issues on employee individual rights. CFW received the report but took no further action.

### **Benefits Presentation**

Pamela Hayes, Benefits Representative, Campus HR provided an overview of benefits for faculty. At present, when faculty join UCSF, they don't receive a comprehensive benefits overview. With some of the OE changes, a one-hour overview webinar is being developed for faculty. This would be separate from the Faculty Development Day (held in September) and is proposed to occur twice a month to accommodate faculty hires throughout the year.

Committee members recommended:

1. This information be shared with faculty member in advance of their arriving – or even accepting their faculty offer.
2. Members also asked for an explanation of faculty housing assistance; while this latter item isn't handled by benefits directly - Pamela Hayes will route to the right group within HR to be added to the Benefits website.
3. A single sign-on location within the Benefits website, and within that a clear step-by-step instruction list for new hires/potential hires.
  - a. If a short instructional video were included along with the step-by-step instructions it might be most beneficial.
  - b. If faculty choose to opt-out of a particular benefit, it should be clearly communicated to them that particular benefits—once declined—can never be restored in the future.
    - i. Examples of this include use of UC legal services and Disability Insurance.
  - c. Of crucial importance is having a Benefits representative available to discuss options.
    - i. Pamela Hayes advised that everyone has access to a Health Care Facilitator who can do so – however most faculty were unaware of this.

CFW looks forward to continuing communication and participation in improving faculty access to benefits information.

### **Presentation on Disability Management Program**

Members discussed with Judy Rosen, UCSF Disability Manager, better ways to communicate to faculty as a whole the fact that this service exists. Staff is aware of it, however, faculty often do not discover it until long past when they need it.

Committee members recommended a website link from Academic Affairs and each School back to the Disability Management webpage be created.

They also advised including this information in with the Benefits overview new faculty receive when joining UCSF. They also recommended the creation of a Disability Handbook specific to Faculty.

### **Health Care Facilitator Program**

Sue Forstat provided an overview on the Health Care Facilitator Program (HCFP) which provide assistance to staff, faculty, UCSF Medical Center employees, and UC retirees on health care programs, including answering questions on how the programs work, billing, and comparing the health plans as needed. It's completely confidential and free.

Most recently, HCFP held a seminar to assist people who just retired and switched to Medicare. They aimed to explain what happens to their insurance when this switch occurs.

FW Members recommended various pathways to increase visibility of this program, including:

1. A table at Faculty Development Day each Fall, including training employees where to find the information they need.
2. Being added to the Academic Affairs website
3. Overall advertising that Human Resources is here for faculty, in addition to staff.
4. Communicate with UCSF Primary Care Physicians such that they are passing this information along to patients who are UCSF employees.

### **IT Privacy**

CIO E. Harel and IT Security Officer D. Rusting provided an overview on email privacy and security measures that surround it at UCSF.

Spam filters pull out about 90% of all emails sent to campus. For the Medical Center, PHI information is a little bit more difficult to filter. The combination within an email of both the UCSF patient number (MRN) with patient name will bounce the communication to the secure email portal—if the communication is being sent outside of the UCSF system. It will also send an automatic reply to the sender that they had used the incorrect format. This policy may be developed for the full campus.

Faculty Welfare committee members inquired about:

1. Use of the secure email portal.
  - a. Guest Rusting explained: simply type: “secure:” into the subject line or “PHI” and it will automatically go to the secure portal.
2. Input provided by UCSF CIO to the Systemwide level committees.
  - a. Guest Harel confirmed that he serves on several Systemwide committees including one with his counterparts from all other UC campuses.
3. If there is anything new on the horizon that faculty should be aware of now, in re privacy matters
  - a. Guest Rusting said still in development are practices to assist each campus with new IT policies that are coming down from the UC Office of the President.

### **Public Records Act and Requests for Public Records**

Guests Harel and Rusting provided an overview on what constitutes a “public record” and the UCSF policies regarding it and requests for public records. The UCSF Legal Affairs website has information on [Public Record Act \(PRA\) Requests](#). Chair Marshall requested a broad educational effort be made that can create “Best Practices” around this topic. Guest Rusting advised that a campaign around Security Awareness was in development.

### **Library Space at Mission Bay**

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reaffirmed its 2009-2010 Communication to the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication in support of the proposed space recommendations for the Mission Bay Libraries. Members strongly endorsed the recommendations outlined in the Library Master Plan, including a larger consolidated library at Mission Bay and secured 24-hour library access at all UCSF locations. ([Appendix 5](#))

## Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2012-2013:

- Senate Membership Task Force
- Health Care Costs
- Open Access Policy
- Increasing burden on faculty to comply with requirements, rules, guidelines and regulations
- Rebenching

## Appendices

- [Appendix 1:](#) Response from the Systemwide Task Force on Senate Membership
- [Appendix 2:](#) Communication from the UCSF Academic Senate Chair Robert Newcomer to all UCSF Faculty Regarding Academic Senate Membership
- [Appendix 3:](#) Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to Campus Life, Facilities, and Administrative Services on the Pilot Backup Dependent Care Program
- [Appendix 4:](#) Joint Communications from the Committees on Academic Planning and Budget and Faculty Welfare Proposing Modifications to APM 668 and APM 670 Governing the Health Sciences Compensation Plan
- [Appendix 5:](#) Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication on the *Recommendation on Mission Bay Library Space*

Senate Staff:  
Alison Cleaver, Senior Analyst  
[alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu](mailto:alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu); 415.476.3808