



## ANNUAL REPORT

2014-2015

### **Primary Focus Points for the Year:**

- UC Faculty Welfare System-Wide Update
  - UC Care and HMO Proposal
  - UC Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Policy
- Ban on Sugar-Sweetened Beverages Policy
- Climate Survey Task Force
- Chancellor's 500K Fund
- Salary Equity Study
- Faculty Morale Taskforce

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

- Faculty Morale Taskforce

### **Issues for Next Year (2014-2015)**

- Faculty Morale
- Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey
- Chancellor's \$500K Fund

---

### **2013-2014 Members**

---

**Leah Karliner, Chair**

**Roberta Rehm, Vice Chair**

Robin Corelli

Elissa Epel

Paul Green

Thuan Le

Thomas Lowe

Molly Newlon  
Lena Kim

### **Ex-Officio Members**

Michael Winter

---

**Number of Meetings: 5**

**Senate Analyst:** Michelle Sanko

## **System-Wide Business**

### **UC Care and HMO Proposal**

In order to retrieve some of the money spent on healthcare benefits, UCOP has discussed implementing a system-wide HMO. If put in place, would limit health care access to faculty that work in Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara and, to some extent, Riverside and Merced. This has been causing widespread dissatisfaction across all UC campuses. This has received strong pushback from UCFW who have advised that the proposal should not be approved for 2016. UC President Napolitano has confirmed that nothing will happen in 2016 but there is a possibility of action in 2017.

Currently, Healthnet is currently trying to negotiate a deal so that they could administer an HMO that would benefit UC. They are heavily invested in not losing UC business. Faculty is already unhappy with the lack of practitioner hours and available appointments. An HMO would add more patients with the same amount of practitioners.

Letters were sent to the council dealing with the HMO proposal requesting the formation of two taskforces: Healthcare Equity and Mental Healthcare Equity Access. The committee stressed the importance of equal access to healthcare for all UCSF employees.

### **UC Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Policy**

Given the national climate, UC has been under pressure for quite some time to change its Sexual Harassment and Assault Policy into something more effective. A lawyer on UCFW has been reviewing the new policy and some are having trouble with the language, specifically around mandated reporters. New mandatory reporters would receive training and be obligated to report to an arbitrator. The UCSF CFW did not seem to have a problem with these changes but is worried that there are only two women on the UCFW that are participating in drafting the new policy.

## Divisional Business

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

### **Ban on Sugar-Sweetened Beverages Policy**

The Faculty Welfare Committee discussed the proposed policy that would ban the sale of sugar-sweetened beverages on UCSF campuses. Rita Ogden, Director, Health Systems Management and Leeane Jensen, Wellness Program Coordinator provided an overview of proposed policy. The committee discussed some of the benefits and pitfalls of such a policy

- This policy does not eliminate individual choice but, rather, limits availability on campus. Employees and the public are welcome to bring their own sugar-sweetened beverages onto campus.
- As a world-renowned health sciences facility, it's important that we set an example of good diet and healthy lifestyle and its connection to overall good health.
- If UCSF is banning sugar sweetened beverages, why will they not ban other harmful food/drink?
  - Over a third of sugar consumption is liquid sugar.
  - Extensive research indicates that sugar consumption is a major cause of obesity. Such research does not exist in the case of high-fat, high-salt foods or diet sodas.
  - Elimination of these beverages will have maximum health impact and minimum financial impact.
- There is a possibility of pushback from non-campus affiliated vendors (i.e. Panda Express, Subway etc.). However, there are no firm numbers to suggest that banning the sale of these beverages would have a negative financial impact on these vendors or on sales at Moffitt Cafeteria or through Moffitt Catering.
- Both committee members and guests voiced the need for alternative drinks to be sold at campus cafeterias and vendors.
- Overall, the committee and guests agreed that the message of the policy needs to remain positive in that we are offering healthy alternatives not taking away a person's right to consume a certain beverage. Members also recommended a narrowing of the policy's scope to focus on healthy lifestyle.

Rita Ogden and Leeane Jensen will spend the next two months refining the policy message and report back at the December meeting. Again, the committee remains mostly in support of the new policy.

## **Climate Survey Task Force**

A system wide Climate Survey was conducted at the end of 2013/beginning of 2014 to gather a wide variety of data related to the institution's living and working environment. Two specific initiatives with measurable outcomes were designed as a result:

- 1) "Non-Childbearing Leave" Initiative
  - a. Currently new mothers are given six weeks of paid maternity leave that is funded by their department. This initiative explores extending those benefits to "non-childbearing parents" (i.e. fathers, adoptive parents and same-sex couples).
  - b. Several factors are being considered including the financial impact of extending leave, the age of an adopted child, whether both parents are employed by UC.
  - c. This benefit would be considered separate from "Family Leave" and would attract more employees. Additionally, it would allow UCSF to remain competitive with other top-tier schools and hospitals.
  
- 2) Initiative to improve work/life balance
  - a. A salary equity report is due at the end of the year and will focus on compensation and living expenses
  - b. Member Le raised the issue of a study being done to show the discrepancy between San Francisco cost of living and faculty salary. This is a major issue for recruitment and other matters.
  - c. Vice Chair Roberta Rehm will continue to represent the UCSF Committee on Faculty Welfare for this initiative.

## **Chancellor's \$500K Fund – Faculty Enrichment Portion**

Requests were cut by 23% to achieve the \$500K given by the Chancellor. Faculty Welfare was awarded roughly \$91K to go towards Faculty Enrichment. A sub-committee will be appointed to decide who should receive the funds. The mechanism for such a decision will not necessarily be permanent and could change in coming years. The committee had the following feedback:

- Faculty should have equal access to all funds (Jr. faculty included)
- There needs to be a mechanism/metrics to analyze how money was awarded.
- The senate should specify that only one request for funding should be made. The application process itself should not be labor-intensive

The committee also discussed the following criteria for deciding who should be awarded funds:

- An application should answer the question "How will this enrich my faculty life?"
- The description will include examples of covered/non-covered expenses.

- Applicants will have to submit receipts after grant has been awarded for analysis purposes.

A brief discussion was also had over how much applicants should be awarded. Members brought up examples of lower cost “enrichment” items (i.e. software) and higher cost items (conference attendance). It was decided that the range for awards would be \$250-\$2000 to account for items of all costs.

The committee also brought up the possibility that the criteria were too vague. One suggestion was to limit travel funding to junior faculty. The committee also decided to eliminate meals, family travel, personal expenses and entertainment from the award.

The Committee reviewed fourteen Faculty Enrichment Applications, approving nine. The remaining five applications were approved pending further information. The following criteria were created for future applicants:

- The issue of awarding funds to Emeritus members came up. The committee decided to approve Emeritus Professor James Cleaver’s application for \$2000.
- Chancellor’s funds can only be awarded to faculty members that are employed at UCSF 50% of the time, eliminating most volunteer faculty requests
- The committee decided that they would approve funds for activities that occurred any time in the current academic year.
- For requests such as the treadmill desk, the committee would like to confirm with applicants that the item has been tested before the funds are given.
- The funds should be limited to one “conceptual request” (example: one conference, one desk set-up etc.)

### **Salary Equity Study**

Committee member Thomas Lowe gave an update on the UCSF Salary Equity study that was done in 2014. The following points were made:

- There is a small but significant difference between male and female salaries. The difference changes when applied to x, x’ or z portions of salaries.
- A recommendation has been made to have the deans of all four schools conduct independent studies regarding salary equity. Each school will have a separate action plan to address the difference.
- There have been generally positive reviews of the study and report quality. The committee made many efforts to get opinions on legality and concentrated on good data

### **Faculty Morale Taskforce**

Chair Karliner led a discussion as part of her participation on the Chancellor’s committee to improve Faculty Morale.

- The Chancellor has indicated that he's working on cost of living and morale improvements among faculty. It was stressed that morale is represented in a number of areas. There are areas of small improvement ("low-hanging fruit") and areas of wider growth.
- Suggestions from the UCSF CFW included more bridge funding, supporting the cost of living and growing our mentoring programs. Mentoring programs could present a challenge since many departments have very specific requirements. Another option would be a "Sponsorship Program" where people would promote their colleagues for purposes of collaboration.
- Another change that was mentioned was improvements on parking and transportation, such as subsidized bus passes. In addition, the committee mentioned creating a faculty concierge or someone that could help facilitate health care access to UCSF employees. The working conditions at Mission Hall were also mentioned as a tie-in to declining morale.

### Task Forces and Other Committee Service

This year, members of the Academic Senate Clinical Affairs Committee served on the following Academic Senate task forces.

- Clinical Chairs Committee (Phil Rosenthal)
- School of Medicine Faculty Council (Phil Rosenthal)
- UCSF Clinical Enterprise Strategic Planning Group (Phil Rosenthal)

### Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions, which the Committee will continue into 2014-2015:

- Clinical Operations Survey
- Move of Inpatient Care to Mission Bay Hospital

### Appendices

[Appendix 1](#): Accountable Care Organizations at UCSF Presentation

[Appendix 2](#): Sunday, February 1, 2015 Move of Inpatient Care to Mission Bay

[Appendix 3](#): Response to Sunday, February 1, 2015 Move of Inpatient Care to Mission Bay Memo

Senate Staff: Michelle Sanko; [michelle.sanko@ucsf.edu](mailto:michelle.sanko@ucsf.edu); 415-476-9683