

Committee on Academic Planning & Budget

Chad Christine, MD, Chair

DRAFT MINUTES

Tuesday, January 26, 2016

PRESENT: Chad Christine (Chair), Russ Pieper (Vice Chair), Janine Cataldo, Michael Clune, Howard Fields, Stefan Habelitz, Hannah Glass, Sally Marshall, , Norm Oppenheimer, Howard Pinderhughes, Paul Volberding, Meg Wallhagen

ABSENT: Michelle Arkin Jennifer Arnett, Joe Bengfort, Mike McMaster, Sean Mong, Elliot Seeley, Lydia Zablotska

GUESTS: Esther Carter, Director of Postdoc Services; Jason Stout, HR Strategy Manager

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) was called to order by Chair Chad Christine on January 26, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in room MH-2110. A quorum was present.

Approval of the November Minutes

Committee members reviewed and approved of the October minutes.

Chair's Report

Chair Christine reported on the following item:

- **UCSF Academic Senate Division Meeting:** Committee members are encouraged to attend the UCSF Academic Senate's Divisional Meeting on January 28, at Rock Hall. The meeting will be focused on the future of faculty workspace. Chancellor Hawgood will be in attendance to respond to faculty questions and comments.
- **University Development:** APB committee member Michelle Arkin has been brainstorming with the Development subcommittee on ways to raise the level of support for faculty mentoring. She is interested in taking ideas forward to the Academic Senate's Coordinating Committee for support. Chair Christine and the committee members offered their support for any proposals.
- **Retirement Options Task Force Report:** The UC Retirement Options Task Force released their final report on January 15. Committee members will be asked to provide their feedback at today's meeting. Once collected, an APB committee response will be sent on to UCSF Division Chair Ruth Greenblatt. After the committee communication is sent, APB members will still have the opportunity to comment on the task force recommendations on the Office of the President's website - <http://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/compensation-and-benefits/2016-retirement-benefits/rotf-report.pdf>. The comment period ends on February 18.

UCPB Report

UCPB representative Russ Pieper continued the discussion on the proposed new UC retirement tier. After reviewing the Retirement Task Force recommendations, committee members discussed and grouped their concerns into three general categories:

- **Overall effect of the plan on retirement benefits:** Members believe that with UC salaries that are below our comparators, for both staff and faculty, the retirement system has been one of the few remaining incentives for employment in the UC system. The 2016 tier, as proposed in the report, represents not a shift in benefits but rather a substantial cut in benefits and total remuneration in comparison the 2013 tier. Because the 2013 tier was essentially neutral, benefits-wise, relative to the UC's comparators and substantially behind salary-wise, the 2016 tier will put UCSF employees further behind in both salary and benefits. APB members are additionally concerned that salary increases, which have been historically difficult to institute, remain the only means to cover the gap in benefits the proposed plan

creates. The existing UCRP is a well-funded and well-reasoned plan with small and resolvable deficits. The proposed plan, in contrast appears hastily considered, was not based on a full range of options, and was designed to address a fiscal problem that could be resolved by less drastic measures.

- Effects on recruitment and retention: APB members feel that the total remuneration package offered continues to fall further behind that of our comparators will limit our ability to recruit the best and brightest to UC and UCSF. Furthermore, although younger hires may be less concerned with retirement packages at the outset, the proposed 2016 tier begins to limit retirement benefits at mid-career, which is exactly the point at which many individuals reach their peak performance. As such the proposed plan increases the temptation for successful mid-career employees to leave the university, and also limits our ability to recruit mid-career individuals with proven records and abilities.
- Equality: The proposed plan creates inequality among faculty and staff in at least two ways. First, new hires post 2016 will receive retirement benefits that are significantly less than those of previous hires. Such approaches do little to encourage co-operation and instead begin to drive wedges between different groups of faculty and staff. Second, the institution of the PEPRA cap will impact UC employees, and UC campuses, disproportionately. Those individuals with higher pay scales, and in particular those in law, business, economics, engineering, and health sciences, will have their benefits limited earlier and more extensively than other UC employees. This is a particular concern for campuses such as UCSF that have a high proportion of individuals on the Health Sciences compensation plan and who are already relatively disadvantaged with respect to covered compensation. The proposed plan amounts to a targeted cut to those programs (science, biotechnology, engineering, health care) that most Californians agree have helped build our vibrant economy. To support an expansion of STEM-based education while at the same time targeting faculty in these areas makes little sense.

Overall, the UCSF Committee on Academic Planning and Budget members agreed that they could not support the taskforce recommendations as presented and encourage the President to work with the faculty and the Governor to devise a plan that more fairly compensates UC and UCSF employees for their often career-long efforts. Members believe that the absence of such a plan will force UCSF to work with other health care campuses to find ways of plugging a new and unwarranted hole in our compensation program.

HR Report

HR Strategy Manager Jason Stout and Esther Carter, Director of Postdoc Services, attended the APB committee meeting to provide a report on the status of HR services. Their presentation covered the following points:

- Annual Service Partnership Agreement (SPA) Process
 - The survey is an annual process
 - HR SPA process calls for annual review of the agreement
 - Committee recommendations are sent to the HR Advisory board for review and approval
 - Current Status
 - Staff and Academic SPA committee met in September and October to develop recommendations
 - HR process owners reviewed the recommendations of the committee
 - HR Feedback was sent to SPA committees
 - Next Steps
 - HR Advisory Board approval of updates SPA, edits as needed
 - Post and communication updated SPA
- 2015 Annual Service Partnership Agreement (SPA) Results
 - SPA Subcommittees approve SPA report format in March 2015
 - Monthly report distribution started in May of 2015
 - On the academic side, target success has gotten better since march of 2015
 - On the staff side, overall target success is better
- SPA Sub-committee
 - Academic Outcomes

- Updated services provided to move recruitment to Academic Affairs Office
 - The Committee recommends 2 service commitment updates
 - Change funding changes from 4.5 day to 5 days
 - Remove separations as a metric
 - The committee developed 8 new process improvement priorities
 - Proposed Improvements to the following academic processes
 - Training: How to submit the ideal academic ticket
 - Training: Postdoc 101
 - Training: Faculty Compensation
 - Training: Overview of Visas
 - Training: Advance – CVs
 - Training: Academic Recruitment
 - SRS return to department enhancements
 - Turnaround and timing document
 - Staff Outcomes
 - The committee recommends no substantive changes to the service section of the agreement
 - The committee recommends keeping all existing service commitment with no changes to the target turnaround times
 - The committee recommends adding 3 service commitment metrics
 - The committee developed 7 new process improvement priorities and provided a rank order based on impact and difficulty
 - Proposed Improvements to the following staff processes
 - Offer letter standards
 - Job Advertisement Option Tools
 - Salary Setting Processes
 - Premium Recruitment Services
 - Return for Changes
 - HR Website
 - Funding Changes
- Next Steps
 - Services commitment recommendations from the sub-committees
 - Proceeded with 2016 work plan items
 - Continue to evaluate premium recruitment (staff) options and conduct a deeper needs assessment.
 - Add new turnaround targets to the SPA document in January 2016
 - Results reporting for new metrics to be developed in 2016
 - Update and communicate SPA in January of 2016

At the end of the presentation, APB members asked for the HR department to collect metrics not only on staff hires, but also academic hires. Faculty should know how long it takes to fill a vacant position. These metrics would help in the communication process with faculty. Committee members also requested another meeting with HR Manager Stout before the end of the year.

Old Business

None

New Business

None

Chair Chad Christine adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Academic Senate Staff:
Artemio Cardenas, Senate Analyst
Artemio.Cardenas@ucsf.edu (415) 476-4245

DRAFT