

Committee on Faculty Welfare
Leah Karliner, MD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT
2015-2016

Primary Focus Points for the Year:

- 2016 Faculty Enrichment Fund
- 2016 UC Retirement Tier
- Human Resources Reforms
- IT Security
- Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey
- Private Supplemental Disability
- Review of Faculty Exit Survey
- UC Benefits Coordinator Meeting
- UCSF Family Friendly Taskforce

Issues for Next Year (2016-2017)

- Enrichment Fund
- Gender Equity
- Human Resource Reforms
- IT Security
- Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Study/Faculty Workspace
- Supplemental Disability

2015-2016 Members

Leah Karliner, Chair

Roberta Rehm, Vice Chair

Robin Corelli

Michael Disandro

Doranne Donesky

Paul Green

Margot Kushel

Thuan Le

Shuvo Roy

Number of Meetings: 5

Senate Analyst: Artemio Cardenas

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

2016 UC Retirement Tier

In May of 2015, UC President Napolitano and Governor Brown agreed to a budget deal that would provide UC with additional state funding in turn for an undergraduate tuition freeze and several university policy reforms. One of the components of the deal was a requirement from Governor Brown and the state legislature that UC align its pension plan with the state's CalPers program. This included a cap on UCRP covered compensation at \$117,000. On January 15, 2016, the UC Retirement Taskforce released their recommendations report for systemwide review. UC Faculty Welfare representative Roberta Rehm reported that in February, UCFW reviewed and comment on the recommendations. All UCFW members expressed displeasure with the proposed recommendations and the implementation of the proposed new pension tier. Members noted that the proposed new tier would not only cut employee benefits, but it would also barely net the university any savings. Some members discussed requesting that the President reject the plan.

On March 15, with consideration of the Retirement Task Force recommendations, President Napolitano released her proposed plan for a new tier. In the proposal, the President decided to split benefits options between faculty and staff and make changes to the percentage supplemental matching funds above the PEPPRA cap of \$117,000. At the end of March, the Regents approved of the new 2016 UC Retirement Plan tier, as proposed by the President.

In June, Division Chair Ruth Greenblatt asked the Committee on Faculty Welfare to review the approved plan and discuss potential ideas for how the campus could mitigate the future impact on faculty recruitment and retention. To compensate for the retirement benefit cut, committee members proposed the following alternative ideas for UC and UCSF to consider:

- Loan Forgiveness/Tuition Repayment
- Subsidized Childcare
- Matching Funds for Dependent College Tuition
- Covering Moving Expenses
- Expansion of the MOP Loan Program
- Support for Family Friendly Initiatives

Members also discussed the idea of requesting salary compensation for new hires under the 2016 tier. However, members felt that supplementing compensation may not be a good idea as it would be very difficult to implement and would create a great deal of administrative burden.

UC Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Committee Reports

In February, UCFW Representative Roberta Rehm provided the committee with the following report:

- Cybersecurity: In February, it became public that the UC Office of the President had contracted with an external vendor to monitor network traffic on all campuses. The decision to monitor the networks was done to help secure campus information after leadership had become aware of potential security breaches. When news of the network monitoring was leaked, faculty, students and staff all noted concern that network monitoring may be a breach of privacy. The Office of the President responded that the monitoring occurred within policy guidelines. However, due to concerns and cost of the vendor, UC will be suspending all monitoring efforts until better options can be identified. Overall, faculty believe that the security actions were poorly communicated to the campus community.

In June, UC Faculty Welfare Committee representative Roberta Rehm provided the following written report:

- UC Care Update: Anthem Blue Cross has been named as the new third party administrator for UC Care beginning January, 2017. They are currently evaluating "disruptions" that will occur with the transition. While 1500 providers will be now be out of the plan, 6700 will now be moved to "in

network” status. All providers who will not be in the plan are being contacted to see if they want to join, or reactivate as network providers.

- Behavioral and mental health services have been raised as a significant concern by UCFW and the Health Care Task Force. Jack Stobo, executive in charge of health plans has formed a task-force to study the needs and recommend improvements.
- Faculty Salary Increases: 3% raise in faculty salaries again, with 1.5% going to the scales, and 1.5% to be allocated at campus discretion to address equity, inversion, etc. Last year this led to the majority of UCSF faculty receiving 1.5%, and no faculty from the smaller schools receiving any “equity” funds.
- Tuition Benefits for Dependents: The Riverside Division has recommended that tuition reimbursement be considered as a faculty benefit, which UCFW thought would be very appealing to faculty and helpful in recruiting. However, previous proposals have not been approved due to expense.
- Disability Benefit Changes: A new disability plan revising the current structure and expense of short term/long term plans is being considered by the UC system and details should be available soon.
- Family Friendly Policies: Proposals under discussion with the Human Resources and Benefits office include a cash benefit to assist faculty who adopt a child, and further exploration of child-care support. It is a goal of UCFW to support “family friendly” initiatives, but it is unclear whether there is money to support these initiatives.
- UC Faculty Exit Survey: The UC wide exit survey is entering a pilot-testing year. Six campuses (not UCSF) are participating. They plan to also survey faculty who choose to remain in the UC system. There will be a system-wide roundtable meeting at Irvine in June to discuss early results. I believe our own Robin Corelli will attend.
- Mortgage Origination Program: The Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) for faculty has raised its limits for borrowing to 1.4 million. Representatives have met with UCFW 3 times this year to discuss concerns about how housing issues are affecting faculty, both current and potential hires. Different campuses have varied access to types of housing for faculty and there are strict rules about how funds from the MOP can be used, e.g., no multiunit buildings are funded.

Divisional Business

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

Faculty Enrichment Fund

In 2014, the Chancellor announced that he would be awarding the Academic Senate with an annually re-occurring fund of \$500,000. The aim of the fund would be to benefit faculty life. After receiving the funds in the spring of 2015, the Senate decided to break up its standing committees into five clusters and divide the funding equally. A total of \$91,000 was allocated to the Faculty Welfare committee for the use of Faculty Enrichment funds. These funds were available for a broad number of items and activities to benefit faculty.

In October of 2015, Chair Karliner asked for all awardees to provide feedback on their experiences. A report on the experiences (Attachment 1) was provided to the group. Overall, awardees were very satisfied with their items and activities received through the program.

Using the feedback provided, members agreed that the Faculty Enrichment Fund should continue through the 2015-2016 academic year. After discussion, the committee agreed upon the following criteria:

- The Enrichment Fund will consist of small grants, \$250-\$2,000, focused on enhancing work-life and/or well-being at work for a UCSF faculty member;
- For requests for furniture (e.g., sit-stand desks) and computers, applicants must attest that they are unable to get these through their department/unit, or through an ergonomics evaluation (where relevant) -- but no signature will be required from department Chair or representative. These also must be for the faculty member’s use, not for staff (research or otherwise) use;

- For requests for software, applicants must first check MyResearch to see if it is available for free (if it is, we will not fund);
- Requests that will benefit multiple faculty – e.g., to support a group of faculty who meet regularly around a theme like a writing group, a leadership group, etc., including to pay for speakers/consultants for that group will be considered. This can be in the form of a single request from one faculty member to support a group (max \$2,000), or a bundled request from multiple faculty members for the same activity (with a limit of \$10,000 total for the group);
- Requests for personal expenditures, for example personal entertainment or personal travel, will be excluded from funding;
- Faculty funded in FY 2015 will not be funded again this year as individual faculty may only be funded once every 3 years in order to make the funds available to as many faculty as possible over time.

In June, Chair Karliner informed the committee that the Enrichment Fund went very well. The committee awarded over \$90,000 in requests. Additional proposals were received, but many applicants were deemed ineligible because they had received enrichment funding in the 2014-2015 academic year.

Human Resources Reforms

In October, Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources David Odatto and Manager of HR Strategy Jason Stout attended the Faculty Welfare committee to present on that status of the UC Retirement Fund reform and to provide an update on HR reforms over the past year. AVC Odatto reported on the following items:

- 2016 Retirement Options Taskforce
 - Taskforce Overview:
 - In May, UC President Napolitano and Governor Jerry Brown reached a budget agreement that would provide the university with additional state funding. However, there were certain conditions that the university would need to meet. One of the conditions requires UC to make reforms to its Retirement Program (UCRP). To come up with recommendations on how to make the necessary changes, President Napolitano formed the UC Retirement Options Taskforce.
 - Taskforce Composition
 - Faculty, staff and administrations from all 10 campuses
 - 13 members
 - Membership list can be found at <http://ucal.us/2016retbens>
 - There are two faculty representatives on the taskforce. One is the Chair of the Systemwide Academic Senate and the other is a UCLA Dental School faculty member. AVC Odatto informed the group that he is also a member of the committee and will be representing the interests of those in the Health Science Compensation plan.
 - Taskforce Charge
 - Reformed UC retirement benefits should still remain competitive in the context of total remuneration so that UC will be able to continue to recruit quality faculty and staff
 - Total cost of 2016 retirement options does not exceed current cost, and that any alternative arrangement includes and assessment to pay down the unfunded UCRP liability.
 - Simplicity of design for implementation and communication
 - State partners perceive that benefit options appropriately align with the State budget agreement.
 - Parameters for Options
 - The new benefits tier will apply to all future employees hired or re-hired on or after July 1.
 - Current employees and retirees will not be impacted
 - There must be an alignment with pension-eligible pay for future employees with that of state employees under PEPR

- There will be a consideration of offering of a defined contributions plan. Either there will be hybrid defined contribution/defined benefit plan, or just a defined contribution plan.
 - Meeting Timeline
 - The taskforce has been meeting since August and will continue to meet weekly until the recommendations are due in December.
 - Once the recommendations are complete, they will be submitted to the Regents for approval in spring of 2016.
 - New retirement benefits tier will take effect July 1, 2016.
- HR Initiatives Update
 - The UCSF Human Resources Office has been working hard over the past several years to implement reforms that will reduce overall cost for the university and improve efficiency. In order to improve, the HR department is focusing on the opportunities for transformation:
 - Organization
 - Optimize organizational structures to streamline delivery.
 - Assess and actualize recommendation from Chazey Partners independent study
 - Processes
 - Identify quick wins for customers and partners to address key challenges with simple fixes
 - Apply LEAN to improve process/workflow that directly impact customer interactions
 - Priority areas are improved post-doc processes, LER processes, and onboarding
 - Technology
 - Deploy Customer Relationship Management technology to transform the customer experience
 - Digitize personnel files to enable direct, effortless and intelligent access to HR information and records
 - Optimize Enterprise Data Warehouse to support planning and decision-making in staff and academic personnel.

Faculty Welfare Committee members commented that HR services have not improved over the past couple of years. In fact, in some departments, the experience has been that the quality of services has declined. Faculty stated the following concerns:

- HR has been slow to post new faculty positions
- HR has problems with recruitment. There needs to be a recruitment manager.
- There is lack of communication from HR staff. Faculty send emails for status updates on transactions and no one responds.
- There should be a mechanism for UCSF to provide benefits to contactors. Faculty would like to retain great staff members that assist on grants.

AVC Odat and HR Manager Jason Stout acknowledged the concerns and noted that staffing shortages, reorganizations and complex process reforms have made it difficult on HR staff and their customers. He hopes the reforms that the HR department has implemented should help the situation.

IT Security Presentation

In February, IT Security Director Pat Phelan attended to provide the committee with the following report:

- UC Systemwide Monitoring
 - Director Phelan acknowledged the concerns of faculty, staff and students with the Office of the President's network monitoring efforts. He assured the committee that the actions that the university was taking did not include review of individual email accounts or web browser history. Instead, the university was focusing on suspicious network traffic such as high-volume and or high frequency data transfers from foreign countries. He noted that

while the Office of the President has suspended the monitoring program, UCSF has plans to do something similar. He assured the committee that in the future there will be plenty of communication between the IT office and the Academic Senate and that the monitoring will comply with university privacy rules.

- **Background of UC IT Security Improvements**
 - Due to potential security breach incidents, the UC system is taking new steps to increase security systemwide
 - Each UC campus has assigned responsibility to cyber-security contacts on each campus
 - The President requested that each campus design a 120-day accelerated action plan. This was developed to identify quick solutions
 - Advisory Board was developed which included internal and external experts
 - Framework has been established for assessing and documenting risks
- **Strengthen and Modernizing our Security Environment**
 - UC accelerating plans in place
 - Investigating new funding options for security applications
- **UC Systemwide Privacy Concerns**
 - UC Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) Response
 - The UCACC will be closely consulted on all security efforts going forward
- **UCSF to Contract External Vendor**
 - UCSF will be contracting with a network security platform
 - This platform will provide real-time protection against many threats and most cyber attack strategies
- **Immediate Efforts**
 - The UCSF Information Technology department is working on the follow efforts in the near-term
 - BigFix
 - Network Patching
 - Dual-factor authentication
 - Increasing password standards
- **Upcoming Initiatives**
 - The Information Technology department will be working on password reset systems in preparation for increasing password security
 - Once plans are complete a new password standard will be set and implemented. To ensure the new policy will not be too much of a burden, UCSF will offer premium keychain services such as LastPass.

Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey

In October, Faculty Welfare committee members reviewed the revised draft of the Mission Hall Post-occupancy study and provided the following comments:

- **Survey Length:** All reviewers were concerned with the extensive length of the survey. With so many questions to answer, committee members noted that respondents would become too fatigued to complete the survey. If questions cannot be consolidated or eliminated, committee members proposed the following efforts: First, there must be test of the survey, including all skip-patterns and written comment sections, to determine exactly how long it takes a typical respondent to complete the entire survey. Setting survey time expectations will help faculty set aside the necessary time to provide complete responses. Second, there must be functionality to allow for the survey to be saved, so that that faculty can come back at a later time to finish their responses. Third, respondents must be informed that they can submit partially completed surveys. This will ensure that all faculty members will have a chance to provide some feedback, even if they do not have time or desire to complete the entire survey. Finally, the survey should be re-ordered to ensure that questions regarding privacy, concentration, utilization of space, and productivity are at the beginning. Prioritization will allow faculty to quickly provide feedback on issues most important to them.
- **Drill-Down Questions:** Committee members recommend the addition of drill-down questions for the activity-based workstation and the conference room questions. Members believe that the drill-down options will provide more meaningful details on issues faculty may be having, or not having

with a particular feature of the space. For example, a question on the survey asking about the utilization of conference room space could produce a lot of different responses that would be difficult to categorize and may not be very useful. A drill-down question would ask for more detail on an issue with a conference room such as services, noise, or availability. In the case where the faculty member's concern is with technology services, then a second drill-down question would ask what is it about the service that is lacking, such as connectivity, lack of tech support, lack of training. Committee members feel the additional details on why spaces do and do not work, would be much more meaningful to all those involved.

- **Incentivize Participation:** To encourage survey participation, committee members recommend that there should be an incentive offered to faculty. Gift cards for campus dining, or a small give-away might help increase the overall response rate.
- **Inform Faculty of the Survey's Implications:** When announcing the survey, the Academic Senate must ensure that faculty are informed of the importance and implications of the survey. All respondents must know that the survey results will not only influence the design of space in Mission Hall, but also for all other future buildings.

A communication was sent on behalf of the committee to UCSF Senate Division Chair Ruth Greenblatt (Attachment 2). Using the feedback provided, the Mission Hall Post-Occupancy survey was edited and a revised draft was submitted to faculty through January and February. Survey results were provided to the Academic Senate in April (Attachment 3).

Private Supplemental Disability Insurance

In December, Chair Karliner informed the group that the School of Medicine Academic Affairs Office had ask the committee to review a potentially new supplemental disability insurance option for faculty. SOM Assistant Dean Mickey Zief attended along with two insurance brokers to provide an overview of the insurance product.

The insurance brokers explained to the committee that they feel UC does not offer adequate coverage for the Y portion of faculty salary. Currently, the products that are offered will only cover up to 50% of a claimant's salary. The product that is being offered by the brokerage will cover up to 70% of the Y portion and payments will be offered for longer than UC's plan. In addition, the brokerage's product will include language that more effectively covers clinical faculty. When asked whether the product could be offered to all four schools, the brokers stated that it is most applicable to the School of Medicine and School of Pharmacy. The brokers informed the group that they are unsure whether it would be applicable in the Schools of Dentistry and Nursing. Member Paul Green asked why the insurance broker's firm was being considered over other firms? The response was that there is a 25% discount for UCSF; there are no health questions; and there is a payroll deduction.

After the presentation and discussion, members provided the following feedback:

- **Uniform Application:** Members believe that all faculty benefits should be offered equally across all schools. Members were concerned that the insurance product is only being offered as an option to the Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy at this time. Many faculty in all schools are eligible for a Y salary component; offering disability on the Y salary component only to faculty in these two schools would create an inequity in benefits, which the Committee absolutely does not support.
- **Develop Scenarios:** Members felt that the coverage benefit is complicated and can be difficult to explain. To ensure that faculty can quickly understand the insurance product and apply it to their situation, members recommend that the Academic Affairs Office, or the brokers, create several scenarios.
- **Tier the Monthly Rate:** Members feel that the product should have a tiered monthly rate. Many School of Nursing faculty make under the \$150,000 cut off and it would not make sense to have to pay the rate for those who make \$150,000 or over.
- **Removal of Z:** On the summary document that was provided to the committee, it was noted that Z is a form of compensation that could be considered covered. Members suggest the removal of the mention of the Z portion of salary because the funding resources for Z are not consistent and it would be difficult to have coverage on a payment that may be here one year, but gone the next.

Review of Faculty Exit Survey

In April, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Brian Alldredge attended the meeting to provide a review of the 2012-2014 UCSF Faculty Exit Survey Report -

<http://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu/ccfl/media/Faculty%20Exit%20Survey%202012-2014.pdf>.

Vice Provost Alldredge informed the committee that the Faculty Exit Survey was administered by a third-party vendor and was sent to faculty who separated from any of the four Schools. In these two years, 206 faculty members separated, and largely mirror the demographics of those faculty retained at the University (this represents a 4-5% attrition rate from the total faculty population at UCSF). A total of 45% of those separated faculty members responded to the survey. With respect to the new position or setting that these respondents left UCSF for, 34% noted that they went to another academic institution, 14% went into private practice, and 11% took a position in the private sector. Top reasons for leaving UCSF included personal and family issues (39%), insufficient salary (33%), lack of administrative support (27%), the UCSF position did not meet expectations (23%), high cost of living (19%), and a lack of a feeling of inclusion (13%). Vice Provost Alldredge noted that he would like there to be more analysis on the results from Underrepresented Minority faculty; however, the number of URM faculty was too low to draw inference.

Vice Provost Alldredge informed the group that, at the systemwide level, the UC Office of the President (UCOP) is developing a similar survey that will be piloted by six UC campuses (UCSF is not participating in this survey but may adopt the UCOP survey at a later date). Vice Provost Alldredge informed the group that there would be a conference at UCOP to discuss the new survey. Faculty Welfare committee member Robin Corelli volunteered to attend the event.

After the review by the Vice Provost, the Faculty Welfare committee members focused on the following top reasons for departure:

- **Family Issues:** All committee members noted that family issues are a top issue in the recruitment of new faculty and retention of current faculty. Limited and expensive childcare resources at UCSF have been a long-standing problem. Vice Provost Alldredge acknowledged the issues and informed the group that Academic Affairs is currently focusing on family friendly policies and is forming a special task force to work on these issues. Currently the group is looking at topics such as part-time options for Senate series faculty, HS Clinical leave, and parental leave.
- **Insufficient Salary:** Members noted that in prior years, the lower salary provided by UCSF was fine because the university offered generous retirement and health benefits. With recent cuts to the UC Retirement Plan, the fringe benefits offered are no longer a draw for prospective faculty. In order to offset the retirement plan cuts, the university needs to do something to supplement compensation. Otherwise, if no action is taken, the university's ability to recruit and retain high-level of faculty will be significantly hindered.
- **Administrative Support:** Vice Provost Alldredge and the committee members agreed that administrative support for faculty is a considerable issue for UCSF. With increased cost of living, below market salaries and increasing workload, it is difficult for the university to recruit and retain high-performing staff. The implementation of the Operational Excellence model did not improve conditions. Instead of providing better services, the faculty have become frustrated with an overburdened pre-award and HR office. Vice Provost Alldredge informed the committee that he and other leaders at UCSF need to take a look at options for how to improve administrative support. He would also like more information on what exact issues faculty are having with their support to determine where the university should commit limited resources.
- **Space:** Faculty Welfare Committee and Equal Opportunity Committee members noted that faculty feelings on workspace should be a metric that is tracked on future exit surveys. As UCSF continues to move away from private offices and implements more activity-based work stations, more and more faculty may find that their working conditions are a significant issue in leading them to leave the university.

After the discussion was over the committee members made the following recommendations:

- **Task Force:** During the report, Vice Provost Alldredge mentioned that he was considering the formation of a task force to come up with potential actions. Members asked for actions to occur

as soon as possible and that if a task force is formed they would like Academic Senate representation.

- Faculty Advocate: Committee members suggested that there should be a campus-wide office that is available for faculty who are considering leaving UCSF. The person serving in this position could help to understand the underlying issues and work with the respective Dean or Department Chair to come to a resolution. This office would be a last resort for a faculty member considering leaving. Vice Provost Alldredge noted that he would consider the idea.
- Survey Improvements: Members noted that there are several issues that they would like to be improved in future iterations of the UCSF survey:
- Timing of Survey Request: The survey should be sent out to faculty before they leave the university
- Determine Involuntary Retirements: The survey should ask questions to determine whether retiring faculty departed the university by choice or because they were forced.
- Comparison Data: There should be way to benchmark the data to one or more universities.

UC Benefits Coordinator

In February, UCSF Health Care Benefits Facilitator Sue Forstat gave an overview of her consultative services and asked the committee for recommendations on how she can widely promote her office as a resource. Facilitator Forstat informed the group that several years ago, the UC system created a new Health Care Facilitator office on each campus to be a resource for benefits information and be an advocate for employees, dependents and retirees. The consultative service that her office provides is confidential and free. To accomplish the mission of her office, Benefits Facilitator Forstat conducts educational events such as health and retirement workshops. During these events she helps individuals, sometimes up to 100 in attendance, navigate benefit processes and helps employees understand and fill out necessary paperwork. Committee members asked Benefits Facilitator Forstat to provide some specific examples the consultative services she has provided. Forstat informed the committee that she recent helped an employee navigate the reimbursement process with UC Care to receive payment for emergency care she received in another country. In addition Benefits Facilitator Forstat also helps a lot of individuals with their flex spending accounts.

Committee members noted that many faculty and staff at UCSF are unaware that a Benefits Facilitator exists and that there must be more promotion of the helpful services. Committee members suggested that the most effective way to bring awareness would be to contact all department MSOs and school Associate Deans of Administration. Another suggestion is to have a newsletter or email blast that notes a particular benefits updates. Benefits Facilitator Forstat agreed and thanked the committee members for their input.

Family Friendly Committee Report

In June, Committee member Paul Green informed the group that he is a member of the new UCSF Family Friendly Policy Committee. The Family Friendly committee was formed to research and review existing policies; reconcile variations in existing policies and practices; and develop a strategy to promote the available family friendly resources to the UCSF community. The ultimate goal is to develop one uniform family friendly policy for the entire campus. The policy will be comprehensive in that it will not only include children, but elders and immediate family members.

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2016-2017:

- Enrichment Fund
- Gender Equity
- Human Resource Reforms
- IT Security
- Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Study/Faculty Workspace
- Senate Membership Task Force
- Supplemental Disability

Appendices

- [Appendix 1:](#) 2015 Enrichment Fund Feedback
- [Appendix 2:](#) Communication from CFW RE: Review of the Mission Hall Survey Draft
- [Appendix 3:](#) 2016 Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Survey Results

Senate Staff:
Artemio Cardenas, Senate Analyst
Artemio.Cardenas@ucsf.edu; 415.476.4245