

# Coordinating Committee Report

February, 2016

---



January was a busy month, and this activity will extend into February. We are holding a Town Hall on the UCRP Options Task Force, with UCwide Senate Chair Dan Hare and Vice Chair Jim Chalfant. The meeting is Monday February 8, from 2-4 in Mission Hall. This should be a good discussion of the new retirement benefits Tier led by two members of the Task Force, both of whom have outstanding understanding of the issues involved. We need to generate a Division response to the UCRP Task Force Report in the first 10 days of the month. The report was discussed at January's Academic Council, and it appears that the Senate Divisions each have a fairly similar assessment of the situation. The major points are that:

1. Adverse impact on recruitment and retention may be greatest for the Health Sciences because of high competition, the long duration of training and thus late initiation of retirement savings, and high educational debt. Also many health sciences faculty have salaries >\$117,000 at the time of their initial appointment.
2. The adverse impact on recruitment and retention may be particularly pronounced for candidates from under-represented minorities and first to college generation due to high educational debt and the high cost of living at most UC campuses. This may set back efforts to diversify UC faculties.
3. While some competitor institutions have defined contribution plans for retirement, most have a higher salary structure, so total remuneration is better.
4. The new tier may have a larger impact on recruitment than the previous new tier because it is a major change and because retirement of the baby boomers will cause a relatively sizable efflux of faculty in the next decade.
5. UC needs to create an advantageous mechanism for annuities for the defined contribution retirement accounts since the outside market annuity plans often have sizable charges, which can consume any interest that accrues.



Our Division meeting was well-attended, though we experienced significant technical problems with satellite sites. We will work on improving the satellite capability for future meetings, including rehearsals. It is clear that space planning is a major interest for many faculty. The approach of the meeting inspired improved communications from Administration space planners, and this revealed a higher level UC Space Committee, which had a faculty representative who was appointed by Bob Newcomer, but who was not included in that committee roster as posted on the UCSF web. We should discuss how to

organize the senate space committee rep group to optimize communication back to the faculty and from the faculty to space planners. There is a bit of difference of opinion about how much planning has been done for Block 33 and other buildings prior to the first committee meetings with faculty, and we should be proactive to ensure full participation in planning. The Chancellor did a good job answering faculty questions at the meeting, and I think the event provided a more open discussion of space related issues than has occurred previously.



This month's Coordinating Committee meeting will include a presentation by Chief Information Officer, Joe Bengfort, who is also our campus' Cybersecurity leader. Senate-wide there is a great deal of concern about the new UC Cybersecurity monitoring, and its potential impact on faculty privacy and academic freedom. The new system, which involves monitoring of network activity level, was implemented without a formal announcement, perhaps related to the UCLA breach. This breach, will cost UC millions, originated on campus, not in the Medical Center. The invaders apparently were looking for IP, but found their way into the EMR, and breached thousands of personal health records. The breach attests to the weakest link theory of computer security, and is a major challenge to the academic environment, which includes many users and platforms, and students who all are transitory. The manner of announcement may have aggravated the situation, increasing concerns about Faculty rights, when it appears the new system likely does not alter current privacy protections, which prohibit IT from accessing, without permission, the content of Faculty computers and mail. The system is focused on aberrant patterns of activity that may indicate individual computers having rogue functions, such as serving as an entry point for attacks on firewalls, or sending large quantities of spam, which may occur without user awareness. CIO Bengfort can address this issue, as well as factors related to indexing or non-indexing of UCSF web materials, and costs issues related to UCSF IT.

UC cybersecurity and privacy policies can be found at:

<http://www.ucop.edu/information-technology-services/policies/index.html>



The UCAAD committee reports that the President Scholars Program that provides 1-2 yr funding for URM post docs can be directed at any post doctoral trainee in the UC system, now including health sciences. Also once a scholar, always a scholar even if the recipient works at another University, if they return to UC, there are salary and start up package benefits. The first 5 years of salary is covered, and now other start up components are also covered. EQOP and other committees may want to insure that search committees are aware of this.