Coordinating Committee Report

April, 2016

March was a hectic time, culminating in the Regent's meeting at which several key issues were decided including the new UCRP tier (so-called 2016 tier). As noted previously, this new tier is entirely prospective; the retirement plans for current faculty (and any appointed prior to July 1, 2016) have not changed. President Napolitano did respond to input from the Senate and others in response to the UCRP task force. She decided on a separation of plans for faculty and staff for the first time (though the Senate recommended that faculty and staff be given the same retirement benefits). For faculty the approved plan calls for increased employer contributions (13%) to the PEPRA cap of $117,000 for the defined benefit plan and employer contribution of 5% on salaries above $117,000 up to $265,000 for a defined contribution supplement. New employees are also given the option of a defined contribution plan (retirement savings account). The UCOP summary of this decision is posted with this report **here**, and includes an estimated savings for which savings that will occur to non-State entities (such as NIH or Clinical revenues) are not separated. The total savings to the State and the UC system are likely much less.

The Regents also voted on a contentious issue related to the UC policy regarding intolerance.   This proposal had been committee for several years following reports of anti-Semitic bigotry on several UC campuses. During the deliberations, other examples of religious and racial bigotry have occurred on UC campuses and other California colleges. The statement of policy is neutral with regard to any specific forms of bigotry, but a preamble provoked controversy in that it cited anti-Semitism as the only example, and also indicated that anti-Zionism was an example of unacceptable intolerance. The Senate, including letters from Equal Opportunity, Academic Freedom and a joint statement from the Division Chairs, suggested that citing a single example was not productive. The Academic Freedom Committee recommended that anti-Zionism be specified as anti-Semitic forms of anti-Zionism, since Zionism itself is viewed by some as a political and nationalistic movement, and since some UC faculty experts on politics might weigh in critically on some aspects of Zionism and thus could be cited for intolerance via the original wording of the policy and preamble. The Regents accepted the modified wording of anti-Semitic forms of anti-Zionism, and then approved the policy.

Issues related to IT continue to receive attention. Joe Bengfort met with the IT subcommittee of AP&B and discussed changes in the IT system, as well as several outages to clinical systems this past month. UCOP announced that the

IT security firm FireEye will be used by the UC system to detect and prevent intrusions into UC systems. FireEye has extensive experience in cybersecurity, and has done forensic work for SONY studios and Target. They maintain a large threat assessment system. Given all the activity in the IT realm, and the level of interest expressed via our question of the month, we will focus the June Division Meeting on this issue.

Some of you may have read about an audit of the UC system that was requested by the State Legislature. The results were announced and were quite critical of the UC system, particularly admission of out-of-state students which was described as being at the expense of Californian applicants.   UCOP and the Senate disagree with the audit report, which seems to diverge from a simple statement of the facts to a politically charged interpretation of them. While out-of-state undergraduates were admitted to UC campuses, UC did not decrease the number of in-State students (the California State University system did decrease enrollment due to budget cuts). Out-of-State student tuition (roughly $38,000 per year) was used to offset State budget cuts and to provide resources needed for in-State students. Indeed, acceptance of out-of-state students who pay a higher tuition is a mechanism used by multiple State higher-ed systems to offset loss of support from public sources and to avoid rapid tuition increases for in-state students.

Chancellor Hawgood, the Provost, CEO of the Medical Center, Chief Finance Officer and Senate Chair met with President Napolitano to present the campus budget report. It is my impression that UCSF is in stable shape, that UC faculty have actually increased NIH funding in the last year, the medical center now provides about 60% of campus revenue, and that UCSF has very good financial management. Clinical revenues are greatly influenced by payor policies, most notably Medicare and MediCal. UCSF has experienced an increase in percentage of patients covered by MediCal, and it should be noted that the designated providers of care to the indigent (SFGH in San Francisco) recover a higher payment yield from MediCal than other providers. So SFGH receives roughly 70% of cost and UCSF roughly 50%. So growth in the MediCal patient population creates challenges for Med Center finances, though the Medical Center is highly committed to providing needed services for all patients.

We will discuss planning for a revised UCSF Senate Website, and related activities at this week's Coordinating meeting.   With the high interest in our question of the month, and the very interesting developments that occur within the UC system and outside of our campus, we propose upgrading the website in the following ways:

- o Use new UCSF templates and photos providing more color and interest

- o Feature a weekly front page news item "Health Sciences Pulse" from UCSF, UCOP, Chronicle of Higher Ed, etc.

- o Feature a banner listing key senate events of the week

- o Include an "I am interested" button on each page that prompts completing of the senate call data base

- o Feature faculty profiles

- Via new Senate writing staffer, new faculty and growing subset of other faculty which will also be used by the Development office to link faculty with interested donors

- Sections of each committee with Community Question feature, and "I am interested" button

- Answer of the Month, with contributions by Senate Writer, including key interviews

- Question of the Month section and repository

- Suggestions for theme for Division Meetings, questions for Division Meetings, suggestions for Question of the Month