

Coordinating Committee **Ruth Greenblatt, MD, Chair**

Monday, December 3, 2015

2:00 – 4:00 pm

Parnassus, S-118 or by phone

1-866-394-9509; 87 52 185 #

PRESENT: Ruth Greenblatt (Chair), David Teitel, Lisa Murphy (T), Janice Tsoh (T), David Saloner (T), Pamela Bellefeuille, Farid Chehab (T), Marek, Brzezinski, Leah Karliner, Torsten Wittmann, Steven Cheung, Rena Fox, Patricia McDaniel, Leslie Zimmerman, Jae-Woo Lee, Janet Myers, Art Miller, Russ Pieper, Jeffrey Lotz, Paul Garcia, Brian Alldredge, Donald Kishi, Michael McMaster, Patrick Finley, Stefan Habelitz, Janine Cataldo, Joseph Guglielmo, Todd Giedt, Alison Cleaver, Shilpa Patel, Ken Laslavic, and Karla Goodbody

ABSENT: George Rutherford, Henry Sanchez, Liz Watkins, and Sharon Youmans

Chair Greenblatt called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm in Parnassus, S-118. A quorum was present.

I. Chair's Report – Ruth Greenblatt

Chair Greenblatt briefed members of systemwide and local issues:

Systemwide Updates:

- **UCRP:** President Napolitano has promised that the Senate will receive the report of the UC Retirement Benefits Advisory Task Force, as well as her preliminary recommendations, by January 15th for a month-long review. In order to meet the tight deadline, she suggested an additional Coordinating Committee meeting, via teleconference, in mid-January. Issues include raising the contribution levels, the relative level of fees, the PEPRA cap (~\$117K), and the format of the defined contribution plan for new employees (e.g., supplemental plan). There is also some discussion as to whether there will be separate plans for faculty and staff.
- **Joint Committee on Sexual Harassment:** UCOP has convened a Joint Committee on Sexual Harassment in response to the case of the astronomer at UC Berkeley. Each Division will be asked to provide up to three present or past P&T members to provide input to the Joint Committee on how their campus complies with existing UC policy, as well as any local problems.
- **Equity for Access:** Principles are being developed for UC campuses to offer research space in exchange for company equity (e.g., incubators), thereby allowing UC to retain an ownership stake in these companies. This concept builds upon the entrepreneurial activities of faculty and students to exchange use of University facilities and resources. Campuses may create new programs or modify existing programs via this process. For UCSF, which hosts a significant number of incubators, one issue is the interaction with the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP). "Outside income" derived from such equity arrangements would represent a different path from that which such outside income is traditionally derived (e.g., through the Schools, etc.). UCOP Equity for Access concept will need careful consideration in the coming months. This concept is being explored through a three-year pilot. The Senate may be interested in determining how this process will interface, and potentially impact teaching and research generally, but also how revenue interests might influence decisions made regarding direction of research, selection of new faculty and how resources are allocated.

UCSF Issues

- **Space Planning:** The Senate would like to convene a meeting of the Senate representatives on campus space planning committees to share perspectives and information. There will also be an opportunity for Senate members to discuss their thoughts and priorities for the ongoing process at the Division Meeting on January 28, 2016, which will be entirely devoted to space planning
- **Open Plan Space Task Force:** This task force, which was convened by EVCP Lowenstein and is being chaired by Senate Vice Chair David Teitel, is responsible for evaluating space usage at UCSF.

It is developing principles to not only reconfigure Mission Hall, but also all future building projects, which will be designed for an “open space” configuration. The primary issues include environmental issues (e.g., privacy, acoustics, lighting, ergonomics, etc.), the configuration of common areas, technology, as well as workspace configuration and allocation. Future buildings will include a number of private offices, and at Mission Hall, most of the focus rooms will be converted to private offices. The Coordinating Committee will receive the task force’s preliminary recommendations in early January 2016.

II. Consent Calendar

Members approved the minutes from the November 5, 2015 meeting.

III. Report from Academic Planning & Budget – APB Vice Chair Russ Pieper

- UCSF Financial Report: UCSF is in good financial shape with an excess of \$234M in revenue. However, 80% of the revenue is coming from rapidly changing markets – clinical revenue and research. 63% of UCSF’s costs relate to personnel. A capital-spending plan of \$4B is in place for the next ten years.
- Mission Hall: The Mission Hall survey will go out in January 2016.
- Parnassus Campus: The Clinical Sciences building will be completed in mid-2017. The UC Hall retrofit will begin in mid-2017; the design approval will be complete in mid-2016.
- Mission Bay: A number capital projects will soon be underway at Mission Bay. These include Block 33, the new Precision Medicine Cancer Building, and student trainee housing (in early planning stages). However funding is yet to be determined for Block 23A, which will be the new Neurosciences building.
- Oakland Children’s Hospital: This will remain a private hospital, but it will be owned by UCSF. While there will be no UCSF trainees there, residents will be located this hospital.

IV. 2015-2016 Chancellor’s Fund/Faculty Academic Renewal (FAR) Funds

Members briefly discussed the Embase and the Open Access proposals. Given that the Chancellor’s Fund monies can only cover about 30 open access applicants, the Senate cannot cover the entire need for open access at UCSF. COLASC Chair Patricia Mcdaniel also noted that applicants must show that they do not have any other means to cover open access fees.

ACTION: Members approved the Chancellor’s Fund, as submitted in the budget. Committees will be submitting criteria for some of the different funds. A small committee will be convened to review these applications.

V. UC Retirement Benefits Advisory Task Force and the New 2016 UCRP Tier – Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources David Odat

UPDATE: AVC Odat remarked that UC traditionally has provided excellent retirement benefits through its 1976 and 2013 tiers. The development of a 2016 tier (for those hired after July 1, 2016) is precipitated upon the budget agreement between President Napolitano and Governor Brown, which resulted in \$436M in State funding to be allocated to UC’s unfunded pension liability, along with the promise that a new UC tier that would correspond to the PEPRA limit of ~\$117K of covered compensation. The task force was charged not only with mitigating the deleterious impacts of the PEPRA limit, but to also demonstrate savings from UCRP. Task force members are keen to leverage any “savings” to improve benefits however. One option is the creation of a supplemental defined contribution plan (DCP). Another possibility is to give new employees a sole DCP (without a defined benefit plan or DBP). For those employees who begin with a sole DCP, there may be a choice to give them a choice to vest back into the combined plan (DBP with the supplemental DCP) at five years. The option of a “Year 5” choice is important for faculty, especially those faculty who decide to stay on at UC after five years and possibly long-term. There would be a couple of options for such faculty members – either invest the contributions made thus far, or become vested after year five with service credit beginning then. He added that there are a number of short-term staff employees who do not receive any retirement benefits whatsoever under the current UCRP. Indeed, the relative complexity of these different plans is another issue.

DISCUSSION: Members asked if any of UC's competitors cap their retirement plans. AVC Odatto does not know if any are capped, but approximately half of UC's competitors do have DCP plans, and some do have hybrid plans, similar to the one UC is considering. He noted that one of the challenges in calculating the UCRP benefit is its variability due to a number of factors (length of employment, salary, etc.). Members also asked about the possible impact of the new tier on the recruitment of faculty members. He remarked that one recruitment issue is already present – the UCRP contribution rate. In this sense, introducing a choice might help in this area. However, the 2013 tier made UC about average with its comparators in terms of total remuneration; a new tier may only further deteriorate total remuneration. Members remarked that there seems to be a tendency to isolate the retirement plan from total remuneration. He added that this task force is not considering any changes in retirement health benefits. AVC Odatto also briefed members on the history of UCRP's unfunded liability, which is due to an almost 20-year contribution holiday. Currently UC is contributing 14% and employees are contributing 8% into the 1976 tier, which amounts to a 4% liability tax. There is a question whether this surcharge will be paid above the \$117K PEPRA cap however.

AVC Odatto commented that Senate members on the task force have voiced opposition against separating out faculty and staff in new tier, and this opinion might be part of a minority report within the task force's final recommendations. Members also asked if there is any idea about how much money needs to be saved. While he could not comment on any specified amount, AVC Odatto responded that the task force is considering the different options in investing any "savings" back into the plan to mitigate the damage caused by the PEPRA cap. The Regents would it approve it at the May 2016 meeting. Members also asked what percentage of new hires stay after five years? On the staff side, about 20% of the staff leave within 18 months, but this is probably due to temporary employees. Therefore, one-year vesting is being actively considered (for a DCP). The unions will negotiate this as part of their next contracts, and there is a possibility of the unions might negotiate different deals with the University, which is what happened with the 2013 tier (e.g., the Nurses' Union). Finally, AVC Odatto outlined the following timeline: the Senate leadership will receive the task force's recommendations in mid-January (along with the President Napolitano's recommendations) and the President's final recommendations will go to the Regents for a first hearing in March.

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Adjournment

Chair Greenblatt adjourned the meeting at 3:52 p.m.

**Agenda items deemed noncontroversial by the Chair, may be placed on a Consent Calendar agenda item. Approval of all business on the Consent Calendar requires a single unanimous vote. At the request of a committee member, any Consent Calendar item may be extracted for consideration under "New Business" later in the agenda.*

Academic Senate Staff:
Todd Giedt, Executive Director
todd.giedt@ucsf.edu (415) 476-1307