

UCSF Senate Executive Council Report

May 2017

ITEM ONE. Academic Council. The most recent State Audit report was discussed (see link for full report: <http://www.auditor.ca.gov/reports/2016-130/summary.html>).



Most notably, the complaints that UCOP staff are overpaid were based on comparisons to CSU, for example the CFOs were compared, though UC has its own retirement system and a much more complex funding stream. There was also a claim that >\$100 million were held in unspecified reserves, though all but \$35 million is committed to programs that have been publically posted and approved by the Regents. \$35 million is held in reserves, which the Sacramento Bee notes is an appropriate reserve fund for an institution of UC's size. Two KQED Forum MP3 files have been posted on the Senate Website, one a discussion of the audit report, and one an interview of President Napolitano.

Council also discussed the new Clinical Affairs Task Force, which is to be chaired by the faculty representative on the Regent's Health Committee. There was also a discussion of ways to diversify Senate leadership, which mostly focused on getting a more diverse group of committee members and chairs. Aimee Dorr is stepping down as UC Provost, and a search is on for her replacement. UCFW recommended that Council endorse application of the full 3% salary increase to all faculty salaries instead of the approach taken over the past two years in which 1.5% increase is applied for all faculty and 1.5% is applied in a targeted manner. The Committee noted that the purpose of the 3% increase is to improve the competitiveness of UC faculty salaries, and not to constitute merit increases or equity increases, which should already be slated to occur. At UCSF this would likely mean a further increase in base salary and a compensatory decrease in the Y component for most faculty. This adjustment does not result in a raise, but it does increase the retirement benefitted salary.



ITEM TWO. 95% rule. The Task Force report, committee comments and faculty vote tally were presented at the Budget and Investment Committee in April, and we expect to have a response from Administration by our Fall Division Meeting. It seems, in general, most Deans are supportive. I suspect that Federal actions regarding NIH funding (beyond the current year) and health care funding may impact the capacity of the campus regarding this issue.



ITEM THREE. Division Meeting. We should have interesting presentations on May 11 regarding potential impact of changes in Federal funding and policy, including Natalie Alpert, the UCSF government relations rep in DC, Keith Yamamoto the VC for research, also active in government relations, Provost Dan Lowenstein, Claire Brindis, Director of the Health Policy Institute and Kishore Hari, SEP leader and UCSF point person for Stand Up for Science event. Then we will discuss the various recommendations and tally of the faculty survey on the Diller endowment gift.