

Committee on Faculty Welfare
Roberta Rehm, RN, PhD, FAAN, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT
2016-2017

Primary Focus Points for the Year:

- 2017 Faculty Enrichment Fund
- Faculty Family Friendly Initiative (3FI)
- Faculty Health and Disability Benefits
- Faculty Home and Childcare Pilot
- Faculty Life and Percentage Appointments
- Open Access 2020 Presentation
- Risk Management and Insurance Services
- Transportation Presentation

Issues for Next Year (2017-2018)

- 2018 Enrichment Fund
- Faculty Climate Survey
- Human Resource Reforms
- IT Security
- Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Study/Faculty Workspace

2016-2017 Members

Roberta Rehm, Chair

Margot Kushel, Vice Chair

Robin Corelli

Michael Disandro

Doranne Donesky

Elyse Foster

Audrey Foster-Barber

Snehlata Oberoi

Shuvo Roy

Number of Meetings: 4

Senate Analyst: Artemio Cardenas

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

UC Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Committee Reports

Over the course of the academic year, Chair Roberta Rehm and Vice Chair Margot Kushel reported on the work of the systemwide UC Faculty Welfare Committee:

- *Domestic Partner Coverage:* In December, the UC Health Care Task Force has been working on addressing disparities in benefits coverage for domestic partners. There have been some recent instances where domestic partners have been unable to access benefits after their partner has passed away. The reasoning given is that the proper paperwork for registering a partnership had not been filed before the faculty member had passed away. UC is now working on potential solutions to address this issue. Until policy revisions are made, all faculty are encouraged to review their benefit options online and make sure they file the correct paperwork. In February, UCOP costed out how much it would cost to reconcile benefits and it is estimated 15-30 million. Due to the cost, HR leadership is concerned how to pay for any revisions in policy. UCFW members want to put more pressure on leadership and the Regents to make a reconciliation. In April, one of the proposals is to pre-fund the benefits, similar to UCRP. UC is still in the early discussion phase.
- *Transition to Optim:* In April, CFW was informed that the Health Care Task Force continues monitor the transition to Optim for pharmaceutical benefits. There have been some significant computer glitches. Some faculty and staff did not receive their pharmacy cards in time for them to obtain necessary medication. The university is working hard and the number of complaints are going down.
- *Out-of-Pocket Expenses Maximums for UC Care:* In December, UCFW was informed that UC Care program administrators have revised the out-of-pocket expenses this year. In previous years, the out-of-pocket maximums have been capped at \$5100 for medical and pharmaceutical expenses. This year, UC Care has removed the distinction between medical and pharmaceutical expenses and combined them into one. The concern is that the changes can place some people at a great disadvantage. UCFW has asked for more information on how much more people will be paying with the reform. The goal is to determine whether the cost saving to the university is worth the cost on faculty. The good news is that UC will postpone the revision until there is data to support the changes.
- *Campus Safety:* In April, the committee discussed campus safety for faculty. There have been instances around the UC system where faculty have been threatened by students. In some cases, there have been death threats. The committee would like to bring this issue up with administration and UCPD.
- *Retiree Health Benefits Cost:* In April, the university has been reviewing options to make UC retiree health benefits sustainable. Currently, the UC retiree health benefit allows retirees to continue the UC-paid portion of health care coverage. UCOP is working on different solutions to reduce costs.
- *New UCRP Tier:* There has been a lot of confusion around the 2016 UCRP Tier.. Currently all new faculty have 90-days to choose between UCRP or a 401k-style retirement plan. If no option is selected, all faculty are defaulted to UCRP. The problem is that if a faculty member waits the entire 90-day period without making a selection, then they lose up to 90-days' worth of retirement plan accruals. Over a period of a career, this could be a significant loss to the faculty member. UCFW members would like each campuses HR office to make this issue clear to newly hired faculty.

Divisional Business

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

2017 Enrichment Fund

In December, Committee members agreed upon the following 2017 Enrichment Fund guidelines and dates:

Key Dates:

Posted Date: February 1, 2017

Proposal Due Date: March 15, 2017

Applicants Notified of Decision: April 17, 2017

Description:

The Faculty Enrichment Fund continues to be intended for small grants to support activities, services, or items that would enhance work-life and/or well-being at work for a UCSF faculty member.

Guidelines:

1. UCSF faculty appointment must be at 50% or greater
2. Awards are limited to \$3000 maximum (Partial funding may be offered)
3. 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;
4. For requests for software, applicants must first check MyResearch to see if it is available for free (if it is, we will not fund);
5. 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 \$3,000), or a bundled request from four or more faculty members for the same activity (with a limit of \$12,000 total for the group);
6. Requests for personal expenditures, for example personal entertainment or personal travel, will be excluded from funding;
7. Faculty funded in FY 2015 and 2016 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. Faculty who applied through a group proposal in previous years are excluded from the 3-year rule.
8. Funds can be used for any learning or development activity that has occurred, or will occur during the 2016-2017 academic year (July 2016 – June 2017)

Application and Selection Process:

Applicants must submit a PDF with their request including what the request is for, the amount requested, a brief paragraph explanation about how funding of the request will enhance a faculty member's work-life and/or well-being at work. In consultation with the Faculty Welfare committee, the Academic Senate Office staff will evaluate the submitted proposals to determine whether they meet all of the guidelines of the fund. If proposals do not meet the necessary requirements, they will be returned to the applicant. Once all eligible applications have been determined, if the number/amount requested exceeds the amount of funding available, the Faculty Welfare Committee will hold a lottery to make all final selections.

All awardees of the funds will be required to provide a summary of their experience and notes on the usefulness of the conference, course, or activity they participated in using the funds.

Due Date: All proposals must be submitted by **March 15, 2017**

Award Notifications: All applicants will be notified of final decisions by **April 17, 2017**

In April, Analyst Cardenas provided a report on 2017 Enrichment Fund. This year the fund received a considerable amount of interest. A total of 66 applications were received and 19 were selected. The entire fund of \$86,000 was granted. Proposals that were awarded included:

- Visiting Scholars Group at Mission Bay Pediatrics
- Neuroscience Center Speaker Series
- Laptops
- Stand Up Desks
- Software Packages
- Professional Leadership Coaching
- Journal Club
- Early Career Women Faculty Writing Group
- Visiting Professors for Pediatric Headache Program
- Lecture Series
- Dentistry Team Building Retreat
- Database Access
- Leadership Program

Faculty Friendly Initiative (3FI)

In October, Faculty Friendly Initiative (3FI) committee member Paul Green attended the committee meeting to provide a review of the proposed 3FI recommendations and receive feedback ([Appendix 1](#)).

The goal is to provide the final recommendations to the Chancellor by January 2017. Implementation work will be facilitated by the VPAA with potential partnerships throughout campus.

- Charge of the Initiative
 - The charge of the Faculty Family Friendly Initiative (3FI), in support of the campus wide effort to help attract and retain top talent at UCSF, is to assess the current state and make recommendations to the Chancellor and campus leaders that promote an environment for faculty that enhances the ability to meet their responsibilities to the University and their responsibilities to children, elders, partners and others.
- Representation
 - Committee members sought broad representation and individuals representing different perspectives
 - Over the course of the summer of 2016, the committee met 8 times. The group did an in-depth analysis for existing family friendly policies
- Background
 - EVCP Dan Lowenstein has tasked the VPAA office with leading a steering committee charged with addressing issues pertaining to faculty family friendly policies and benefits and making recommendations for new programs and policy changes as appropriate.
 - Although not within the scope of 3FI, the committee wishes to highlight that adequate access to affordable childcare services is critically important for promoting an environment for faculty that enhances their ability to meet both University and family responsibilities
- Strategy
 - Conducting a comprehensive review of existing policies and utilization (with available data), including interaction of relevant policies with State/Federal regulations:
 - Childbearing
 - Parental Leave (childrearing)
 - Active Service Modified Duties (ASMD)

- Part Time Service in Senate Series
 - Stop the Clock
 - For each policy, the group has asked the following questions
 - What is the process for receiving a benefit?
 - How do faculty find out about the policy/benefits?
 - Are we addressing the needs of faculty with this policy? If not, what else needs to be addressed?
- Broad Categories for Proposed Recommendations
 - Enhance available benefits
 - Centralize faculty friendly policy and leave services
 - Facilitate/promote a family friendly culture
 - Streamline processes
 - Conduct on-going assessment
 - A list of recommendations was brainstormed. Members evaluated the recommendations individually to identify high priorities, rank by impact/difficulty, and arrived at an initial list of priorities and recommendations which I will explain
- Proposed Recommendations
 - Enhance Available Family Friendly Benefits Provided by UCSF Health Science Compensation Plan
 - Extend the current maximum for childbearing leave from 6 weeks to 8 weeks (HSCP)
 - Increase Chancellor’s fund to support an additional 2 weeks childbearing leave (from 6 weeks to 8 weeks) at Scale 0
 - Extend the current minimum for parental leave (childrearing) from 2 weeks to 4 weeks (HSCP)
 - Time and pay benefits differ across departments and schools and creates complication for tracking or explaining benefits
 - Centralize Faculty Family Friendly Policies and Leave Services
 - Create a new campus level staff position dedicated to overseeing a coordinating effort for faculty to obtain expert and individualized support on family friendly policies and benefits
 - Examples of the duties include:
 - On-going responsibility to leverage tracked metrics on utilization to make informed decisions and to design future programming and implement appropriate changes to help sustain a family friendly campus
 - Develop broad communication channels to reach faculty including website
 - Develop comprehensive resource materials that are easily accessible to faculty
 - Develop targeted communications to appropriate audiences, e.g department chairs, junior/new faculty
 - Work closely with HR Shared Services and disability manager to ensure academic generalist are aware of academic policies (e.g. stop the clock) and how these policies interact with leave policies/benefits
 - Facilitate/Promote a Family Friendly Culture at UCSF to Enable Faculty to Avail Themselves of Benefits
 - Extend how we define “family” to be reflective of constituent concerns through making policy updates and changes
 - Define families as created by choice not exclusively by birth
 - Advocate with UCOP to update the APM with language that consistently defines a child as “any child who is, or becomes part of a faculty member’s family under the age of 18

- Advocate with UCOP to update the APM terminology for “birth mother” with “birth parent” and “non-birth parent”
 - Advocate with UCOP to update the APM to change guidelines to mitigate inequitable time granted for ASMD for quarter and semester based campuses
 - The current terminology for family is inconsistent and difficult to interpret. ASMD policy is not written clearly, therefore not fully understood; few faculty use this benefit; if taken, it sets back faculty from advancing with peers.
- Eliminate barriers that undermine the promotion of a family friendly work life environment by making policy updates and changes
 - Update and change local UCSF policy language to remove the 2-year limitation for requesting stop the clock.
 - Provide resources that explain the policies for stopping the clock and requests for part-time senate appointments in the context of implications for future advancement.
- Help make faculty aware about their eligibility for family friendly support through publicity and education
 - Develop broad communication channels to research faculty
 - Develop comprehensive resources materials that are easily accessible to faculty
 - Deliver consolidated and clear information to target populations when it is needed most
 - Educate faculty about perceived and actual career consequences of taking advantage of family friendly benefits
 - Improve education to faculty about their benefits and the processes to obtain them.
- Enable department leadership to support and promote family friendly benefits with additional tools and communication
 - Education to Chairs to prevent them from inadvertently discouraging faculty from utilizing family friendly benefits
 - Education to Chairs so that they can provide accurate information to faculty re: the impact of taking family friendly benefits might have on their careers as faculty
 - Develop transparency for faculty and Chairs on the purpose of the Chancellor’s funds for salary support during childbearing leave and how it is used
- Streamline processes at UCSF to support faculty getting benefits they need, when they are needed
 - Simplify and streamline the process by which faculty request family friendly benefits
- Develop a system-approach to capturing relevant data to track benefits utilization to support on-going assessment of faculty needs
 - Develop methods to track volume and usage of various leave options by population type. By doing this we can better understand career consequences. This will also inform us on the impact/effectiveness of our efforts and identify areas which require further focus/attention
- Next Steps/ Group Input
 - The 3FI committee reconvened on October 14 to consider all feedback that has been received on the recommendations.
 - Faculty Welfare committee requested that #FI consider the following questions:
 - Do you agree or disagree with any of the 5 broad categories for proposed recommendations?

- Are there any areas of concern not addressed? What is missing?
- Are there any other stakeholders on campus we should consider consulting with for additional input?

Faculty Welfare committee members provided the following feedback:

- Child bearing language: Committee members supported the idea that that the childbearing benefits should not just be for the birth parent. Parents who choose to adopt should be afforded similar benefits to bond with their new child. Currently the time allowed is too short. There is a potential that the current policy hinders faculty from adopting. Committee members recommended that the same childbearing leave benefits be given to adopting parents.
- Adoption Benefit: Committee members recommended that the monetary adoption benefit offered by the university should be increased.
- Considering the life-span of the faculty member: Committee members noted that the recommendations are focused on policies that consider faculty during a certain segment of their life time. The policies should be more comprehensive in offering family friendly policies throughout the life span. For example, when a faculty member must take care of elderly parent later on in life.
- Coverage of other faculty on leave: Committee members noted that when a colleague is out on leave for family reasons, it causes a burden on the rest of the department. Often overloaded faculty must take on additional responsibilities in the meantime. Committee member noted that there should be a resource to compensate the covering faculty. This will help faculty morale and productivity.

Faculty Health and Disability Benefits

In October, UCSF Benefits Specialty Manager Pamela Hayes attended the committee meeting to report on upcoming changes to faculty health and disability benefits ([Appendix 2](#)). She provided the following report:

- Specialty Center Update Benefits News
 - Open Enrollment for 2017 begins October 27 and ends on November 22
 - All open enrollment changes are effective on January 1, 2017
- Disability Plan Open for Enrollment – New Plan Design
 - Key Drivers for the change
 - The current state of the UC disability benefits program is not sustainable from a cost perspective
 - Short-term and part-time employees have no disability protection
 - Employees want options that not only provide income protection, but also support their individual needs and financial goals
 - Key Changes
 - Eligibility is being expanded to employees in Core and Mid-level benefits (the option is currently only offered to employees with full benefits)
 - Employer paid disability insurance continues – charge to 14 day waiting period
 - Employee paid voluntary ‘supplemental disability’ insurance is being split into two employee paid options – employees can enroll in one or both options
 - Short-term disability – 14 day waiting period
 - Long-term disability – 6 month waiting period
 - The disability benefit paid out during an approved disability is changing from 70% to 60% of pre-disability income
 - Next Steps
 - UCOP is still developing online tools, resources, and a premium calculator to support informed decision making
 - Employees just received a direct mail postcard announcing these changes prior to open enrollment

- Locally we are working on communication and education plans
- Faculty Welfare committee members were informed that more information can be found on the Disability Insurance portion of the UCnet website.

Manager Hayes noted that disability benefits available to faculty differ between departments, so it is important for faculty to inquire within their department on whether the new UC plan will be a positive benefit. To help faculty in the decision-making process, a guide sheet will be developed. Committee members later participated in the development and final review of the guide.

Faculty Life and Percentage Appointments

In April, Professor Tom Newman attended the committee meeting to have a discussion on Academic Senate series faculty percentage appointments. He informed the committee that in considering how life could be improved for faculty at UCSF, members of the Epidemiology and Biostatistics department have questioned why all In Residence faculty must have 100% appointments. There are many instances for In Residence faculty, and others in Senate series, where a lower percentage appointment would help a faculty member address personal or funding issues. When reviewing the topic, Professor Newman discovered that the APM does allow for less than 100% Academic Senate appointments. However, reductions in appointment are most likely not common as they require approval from the Dean and Chancellor. Committee members found this point interesting and inquired whether or not there are records of how many faculty have requested a reduction. Professor Newman noted that he does not have any data. He added that there are pros and cons to having a less than 100% appoint. The pros are that faculty have more flexibility over their career and personal decisions. The cons are that department chairs and deans may find ways to reduce appointments of faculty to save units money. In fact, there could be cases where a faculty member is at a 75% appointment, but still working 100% as research, teaching and service loads often demand. It can be argued that the 100% benchmark may also be a protection for faculty. Committee members agreed.

After discussion Chair Rehm noted that she could contact UC systemwide Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Sue Carlson to ask for data on how many faculty have requested reductions in Senate series appointments. Professor Newman stated that he could reach out to UCSF Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Brian Alldredge to ask if he has any additional information and whether or not related questions could be added to the faculty life survey.

Faculty Childcare and Home Care Pilot

In December, The UCSF Academic Senate's Executive Council asked Committee on Faculty Welfare to take on the Faculty Child Care and Home Care pathway of the Chancellors Fund allocation. The Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) Committee had been overseeing the pathway for the past two years and the Executive Council believes that it would be more appropriate for the allocation to be under the Faculty Welfare Committee's purview. Committee members discussed and agreed.

This year, the Campus Life Services department has submitted a proposal ([Appendix 3](#)) for an extension of the faculty in-home child and elder care services. Different than in previous years, the 2017 proposal asks for \$20,000 for two years to waive the \$200 enrollment fee and waiting period. The Campus Life Services department hypothesizes that while there is a demand for emergency child-care and elder-care services at UCSF, the enrollment fee and the waiting period have created a barrier for faculty interested in accessing the program. If their proposal is fully funded, CLS wants to test their idea by waiving the fee and observing how many additional faculty enroll in the program over the next two years. The hope is that if the increased enrollment is significant, the campus leadership could allocate permanent funding.

Committee members discussed and agreed that additional access to child and elder in-home care would be beneficial faculty and UCSF. When faculty are afforded care for family members, they are able to continue their work and be productive. The Faculty Welfare Committee voted to provide their full \$20,000

allocation for the program. If more funding is provided to the committee next year, they will consider an additional allocation to CLS to continue their fee waiver pilot.

Open Access 2020 Presentation

In February, Chair of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication, Rich Schneider, presented on the Open Access 2020 Initiative (OA2020). OA2020 aims to accelerate the transition to open access by transforming the existing corpus of scientific journals from their current subscription system to open access. In making this presentation, COLASC Chair Schneider is asking the committee to support UCSF becoming a signatory to the Expression of Interest.

Chair Schneider reviewed the well-known model of scholarly journal publishing, in which academics typically provide labor (e.g., research, drafting articles, and peer review) that scientific journals in turn charge readers, academic institutions, and researchers to access. Internationally, \$8-10B is spent annually for journal subscriptions, with 1.5-2M papers being published worldwide. Subscriptions costs continue to rise (60% over the past decade vs. CPI of 16%). 50% of all papers are from the top five publishers (Reed-Elsevier, Wiley-Blackwell, Springer, Taylor & Francis, etc.) who extract over \$2B in profits annually with margins of 30-40%. He also reminded committee members that UCSF was a leading institutions in open access, as it was the first UC campus to adopt an open access policy in May 2012. This was followed by the systemwide Senate's Open Access Policy in July 2013, which became a UC Presidential Policy in October 2015. Despite the nearly 800 OA mandates and policies worldwide, OA publishing has grown only about 1% per year.

The goal of OA 2020 is to convert journals from subscription to open access by re-directing the existing funds spent on journal subscriptions into open access funds, in order to finance the essential services that publishers provide for scholarly communication (e.g., the administration of peer review, editing, and open access article dissemination). OA2020 would enable an orderly transformation of the current publishing system, since the disruptions would affect only the underlying cash flows, rather than the publishing process itself, or the roles of journals and publishers. COLASC Chair Schneider remarked that the money is already in the system to facilitate this transition (\$8-\$10B spent in journal subscriptions). This translates to approximately \$4,000 - \$5,200 paid per research article. The benefits of implementing this transition would include: 1) Existing journals and their systems (e.g., editorial boards, peer reviews, prestige, impact, etc.) can remain intact; 2) authors, funders, and institutions would have a direct market influence on keeping prices (e.g., APCs) down; and 3) publishers would have to compete for authors' "business" by providing services and products. Subscription money can then be reallocated to support new academic publishing models and platforms. COLASC Chair Schneider commented that such a model would only impact 1-2% of research budgets worldwide (likely < 1% for UCSF), but new workflows for payment would be needed (e.g., combinations of library, university, and grant funding). That said, there may be higher costs for research-intensive institutions with high output (like UCSF), but potentially lower overall payments to publishers worldwide. A relative loss in the current negotiation leverage and control by UC libraries with some journals may also ensue. However, "contracts" would be between authors and publishers, instead of libraries and publishers.

Members expressed appreciation for COLASC Chair Schneider's presentation, but voiced concerns over the implementation. Members voted to approve a communication supporting the institution's signing of an expression of interest letter ([Appendix 4](#)).

Risk Management and Insurance Services

In February, UCSF Risk Management and Insurance Services Director Bruce Flynn attended the committee meeting to report the risk management and insurance services available to faculty ([Appendix 5](#)):

- Mission
 - The mission of UCSF Risk Management and Insurance Services is to protect the assets and interests of UCSF employees and programs through assessment of loss exposure,

focused prevention efforts, and efficient management of insurance and self-insurance programs.

- Risk Management Overview
 - UC self-insured Auto, Employment Practices, General, and Property Liability claims programs
 - Clinical Research Risk Management – devoted to preventing and/or reducing clinical trial-related human subject injuries; includes clinical trials coverage overseas
 - University Controlled Insurance Program – management of multiple insurance plans for Mission Bay/Medical Center and Campus construction-related risk
 - Be Smart About Safety – funds risk mitigation projects for diverse programs such as training for research phlebotomists; ergonomics services; network security; and the Chancellor’s Wellness program.
 - Travel Insurance – during 2015-16, UCSF faculty, staff, and students registered over 6000 domestic and overseas trips with coverage under the Travel Accident program; iJet system responded to 11 emergency calls and transported 3 faculty/staff back to US
- Overview of UC Travel Program
 - Travel Insurance
 - Blanket coverage for faculty, students, regents, other college participants and traveling companions
 - Risk Management Services
 - Custom location risk assessments for international campus and study abroad locations
 - Incident management team support and briefs during crisis events
 - On the ground assistance in the event of a potentially life-threatening situation while traveling
 - Emergency Medical Services include referrals, payments, emergency transit, and evacuation
 - Emergency Travel Services
 - Trip Information Services
 - Technology
 - Dedicated UC Travel Risk Hotline
 - Crisis hotline and security assistance center
 - A secure, web-based system for travel global threats, accessing location based risk intelligence
 - Automated security alerts for travelers
- Business Travel Insurance
 - Who is eligible for coverage under the Business Travel Plan?
 - All employees, administration, traveling companions and professor emeritus
 - While traveling on business for UC
 - Coverage begins at the start of the trip and ends upon return to home or work. Includes personal deviations.
 - What is covered?
 - Accident Benefits
 - Out of Country Medical Benefits
- Travel Registration
 - If you booked outside of the conexus portal, you can register your trip by visiting the UCOP website - <http://www.ucop.edu/risk-services/loss-prevention-control/travel-assistance/>

Director Flynn was asked whether UC offers assistance to faculty, students and staff who are conducting research activities in dangerous areas that are located domestically. Director Flynn responded that from a security perspective if any faculty, students or staff are in danger off campus, they should call UCPD for

assistance. From a medical perspective, UC offered benefits will be applicable in case there is an emergency.

Transportation Presentation

In April, Director of Transportation Services Erick Villalobos attended the meeting to respond to the committees request to learn more about increasing parking rates and why the shuttles recently stopped offering wifi. Director Villalobos provided the following presentation ([Appendix 6](#)):

- **Transportation Services:** Transportation department is under the Campus Life Services division of UCSF. The unit manages the shuttle system, the network of parking lots, alternative transportation services, the pre-tax savings program and student transportation services.
- **Guiding Principles:**
 - Parking user fees are based on operating costs and the need to establish reserves for:
 - Salary/Benefits for staff, equipment replacement, major maintenance, facility repair, shuttle service (lease, fuel, insurance, etc.), lights, institutional support, and provision for building new facilities (new construction of parking facilities)
 - Transportation Services is an “Auxiliary” unit and by definition must be self-sustaining. The unit receives no core funding from the campus
 - Funding and operating model is consistent with all other UC campuses
 - FY 17/18 permit parking costs to increase by 7.5% across the board
 - Long-term goal is to reduce yearly increases to the 4-5% range by FY2021-2022
- **Operations and People**
 - Budget Type
 - Transportation Services is considered an “auxiliary” budget
 - Auxiliary means that the unit is self-supporting
 - A fair share recharge of \$4.72 million comes from UCSF Health to offset the cost of the shuttle system. All other costs are paid for by parking revenues
 - **Budget**
 - For FY 2016/2017, total expense budget equaled \$27.1 million
 - **Parking Rates**
 - Parking rates are reviewed and set by a cross-campus/UCSF Health represented Transportation Advisory Group.
- **Parking Summary**
 - Monthly Parking Rates in 2015/2016 = \$188 for most lots
 - The rates are set to increase by 8% in 2016/2017 to \$203 for most lots
 - Director Villalobos noted:
 - Parking pays for free shuttles and many other services
 - The university does not want to create an abundant amount of cheap parking. UCSF is trying to discourage single occupancy vehicle(SOV) driving.
 - UC System initiative to obtain SOV rate below 30% by 2030
 - Rates are all approved by the Transportation Advisory group which includes student, faculty and staff representatives.
 - Relative to other parking lots, UCSF offers parking rates that are average compared to rates offered across the city of San Francisco. Only rates that are subsidized by the organization are lower.
- **Wifi on the Shuttles**
 - UCSF installed wifi in 2013 on the Grey, Blue and Gold shuttles
 - Campus IT conducted a system audit in late 2015 and found security risks in wifi connections. IT asked Transportation Services to discontinue the service pending a new system install and configuration to meet campus WPA standards.
 - Transportation services has budgeted funds for a new system and monitoring
 - IT should install and implement a new wifi system in the Fall of 2017

After the presentation, committee members commented that the parking rates have increased significantly over the past several years. While members understand that parking rates are “market rate” in San Francisco, the salaries of the faculty and staff are below “market rate.” Furthermore, pay increase at UCSF have either remained stagnated or increased only by small percentages. Meanwhile the price increases of parking has gone up significantly and will continue to go up 4%-7% each year for the next several years. Committee members believe that the university should do more to offer some type of subsidy for parking. Director Villalobos acknowledged the concerns of the committee. He added that the financing of necessary parking facility renovations is a key cost driver leading the parking rate increases. have increased significantly to help finance the debt. In addition, UC and UCSF leadership have made He Overall, the hope is to encourage more and more community members to take alternative transportation options. The goal is to help maximize limited space on campus and benefit the environment. Committee members responded that the alternative transportation options do not meet the needs of a lot of students, faculty and staff. Members requested that more options be investigated.

Going Forward

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

- 2018 Enrichment Fund
- Faculty Climate Survey
- Human Resource Reforms
- IT Security
- Mission Hall Post-Occupancy Study/Faculty Workspace

Appendices

- [Appendix 1:](#) Faculty Friendly Initiative (3FI) Presentation
- [Appendix 2:](#) Faculty Health and Benefits Presentation
- [Appendix 3:](#) Faculty Home Care Pilot Proposal
- [Appendix 4:](#) Communication in Support of OA 2020
- [Appendix 5:](#) Risk Management Presentation
- [Appendix 6:](#) Transportation Presentation

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