

Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction
Katherine Yang, PharmD, Chair

October 22, 2020

Sharmila Majumdar, PhD
Division Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Curtailment Proposal

Dear Chair Majumdar:

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) writes to express its concern about the "Proposed 2020-21 Curtailment Program." R&J appreciates that the proposal is an outline rather than a detailed proposal, but the absence of details makes it difficult to provide substantive comments.

The Academic Senate is meant to be a partner in the governance of the University. The Proposed 2020-21 Curtailment Program is missing details that would give the Senate, its Divisions, and its committees a more meaningful opportunity to comment and participate in shared governance.

R&J believes the Systemwide Senate and its Divisions should be involved in shaping the details of the University of California's Curtailment Program and be given an opportunity to comment on a more complete plan. To facilitate improving the proposal, R&J raises the following issues and questions for you to address with the Academic Council.

1. **Salary of Grant-Funded Faculty and Staff:** Faculty and staff who are supported by grants should not be subject to curtailment. Requiring these faculty and staff to be curtailed would not financially benefit the University of California and would harm those faculty and staff without commensurate benefit to any other entity.
2. **Health System Campuses:** R&J is concerned about how curtailment could impact the UC campuses that have health systems. The proposal notes in a fifth bullet point on page 2 that "[c]ampuses would identify essential workers who would be exempt from the program – e.g., medical/clinical staff[.]" This small reference to the large enterprise providing health care to people across California in the middle of a global pandemic did not give R&J confidence that the UC Health system could continue to operate without disruption. UC Health should be able to operate with as few limitations as possible because its work is critical to the health of Californians and the revenue generated by UC Health is critical to the University's economic recovery.

3. **Definition of “Essential”**: The proposal does not define “essential,” and R&J is concerned that “essential” can be narrowly or broadly interpreted. R&J encourages the University to give each campus the latitude to individually define essential workers and apply curtailment to best serve the individual campus needs.
4. **Inconsistent use of “Exempt”**: The proposal uses the term “exempt” inconsistently. On page 2, bullet point 5 and bullet point 6, the proposal suggests an exemption system that is specific to curtailment. On page 3, bullet point 1, the proposal references “exempt employees” which R&J understands refers to a more general category of employment. This requires further clarification.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in grey ink, appearing to read 'K. Yang', is positioned above the typed name.

Katherine Yang, PharmD
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, Chair