

**Minutes**  
**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**January 23, 2020**  
**Kerr 61**

**Present:** Yihsu Chen, Gabriel Elkaim, Thorne Lay, Grant McGuire (Chair), Nico Orlandi, Judith Aissen (ex officio), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

**Absent with Notice:** Tesla Jeltema, Su-hua Wang

**Chair Announcements**

*Report from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Meeting of January 10, 2020*  
Chair McGuire reported that UCFW is aware of the UCSC graduate student strike, and CFW members discussed the latest news in this regard. The Task Force on Investment and Retirement consulted with UCFW and Chair McGuire noted that the numbers look okay. The TFIR reported that the UC system has been creating a comprehensive plan to become carbon neutral by 2025, but it is unclear if this will be doable.

UCFW also spoke with Robert May, the previous Chair of the Academic Council. UCFW was informed that the Unit 18 Lecturer contract is ending at the end of the month, and it is likely that they will go on strike due to pay and teaching load concerns. Unit 18 Lecturers have additionally expressed an interest in being included as members of the Academic Senate, which may not be possible as the group is unionized and one body of workers cannot be partially unionized. Further, UCFW discussed that having bargaining units involved would completely change the way that shared governance between faculty and the administration works, noting that the union is being more aggressive in its goal to expand union membership. May noted that most are sympathetic to the needs of lecturers, but emphasized that the overall consequences of this possible request are unknown.

*Report from the CAB/SEC Meeting of January 21, 2020*

Chair McGuire provided members with an update from the latest Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting, during which, SEC met with the Chancellor's Advisory Board (CAB). Chair McGuire noted that the majority of the conversation was focused on the current graduate student strike. It is unclear if there will be any movement towards resolution. There may be a communication from SEC to the administration on the topic in the near future. Chair McGuire suggested that the unresolved issue may make it difficult for departments and divisions to recruit new graduate students.

**Pathways to Retirement Program – Divisional Review**

CFW has been invited to review and comment on a proposal for a Pathways to Retirement Program at UCSC. The program is being spearheaded by Faculty Administrative Leadership Fellow Adrian Brasoveanu and is modeled on programs at four other UC campuses. Although the members appreciate that this proposal makes retirement more transparent, concerns were raised about the binding contract, confusing text regarding contract modification, equity across divisions, and a lack of comparable data.

Members assume that the main drive of this proposal is to solve an institutional problem rather than a problem that individual faculty approaching retirement are experiencing. Members noted

that in exchange for certain benefits under a program binding contract, faculty lose flexibility, and much of what is being proposed in the program already happens with departmental chairs without a binding agreement. Further, the proposal is confusing in that it states that the contract may not be modified or withdrawn, but then goes on to say that if faculty have doubts about their retirement after signing the agreement they should speak with their dean in a post-agreement discussion, as deans are the major funders, and should have a main agency role in the final decision making. If the contract is binding and unchangeable, members contend that there should be no mention of a post-agreement discussion or reference to a UCLA case where the retirement date was postponed. However, if there is room for modification in some specific cases, this should be explicitly noted, and CFW will note in its response that a process for such modifications should be clearly mapped out in both the proposal and program guidelines.

The committee notes that retiree resources (research funds, office and/or lab space, etc.) are based on divisional resources, and CFW will emphasize that divisional resources vary on campus and are not equitable, so retiree resources under this plan may additionally be inequitable. Further, members questioned the extent to which these resources will provide a sufficient incentive to retire, thereby decreasing the overall effectiveness of the program.

CFW would like to know where the resources for similar programs on other campuses come from (division or central?). In addition, members would have liked to have seen more information on retirement rates on these campuses (perhaps by division) and data on the effect of and satisfaction with these programs in order to determine the possible success of such a program on our campus. Without this data, members are left to question both the inequity and overall effectiveness of the proposed program. As such, CFW will recommend that the program be implemented as a pilot program and be assessed in a couple of years in order to determine its effectiveness and equity across divisions.

### **UCSC Healthcare**

Chair McGuire provided members with a general overview of UCSC healthcare and the unique needs of the UCSC campus. Last year, UCSF wanted to partner with Dignity Health in order to gain access to their facilities. As Dignity Health is a religious organization, services are limited, particularly with regards to reproductive and transgender health. The Senate objected strenuously. Chair McGuire noted that Robert May shared with UCFW that he thinks that the proposed UCSF and Dignity Health affiliation that the UCSC campus raised concerns about will go through. Chair McGuire suggested that if an affiliation is established, then Health Net Blue and Gold, which provides access to Physicians Medical Group (PMG) through Dignity facilities may essentially present as a UC medical affiliate and there may be pressure to remove the Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) from the UC Care PPO due to competition.

Chair McGuire noted that healthcare at the UC is largely dominated by the UC Medical Centers, which is why the UC Care PPO plan was created. The intent of the plan was to give employees access to UC medical center and increase revenue, but UC Care expenses keep going up and there

is no push back to the medical centers and what they are charging. This is essentially a conflict of interest, which was a concern raised when the UC was considering the creation of the program. In addition, as UC Care is the most expensive plan in terms of premiums, younger healthier employees are switching to cheaper plans, leaving older enrollees and those who require more medical care on UC Care, which is more expensive to cover and creates increases in premium costs. As the premiums go up, more leave, which makes prices go up even more, and places the plan on a self-fulfilling death spiral.

Members noted that many were hoping that Kaiser would increase its footprint in Santa Cruz and provide more access to employees. However, Chair McGuire noted that this might not be the case. Apparently Kaiser doesn't take Medical patients, but UC Health Centers are forced to, which is a huge competitive issue. As such, it is unknown whether Kaiser will remain part of the UC plan offerings.

Chair McGuire noted that the people who are determining the UC health plans are usual experts in the UC medical centers. As UCSC does not have a medical center, the UCSC campus's needs are often forgotten. Because of its location and limited market, UCSC's access to healthcare is always precarious. Tight negotiations between medical groups and health plan administrators are always an issue, and because PMG cannot absorb all PAMF enrollees and vice versa, Chair McGuire emphasized the UCSC campus cannot lose access to one of the two plans.

Last academic year, Chair McGuire met with Chancellor Blumenthal and a staff liaison to discuss UCSC's healthcare issues. The Chancellor at the time did not fully understand the precarious nature of UCSC's access. Chair McGuire would like to speak with VCBAS Sarah Latham, who serves on a systemwide healthcare committee and then have a similar conversation with incoming Chancellor Larive. Chair McGuire noted that in a previous CFW consultation with iCPEVC Lori Kletzer, CFW noted that PAMF contacted the campus a few years ago about a possible side plan for UCSC, but later canceled the meeting and the iCPEVC would like more information. Chair McGuire would like to work with campus administration, SEC, and the UCFW Health Care Task Force (HCTF) to push UCSC healthcare needs and restate the moral concerns of a possible affiliation with Dignity Health.