CHAIRS OF THE DIVISIONS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Dear Colleagues:

As directed by the Academic Council, I forward two letters from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) to be considered as part of your divisional review of proposed changes to the University’s post-employment benefits plans. The first letter states UCFW’s endorsement of the dissenting statement signed by faculty and senate members of the Post Employment Task Force work groups and requests Academic Council endorsement of that statement. The second letter states UCFW’s specific recommendations on critical decision points regarding the Post Employment Benefits Task Force Steering Committee recommendations. The Council will consider the specifics of the UCFW recommendations at its October 27 meeting.

As you know, The Academic Council must be prepared to forward a recommendation to on PEB options to President Yudof immediately following its October 27 meeting and will be required to adopt a formal position to guide Vice Chair Anderson’s and my advocacy at the scheduled December 13 special meeting of the Board of Regents called to consider recommendations of the PEB Task Force. Accordingly, I ask that you gather as much advice as you can from your divisional committees and councils prior to the October meeting so that you will be able to represent the view of your division at that time. I realize this is difficult to accomplish and that we previously asked for comment by November 8. I regret the additional burden that this evolving process has imposed on all of you.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Simmons, Chair
Academic Council

Enc. (2)
Copy: Academic Council Standing Committee Chairs
    President Mark Yudof
    Provost Lawrence Pitts
    Vice President Nathan Brostrom
    Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director
    Executive Directors, Divisions of the Academic Senate

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200
September 15, 2010

DANIEL SIMMONS, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Endorsement of PEBTF "A Dissenting Statement by Staff and Academic Senate Members of the Work Groups of the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits"

Dear Dan,

At its meeting of September 10, 2010, the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), continued its discussion of the work of the President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits. While the committee has not yet endorsed a final option, UCFW supports the statements and sentiments contained in the Dissenting Statement – including the categorical rejection of Option A, and we ask that the Academic Council endorse them, too, and communicate that endorsement to the president.

A minority of committee members declined to endorse the Dissenting Statement on the grounds that it did not go far enough in repudiating Option B, as well. In particular, the minority felt that it was misleading to regard Options B and C as “similar,” given the impact of integration with Social Security, which is implicit in Option B.

Accordingly, we offer the following motion:

That the Academic Council echo UCFW in strongly endorsing the Dissenting Statement and communicate that support to the president.

Sincerely,

Joel E. Dimsdale, UCFW Chair

Copy: UCFW
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate
RE: Proposed PEB Options

Dear Dan,

UCFW has begun the process of analyzing the numerous PEB proposals. The committee has followed the process closely and has received numerous briefings on the recommendations. Because of the urgency of the deadline for influencing the university’s decisions on these complex matters, UCFW has chosen to respond with the committee’s considered judgment concerning the three recommended pension options, and will subsequently opine on other matters suggested by the PEB report.

Whereas:

- A competitive pension plan that allows employees a comfortable, secure retirement is a crucial piece of the university’s benefit structure;
- Retirement benefits are a significant component of an employee’s total remuneration;
- The University cannot recruit or retain an excellent workforce without competitive retirement benefits; and
- A pension plan must be clear enough so that employees can make informed choices in their retirement planning;

The committee is resolved that:

- UCFW strongly opposes Option A, on the grounds that it is uncompetitive across essentially all employee groups.
- UCFW recommends Option C over Option B, on the grounds that Option C is simpler for employees to understand and for UC to administer than Option B, and Option B has the same employer normal cost as Option C. However, UCFW would be willing to support Option B instead of Option C if staff preferred it. Option C provides a higher pension benefit than Option B for lower- and middle-income employees, paid for by a higher employee contribution by those employees.
- If current employees are offered the choice to continue under the current UCRP plan terms for their future service, UCFW strongly opposes requiring an employee contribution in excess of 7% for those who choose to remain under the current plan terms.
UCFW’s support for Options B and C is contingent on the creation of a credible plan to raise faculty and staff salaries to competitive levels over the next three years – before the implementation of the new tier.

Therefore, we offer the following:

**Motion:** That the Academic Council endorse the UCFW resolution above and communicate that endorsement to the President.

Sincerely,

Joel E. Dimsdale, UCFW Chair

Copy: UCFW
     Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate