April 28, 2022

SUSAN CARLSON, VICE PROVOST
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Re: Proposed Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay

Dear Susan:

As requested, I distributed for systemwide Senate review the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay. Nine Academic Senate divisions and one systemwide committee (UCPB) submitted comments. These comments were discussed at Academic Council’s April 27 meeting and are attached for your reference.

We understand that the Policy supplements military pay for eligible UC employees on an active overseas military mobilization campaign if the employee’s military pay is less than their University salary. Employees receiving supplements are also eligible to receive University contributions for health and welfare benefits, subject to a two-year lifetime limit. We also understand that the revision would remove the existing four-year renewal provision and extend the policy indefinitely. In addition to extending the policy indefinitely, the revisions update and clarify existing policy language and definitions.

In general, the Senate supports the proposed modifications and the renewal of the policy for an indefinite term; however, Council agrees that if the policy is renewed for an indefinite term, it should also continue to be reviewed periodically to assess its effectiveness and continued alignment with University goals.

The Senate also recommends clarifying to whom and in what circumstances the provisions of the policy apply. Specifically, we are unsure if limiting the supplement to “overseas” deployments will account for a domestic disaster relief effort that entails an active duty recall of the National Guard or military Reserves, or apply to foreign locations that are not strictly “overseas.” The Senate is also concerned that the policy includes specific provisions that could disproportionately disadvantage the lowest paid UC employees, and includes newly added changes that could make health and welfare benefits more restrictive for some eligible employees.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment and encourage you to consider these issues as you make final revisions to the policy. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.
Sincerely,

Robert Horwitz, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council
    Campus Senate Directors
    Executive Director Baxter

Encl.
March 29, 2022

ROBERT HORWITZ
Chair, Academic Council

Subject: Proposed revisions – Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay

Dear Chair Horwitz:

The Council of the Berkeley Division (DIVCO) endorsed the proposed revisions to the UC Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay. In addition, DIVCO questioned the limitations to overseas obligations. This policy should be applicable if there are military activities in the United States, as well as U.S. territories. For example, the National Guard were deployed to various U.S. cities to assist with COVID-19 relief efforts by creating overflow quarantine areas and extra hospital beds. Also, the definition of “overseas” should include countries that are not “overseas”, such as those in North, Central, and South America.

Sincerely,

Ronald C. Cohen
Professor of Chemistry
Professor of Earth and Planetary Science
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

Enclosure

cc: Mary Ann Smart, Vice Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
    Jocelyn Surla Banaria, Executive Director
Robert Horwitz  
Chair, Academic Council

RE: Proposed Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay

April 19, 2022

Dear Robert,

The proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay were forwarded to all standing committees of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Two committees responded: Faculty Welfare (CFW), and Planning and Budget (CPB).

Committees support the proposed revisions. CPB noted two areas of concern:

- Section III.D.1. states that the Group Insurance Regulations will determine whether employees can continue UC health and welfare benefits, rather than the prior policy, which allowed coverage for up to two years. Could this make health and welfare benefits more restrictive for some eligible employees?
- Section V.A.5 states that employees may enroll, change, cancel, or opt out of health and welfare benefits. Does this decision need to be made within a certain timeframe of an employee’s change in status?

The Davis Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Richard P. Tucker, Ph.D.  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
University of California, Davis

Enclosed: Davis Division Committee Responses

c: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate  
Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Richard Tucker
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Request for Consultation – Proposed Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay

Dear Richard:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare has reviewed the RFC – Proposed Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay and did not have any comments regarding the proposed revisions.

Sincerely,

Karen L. Bales
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

c: Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Richard Tucker  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate


The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has reviewed and discussed the Systemwide Review of Draft Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay. Overall, the CPB is supportive of this policy and the proposed changes; however, the CPB would be interested in learning more about the historical impact of this proposed policy (e.g., how many employees have used this policy, from what staffing categories, for what duration, and the cost of the program over time). In addition, some members voiced concerns about how the proposed changes to this policy appear to make the health and welfare benefits more restrictive for eligible employees. In particular, section III.D.1. suggests that the Group Insurance regulations will determine whether employees can continue UC health and welfare benefits, rather than the prior policy which allowed coverage for up to two years. CPB also has some concerns about the lack of UC health and welfare benefits coverage for those whose military pay exceeds their UC pay and will not be considered on pay status. It would also be useful to clarify in Section V.A.5 when employees may enroll, change, cancel, or opt out of health and welfare benefits. Does this decision need to be made within a certain timeframe of an employee’s change in status?

CPB appreciates the opportunity to comment.
April 5, 2022

Robert Horwitz, Chair
Academic Council


Dear Chair Horwitz,

The Irvine Division discussed the draft presidential policy on supplement to military pay at its April 5, 2022 Cabinet meeting. The Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (CFW) also reviewed the policy. CFW’s feedback is attached for your review.

CFW members generally agreed that the policy and proposed changes were clear and straightforward. Cabinet members had no additional feedback.

The Irvine Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Joanna Ho, Chair
Academic Senate, Irvine Division

Enclosure: CFW memo

Cc: Georg Striedter, Chair Elect-Secretary
    Jisoo Kim, Executive Director
    Gina Anzivino, Associate Director
March 14, 2022

JOANNA HO, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE – IRVINE DIVISION

Re: Systemwide Draft Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay

Systemwide Senate Chair Robert Horwitz distributed for Systemwide Senate review proposed revisions to the presidential policy on supplement to military pay.

The Council discussed this issue at its meeting on February 8, 2022, and would like to submit the following comments:

1. Members generally agreed that the policy and proposed changes seemed clear and straightforward.

2. The majority of members voted in favor of removing all references to the four-year review provision.

Sincerely,

Terry Dalton, Chair
Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom

C: Jisoo Kim, Executive Director
   Academic Senate

Gina Anzivino, Associate Director
   Academic Senate

Matthew Hurley, Cabinet Analyst
   Academic Senate
April 18, 2022

Robert Horwitz
Chair, UC Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Draft Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay

Dear Chair Horwitz,

The Divisional Executive Board, councils, and committees appreciate the opportunity to review the Draft Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay. The Executive Board reviewed and endorsed the proposal and divisional council and committee feedback at its meeting on April 14, 2022.

Sincerely,

Jessica Cattelino
Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
    Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
April 19, 2022

To: Robert Horwitz, Chair, Academic Council

From: LeRoy Westerling, Chair, UCM Divisional Council

Re: Proposed Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay

The proposed Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay was distributed for comment to the Merced Division Senate Committees and the School Executive Committees. No comments were offered.

The Merced Division thanks you for the opportunity to comment on these proposed revisions, and declines to comment.

CC: Divisional Council
Senate Office
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
March 16, 2022

Robert Horwitz, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: (Systemwide Senate Review) Draft Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay

Dear Robert,

The Riverside Executive Council discussed the subject draft policy during their March 14, 2022 meeting and like the divisional Committee on Faculty Welfare are supportive of the policy. I have attached their memo.

Sincerely yours,

/s/Jason
Jason Stajich
Professor of Bioinformatics and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

February 15, 2022

To: Jason Stajich  
   Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: John Heraty, Chair  
   Committee on Faculty Welfare


The Committee on Faculty Welfare reviewed the proposed revised Draft Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay at their February 15, 2022 meeting and was supportive of the policy as written.
April 6, 2022

Professor Robert Horwitz  
Chair, Academic Senate  
University of California  
VIA EMAIL

Re: Divisional Review of Draft Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay

Dear Professor Horwitz,

The proposed draft Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay was distributed to San Diego Divisional Senate standing committees and discussed at the March 14, 2022 Divisional Senate Council meeting. Senate Council considered the indefinite extension of benefits to be a good commitment from the University to military service members and endorsed the proposal. It was suggested that although the benefits are extended indefinitely, the policy should still be reviewed periodically to keep it up to date.

The response from the Divisional Committee on Faculty Welfare is attached.

Sincerely,

Tara Javidi  
Chair  
San Diego Divisional Academic Senate

Attachment

cc: Nancy Postero, Vice Chair, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate  
    Lori Hullings, Executive Director, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate  
    Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, UC Systemwide Academic Senate
February 28, 2022

TARA JAVIDI, CHAIR
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reviewed the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay at its February meeting. The Military Pay policy is updated to extend the benefits of covering for the pay difference and health care insurance coverage. The draft proposes to do this indefinitely instead of the previous 4-year renewal provision. The committee considered this a good commitment from the University to military service members. The proposed changes look reasonable. However, the committee would like to suggest that in light of the indefinite extension, perhaps the policy can include a periodic review timeline so that in the future, this policy will stay updated while renewal is guaranteed. The committee endorsed the proposed revisions.

Sincerely,

Shantanu Sinha, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: N. Postero
J.P. Guerra
March 8, 2022

To: Robert Horwitz, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Susannah Scott, Chair
Santa Barbara Division


The Santa Barbara Division distributed the proposed revisions to Senate councils and committees, including the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards (CFW), Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE), and the Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP). CPB and CRPP opted not to opine.

Both the CFW and CDE voiced their support for the policy. CDE found removing the four-year provision and other updates, including adding gender neutral language, to be appropriate. Some CFW members expressed reluctance at the proposal to remove periodic review of the program, “given that U.S. military engagement is beyond the control of the UC, and may have impacts or motivations which do not have unanimous endorsement of the faculty.” The council ultimately agreed the policy should move forward while they reserve their right to rescind support or otherwise offer comment in the future.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment.
March 29, 2022

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Lisa Parks, Chair
    Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards

Re: Draft Presidential Policy - Supplement to Military Pay

The Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards reviewed the proposed Draft Presidential Policy - Supplement to Military Pay at its meetings of February 2 and March 2, 2022. The council ultimately endorsed the policy of supporting employees’ supplemental pay. However, some members expressed reluctance at removing the intermittent review of the program, given that U.S. military engagement is beyond the control of the UC, and may have impacts or motivations which do not have unanimous endorsement of the faculty. That said, given that policies regularly come under review, the council agreed this should move forward while they reserve their right to rescind support or otherwise offer comment in the future.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
February 18, 2022

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair  
   Academic Senate

From: Jean Beaman, Chair  
      Committee on Diversity and Equity

Re: Draft Presidential Policy - Supplement to Military Pay

The Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE) reviewed the draft Presidential Policy - Supplement to Military Pay. CDE found removing the four-year provision and other updates, including adding gender neutral language, appropriate, and offered their support to the revised policy.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
April 14, 2022

Robert Horwitz, Chair
Academic Council


Dear Robert,

The Santa Cruz Division has reviewed the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay. Our Committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Planning and Budget (CPB), and Privilege and Tenure (P&T), have responded. The Santa Cruz Division applauds the inclusion of gender-neutral language in the proposed revisions. However, committee responses noted a need for more context and clarity, and raised some questions and concerns about the health and welfare benefits opt out/change timeline.

Our responding committees noted that it was difficult to opine on the proposed revisions without more contextual information. Questions were raised about the initial reasons for setting the policy up with a four-year renewal, and the reasons for now wanting to make the policy permanent. Additionally, the memo states that the supplement to military pay policy is “the only systemwide policy that currently has a four-year renewal provision”. It is not clear whether this means that there are no other systemwide policies with renewal provisions, or if there are other policies with renewal provisions, but with a different time cycle. Concerns were raised that making this policy permanent may lead to a situation where there is no review process. Further, one committee noted that the review materials did not shed light on roughly how many UC employees this policy applies to, which would have proven useful in terms of weighing the potential impact of the proposed revisions.

There is a need for further clarification in the draft policy on several points. With regards to who the policy applies to, the policy summary in Section I states that the policy applies to those on “active military duty in support of an ongoing overseas military mobilization campaign”. Committees questioned if this would include those in the Reserves who are deployed. Although there is usually a distinction between Active Duty and the Reserves, both may be mobilized overseas for long periods of time. More clarification regarding who this policy applies to is needed. Committees additionally noted that there is a lack of clarity about what is meant by “noncompliance” with the policy. We assume noncompliance to mean the failure of the administration to provide supplementary pay.
However, the intended meaning of this term should be clarified within the policy. Clarification is additionally needed with regards to health and welfare benefits. Although the policy states that, “Employees may enroll in, change, cancel or opt out of health and welfare benefits through UCPath”, more information on the timing of these options would be helpful. Although not directly applicable to the proposed revisions, the Santa Cruz Division would additionally like to note that this review raised questions as to why UC would supplement the salary of those serving in the military, but not other forms of service that might require short-term absences from the university, such as service with humanitarian organizations.

Other than claiming that the policy is “military-friendly” and “straightforward to administer”, the review materials did not provide a strong argument as to why the policy should now become permanent. Without this additional information, one of our committees did not see the rationale for changing the policy, and was unable to support the proposed revisions at this time. Other responding committees expressed general support for the proposed revisions with additional clarification, and with an expectation that the policy will continue to be routinely reviewed. In all, there was no consensus of support for the proposed revisions to this Presidential Policy.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

cc: Kirsten Silva Gruesz, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
    Nico Orlandi, Chair Committee on Faculty Welfare
    Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
    Julie Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
    Matthew Mednick, Executive Director, Academic Senate
ROBERT HORWITZ, CHAIR,
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE PRESIDENTIAL POLICY ON SUPPLEMENT TO MILITARY PAY

Dear Robert,

UCPB appreciates the opportunity to review the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay.

Since 1990, the University of California has maintained a policy to supplement the compensation of UC employees who are called up for active military service. However, this policy is written such that it must be renewed every four years. The proposal will remove the renewal provision and make the policy permanent.

The proposal to remove the renewal provision is sensible and consistent with the intent of the policy; UCPB strongly supports the change. However, UCPB is concerned about consistency in language across various documents and more importantly, what are perhaps unintended consequences of the new policy which we fear could result in unequal treatment of University employees based on their pay level.

Language in the current policy indicates that an employee on pay status who is called up for military service can retain coverage in group insurance plans and that University contributions to such plans will continue for up to two years of military service. This language has been struck from the proposed revised policy and replaced with a reference to Group Insurance Regulations (GIR) under Military Leave. Section 1006 of the GIR indicates that University contributions may (not will) continue for up to two years or through June 30, 2018. Separate employment policies for staff (PPSM, section 2.210 E.1.d) and for faculty (APM 751, section 751-21.a.) do not specify the June 30, 2018 expiration date, but they do include statements that employees on military leave with pay will receive all benefits related to employment that are granted to the employee when on pay status. These statements in the PPSM and APM appear to be in conflict with provisions in the GIR that
specify a few restrictions on some coverages. The language in these various documents ought to be reviewed for consistency.

A more concerning issue stems from the seemingly harmless provision that an employee whose military pay exceeds their University pay is ineligible for the Supplement to Military Pay—a situation that is likely to apply to only the lowest paid university employees. Under the existing regular military leave policies, an employee in this category is considered to be on pay status for a maximum of 30 days. As such while employees remain eligible for coverage for up to six months, University contributions to premiums end after the 30-day period. Higher paid employees who are eligible for Supplement to Military Pay given their greater University salary, will maintain both their eligibility and University contributions to benefits for up to two years beyond the 30 days. Although the new language proposed for the revised Supplement to Military Pay allows those employees who are not eligible for Supplemental Military Pay to “use accrued vacation, PTO and/or compensatory time off (CTO), in order for the University to continue to pay the University’s contribution to their health plan premiums through the employee’s tour of active duty” (mirroring language that is already in the two employment policies), it seems unlikely that such employees will have sufficient accrued vacation or PTO to cover a tour of active tour of duty in support, particularly for overseas military mobilization. This provision therefore apparently disproportionately disadvantages those whose can least afford it and as such is inconsistent with the spirit of the Supplement to Military Pay policy. UCPB suggests that this aspect of the policy be re-examined.

There was also some concern over how University contributions to the DC portion of the pension plan or service credit for the DB portion would accrue. Are contributions / accrual time based on total pay or only the University’s Supplement to Military pay? Again, low-income employees who are receiving no Supplemental Pay could be disproportionately affected.

UCPB strongly supports the intent of the proposed revisions and suggests some additional attention to specific language might be helpful.

Sincerely,

Kathleen McGarry, Chair
UCPB