Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from November 23rd, 2015
3. Benefits comparison across universities: Selection of schools
4. Long Term Care Insurance alternatives (Patricia Dougherty)
5. Social Security deductions on 40% rehire pay
6. Legislative Update (Katy Dwyer)
7. Report by the UW Retirement Association’s Committee on Legislative Issues and Benefits on concerns with the VEBA program (Charles Chamberlin)
8. Good of the order
9. Adjourn

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Siegel at 2:35 p.m.

2) Review of the minutes from November 23rd, 2015

The minutes from November 23rd, 2015 were approved unanimously as amended.

3) Benefits comparison across universities: Selection of schools

Siegel informed the council he knows of a PHD student at the UW who is interested in aiding the council in its work creating a chart comparing benefits between various universities. Siegel explained the student can begin work on this endeavor when the council has identified and selected a list of institutions to be included in the comparison.

Before discussing the selection, members explained they were charged to conduct this comparison, though they do not know for what intended purpose, or what use it will have once published. Siegel agreed, and noted he would consult with senate leadership over the intended use of the comparison.

Members looked at an excel sheet compiled by Siegel which showed three possible established lists of peer institutions for the University of Washington, these were: GCS (Global Challenge State), HECB (Higher Education Coordinating Board), and OFM Peer Institutions (Exhibit 1).

After some discussion, a majority of members suggested utilizing the OFM list, noting it to be the only list option that can be used on its own to create a meaningful analysis.

The council held some discussion of the advantages for including foreign schools (not domestic to the U.S.) in the assessment. It was noted differences in health care systems, other major systems, and
accounting for currency exchange rates may yield a skewed or difficult analysis. After more discussion, the University of British Columbia (UBC) was chosen to be the sole incorporated foreign institution, used to satisfy the international perspective. It was noted a few private higher education institutions should be identified and incorporated, as well.

A member explained the council may want to consult with faculty senate chair Norm Beauchamp to question whether or not the senate or other bodies use a standard group of universities to compare with the UW.

The council attempted to identify additional dimensions of work-related benefits to compare between institutions. After discussion, it was noted that retiree/emeritus benefits should be considered, including any and all activities offered by the university to its retired faculty and staff. It was noted the cost of housing should also be taken into consideration, and median income levels of an institution’s region. Deardorff explained cost of living is a good aggregate score to simplify some of these aspects.

Siegel noted that when the institutions for comparison have been selected, he will inform the PHD student who has agreed to work on the initial comparison. He noted that student is an efficient worker.

Transportation

Gifford explained she has brought some data from UW Transportation Services to review, which was extracted from UW Transportation Services’ annual survey (Exhibit 2). The chart included data on commute times to the UW Seattle campus, costs, and other information on UW Transportation-offered benefits. After some analysis of the document, Siegel thanked Gifford for bringing his data to the council, and asked if the council may consult with her on the transportation portion of the comparison, which was agreed to.

The held some discussion of elements of transportation to include in the analysis, noting (not limited to) parking benefits, average commute times, and offered subsidies for the cost of municipal public transportation.

4) Long Term Care Insurance alternatives (Patricia Dougherty)

Dougherty gave some background to the council on Long Term Care (LTC) Insurance, noting that the UW Retirement Association will hold a workshop relating to the subject on January 28th from 5:00-6:30 p.m. in Alder Hall - wherein an expert will be present to give information and answer questions. One of the topics of this workshop will be who, and who is not, recommended to purchase LTC Insurance, she explained.

Dougherty noted LTC Insurance covers you for self-care, and almost all LTC Insurance is underwritten by insurance companies. She explained despite this, insurance companies are under legal obligation to sell the insurance at affordable rates based on an individual’s financial profile. She explained there have been several hundred consumer complaints recently over LTC Insurance, many due to premium rates and claim-handling. She explained an insurance company’s longevity is an important consideration on behalf of the consumer, as well, given the nature of the insurance type. Though, if a company was to go bankrupt or otherwise close, an individual will still be covered due to regulations governing the liability.

There was some question of “group LTC Insurance.” Dwyer clarified for the group that the possibility for group LTC Insurance must be appraised annually by the PEBB, and has not found to be implementable in
years past. She explained LTC Insurance for UW employees is handled by the PEBB according to Washington law.

It was noted LTC Insurance should be purchased in a person’s mid-fifties, as this is the optimum time for return vs. premium costs to be in the consumer’s favor. Dwyer explained a person should consider their full financial assets when appraising the need for LTC Insurance, as it may be less necessary in certain financial situations; overall health and predisposal to medical dangers should also be considered in this assessment.

After some further discussion, Dougherty and Chamberlin explained they may have more on this topic to consult with the council on, and that they would report in a later meeting.

5) Social Security deductions on 40% rehire pay

Dwyer noted faculty returning for work at the UW after retirement on rehire pay were recently informed they were now required to contribute to Social Security while working at the university. She explained the change came about when old Social Security agreements were investigated, and the existing Social Security exemption for returning faculty was found to longer be applicable. After question, Dwyer explained this is after review with the State, as individual Social Security agreements exist by the thousands, and Washington State has its own Social Security coordinator whose job it is to seek out all agreements, check their compliance with any new laws and regulations, and so on. She noted she personally sent the email to all returning faculty and others, so that she would be able to hear concerns and respond to questions.

6) Legislative Update (Katy Dwyer)

Dwyer explained that there is nothing very substantive to report to the council on the business of the Washington State Legislature as it relates to benefits and retirement. She noted the normal session will culminate on March 11th, 2016.

7) Report by the UW Retirement Association’s Committee on Legislative Issues and Benefits on concerns with the VEBA program (Charles Chamberlin)

Chamberlin explained there are pending questions associated with the VEBA program which were investigated by the UW Retirement Association’ Legislative Committee. He explained that body plans to soon publish a report of their concerns, which will be made available to council members for review. Chamberlin explained he is likely able to provide more information and background into this report in the next council meeting.

8) Good of the order

Spieker questioned if faculty rehired at 40% were to be granted that percentage of their formal base salary, or another amount. She explained someone she knows was told by their department that they would rehire her at 40%, but that would be 40% of her previously-worked 58% time. The council identified Cheryl Cameron (VP of Academic Personnel) as one expert to consult on this question. It was noted that the policy may be separate for clinical faculty, and for tenured and untenured faculty.

9) Adjourn

Siegel adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.
Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: John Mittler, Gowri Shankar, Stephan Siegel (chair), Susan Spieker
Ex-officio reps: Thomas Deardorff, Casey Gifford, Charles Chamberlin
Guests: Katy Dwyer, Patricia Dougherty

Absent: Faculty: Robert Breidenthal, Russel Fernandes, Iulia Metzner, Tom Dodson, Julia Metzner, Gowri Shankar
Ex-officio reps: N/A
President’s designee: Mindy Kornberg

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – Copy of Peer Schools.xlsx
Exhibit 2 – UW Transportation Services’ annual survey data.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Peer Institutions</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado</strong></td>
<td>University of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Colorado, Denver (Health Sciences)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connecticut</strong></td>
<td>University of Connecticut (Storrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maryland</strong></td>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland, Baltimore</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massachusetts</strong></td>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Amherst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Worcester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Jersey</strong></td>
<td>Rutgers University, New Brunswick</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rutgers University, Camden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rutgers University, Newark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia</strong></td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 10
HECB Peer Institutions

Michigan State University
Ohio State University
Texas A&M University, College Station
University of Arizona
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of Cincinnati
University of Florida
University of Hawaii
University of Illinois, Chicago
University of Iowa
University of Kentucky
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of Pittsburgh
University of Virginia
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Utah
**OFM Peer Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Stephan's Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Universities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>University of Southern Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>UBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of Arizona
University of California, Berkeley
**University of California, Los Angeles**
University of Illinois, Urbana/Champaign
University of Iowa
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of Oregon with Oregon Health Sciences Center
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Median commute time (one-way)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Staff</strong></th>
<th><strong>Faculty</strong></th>
<th><strong>Employees (staff and faculty)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 minutes</td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean commute time (one-way)</strong></td>
<td>41 minutes</td>
<td>33 minutes</td>
<td>39 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median commute distance</strong></td>
<td>5 miles</td>
<td>7.5 miles</td>
<td>6.5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean commute distance</strong></td>
<td>11.8 miles</td>
<td>10.1 miles</td>
<td>11.4 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telework</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking benefits
- 50% subsidy
- Payroll deduction

### Transit benefits
- 52% less than retail
- 20% central admin subsidy
- Route planning services

### Vanpool benefits
- Up to $80 subsidy with U-PASS
- Free parking
- Free U-PASS for driver and back-up driver or bookkeeper
- Ridematching services

### Biking benefits
- Secure bike parking options for sale (payroll deduction)
- Free abundant bike parking
- Free bike classes & events
- On-campus bike shop
- Route planning services

### Mean cost of driving (monthly)
$392.53
Source: Trip Data File—Trips taken Monday–Friday among selected respondents
Base: All Respondents
Percentages are based on total weekday trips to campus and in those instances where multiple modes were reported for a single trip (in the case of linked trips) reflect the mode used for the longest portion of the trip.