

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

March 24, 2010

The Committee on Finance met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Community Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Bernal, Lozano, Makarechian, Schilling, and Varner; Ex officio members Blum, Gould, and Yudof; Advisory members DeFreece and Simmons; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Martinez

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Marcus, Nunn Gorman, Reiss, Stovitz, and Zettel, Regents-designate Cheng and Hime, Faculty Representative Powell, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Executive Vice President Brostrom, Senior Vice President Dooley, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Duckett, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Desmond-Hellmann, Fox, Kang, Katehi, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 12:25 p.m. with Committee Chair Lozano presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 20, 2010 were approved.

2. UPDATE ON 2010-11 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BUDGET

Committee Chair Lozano noted that Speaker Pérez had expressed his commitment to investment in the University, which is the pathway to California's economic future.

Vice President Lenz began his presentation by informing the Committee that the University has received the California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) report on the State budget and issues concerning UC. There has been a first overview hearing by the State Senate budget subcommittee; an Assembly overview hearing would be held later that day.

The University has communicated to the Legislature its core budget needs and its hope that the Legislature will restore the \$305 million which was removed from the UC budget as a one-time reduction. UC has reported on its administrative efficiencies and submitted its funding request as approved by the Regents in November 2009. Mr. Lenz recalled that the University's budget was reduced by \$637 million. In the UC 2010-11 funding request, this \$637 million is represented by the \$305 million restoration and the \$332 million requested by UC as a reinvestment in academic excellence. The other elements of the 2010-11 funding request above this amount are the requests for funding for unfunded enrollment growth, the State obligation to the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP)

and annuitant health benefits, and health sciences initiatives. Mr. Lenz emphasized that this is not an excessive budget request.

The University has made a concerted effort to not take the approach of the two other higher education segments in California, which have dramatically reduced their enrollment. The UC enrollment reduction has been small, reflecting the University's concern about the effect on underrepresented students. The University is serving approximately 15,400 students for whom it receives no State funding, at a significant cost to the campuses.

Mr. Lenz drew attention to a chart which displayed levels of State funding for UC and student fee levels from 2001-02 to 2010-11. The levels displayed for 2010-11 included an indication of the amount in the Governor's proposed budget. Mr. Lenz warned that the University is coming dangerously close to a point at which student fee revenue will surpass State investment. If the University is not able to achieve the level of funding indicated in the Governor's proposed budget for 2010-11, this will occur.

The University has been working with the California Department of Finance and the Governor's administration on a May Revise request for capital facilities.

Mr. Lenz noted that the restoration of \$305 million could create a false impression that the University is faring well. He presented a chart which illustrated levels of State funding from 1990-91 to 2010-11 for various programs. The funding levels for corrections and rehabilitation, K-12 education, and health and human services were significantly higher than for higher education and for UC in particular. It is necessary to maintain a historical perspective when assessing State investment in the University.

Finally, Mr. Lenz outlined some perceived threats to the University's status. Six of UC's nine undergraduate campuses are considered Tier 1 national research universities, compared with two in Texas. Texas has embarked on an aggressive effort to catch up. During 2009, Texas voters approved funding of about \$500 million to help seven emerging research institutions achieve Tier 1 status. Texas has also dedicated \$3 billion for research grants. The previous month, the University of Texas system ran a full-page advertisement in the Chronicle of Higher Education directed at faculty nationwide. The University is seriously concerned about its competitor institutions throughout the nation.

Executive Vice President Brostrom then discussed campus budget reductions. He informed the Committee that, since the last meeting, the President has hosted representatives from all the campuses for discussions on how they have managed the cuts of the past budget year. The current fiscal year budget includes a shortfall of over \$1 billion in reductions by the State and ongoing unfunded expenses of over \$300 million for faculty merit increases, increased health benefit costs, salary increases for represented employees, and increased utility costs. The University was able to cover about half of this amount through the furlough plan and the increase in student fees. However, this still left a shortfall of over \$500 million to be addressed by campus efforts.

The campuses are taking these reductions very seriously. They are acting aggressively to meet this obligation while trying to minimize the effect on their academic mission. To that end, reductions are being made in a differential manner. Academic units are experiencing smaller cuts than administrative or institutional support units. At the Davis campus, reductions to academic units over three years were about half of those assigned to administrative units. The Berkeley campus is making differential reductions not only between academic and administrative units, but also among academic units, based on resource availability.

Mr. Brostrom enumerated some common measures used by the campuses to carry out these cuts. There have been reductions in faculty searches; some campuses have suspended searches altogether. There have been layoffs and elimination of positions. Over the past two years, about 6,400 positions have been left empty, eliminated by attrition, or subjected to actual layoff; this represents over 3.5 percent of UC's total workforce. Campuses are also seeking to consolidate units, in particular administrative functions. They are achieving savings through energy efficiency projects.

The campuses are seeking to increase revenue through increased charges on auxiliary units, such as housing and dining, parking, and intercollegiate athletics. Most campuses are considering an increase in nonresident student enrollment as an additional source of revenue. Some of the campuses are using their reserves to bridge cuts over multiple years, a strategy that can function for a short period of time. A near-term return to previous levels of State funding is unlikely.

Campuses are attempting to mitigate the effect of these cuts on academic programs. Nevertheless, there has been a decline systemwide in the number of available primary courses and the number of sections in lecture courses, and an increase in class sizes.

Major restructuring initiatives are under way on the campuses. UC Berkeley is taking the most comprehensive approach through its Operational Excellence initiative. Although still in its diagnostic phase, this is a promising initiative which will develop new means of achieving savings through procurement enhancement, information technology consolidation, and organizational simplification. UC Davis is also examining these issues in a comprehensive manner. The Office of the President will facilitate the sharing of best practices among campuses and seek to implement systemwide initiatives, such as regional data centers and enhanced strategic sourcing. Mr. Brostrom anticipated that the University would achieve savings in the coming three to four years through such initiatives.

Regent-designate Hime indicated the possibility that the University might not receive the entire \$305 million restoration it was seeking. He asked what the effect would be on overall UC operations and what the University has done to prepare for such an eventuality. Mr. Brostrom responded that campuses have taken cuts and are at a lower base, commensurate with lower State funding, and that they should be able to sustain their operations, even without a general fund restoration this year. He acknowledged that this does not take into account all activities the University must fund. The University is

concerned about the campuses' use of reserves or other measures to address cuts on a temporary basis, because it is possible that State funding will not be restored to earlier levels. Regent-designate Hime anticipated that the State budget deficit would be a recurring issue over the next five years, amounting to perhaps \$100 billion. The University must be prepared for a long period of deficit.

President Yudof noted that there has been concern regarding the use of University reserves. In fact, the campuses are taxing many different enterprises. Some campuses are taking as much as ten percent of parking or housing revenue and moving it into the main budget to support their core academic mission. In some cases, the medical schools have seen their allocations from the campuses reduced as their hospital revenue has increased. President Yudof expressed his view that the University was doing reasonably well financially in its medical enterprise, research, and auxiliary enterprises. He emphasized that the University must be careful in shifting funds and must ensure that it is using legal means to bolster its academic mission.

Regent Zettel asked about the decline in the number of primary courses available. Mr. Brostrom responded that the decline in primary courses is much smaller than the decline in lecture sections. Campus reductions are largely decentralized and made department by department. Decisions depend on available faculty or temporary academic support. Departments must address the needs of their majors but also provide gateway courses. Many campuses have major programs which are severely affected, with students unable to major in chemistry or biology, for example. This is due to the fiscal crisis and to changes in student demand over time.

In response to a question asked by Regent Zettel, Mr. Brostrom confirmed that there is a need for more biology, chemistry, and other classes.

Regent Zettel asked if majors are ever removed due to under-enrollment. Mr. Brostrom responded that such a decision would be made by the campus division of the Academic Senate. The elimination of major programs does not occur often.

Regent Schilling referred to the Merced campus' need for infrastructure funding. She asked if the University would rely on specifically allocated State funds to address this need or if it was included in the budget just discussed. Mr. Lenz responded that, in its discussions with the California Department of Finance, the University is considering the use of some unexpended prior-year general obligation bonds to cover these infrastructure costs. The Department of Finance has shown understanding for the needs of UC Merced. Discussions have gone well, and the University has made UC Merced's needs a priority.

Committee Chair Lozano recalled that there has been a 54 percent reduction in State support for the University over the last 20 years. The University is perilously close to becoming over-reliant on student fees. The work of the UC Commission on the Future, the search for alternative revenue, and advocacy efforts are all focused on addressing what will be a multi-year challenge for UC.

The Committee recessed at 12:50 p.m.

.....
 The Committee reconvened at 1:25 p.m. with Committee Chair Lozano presiding.

Members present: Regents Bernal, Island, Lozano, Makarechian, Schilling, Varner, and Wachter; Ex officio members Blum, Gould, and Yudof; Advisory members DeFreece and Simmons; Staff Advisor Abeyta

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Lansing, Marcus, Nunn Gorman, Reiss, Stovitz, and Zettel, Regents-designate Cheng and Hime, Faculty Representative Powell, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Interim Provost Pitts, Executive Vice Presidents Brostrom and Taylor, Senior Vice President Dooley, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Duckett, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Desmond-Hellmann, Drake, Fox, Kang, Katehi, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Johns

3. **UPDATE ON UNIVERSITY ADVOCACY INITIATIVES**

Senior Vice President Dooley provided a high-level overview of the University's advocacy activities. He noted that he served for many years as a private advocate for UC in Sacramento and in Washington, D.C., but that in 20 years he had never seen more advocacy activity than at the present time. The results of a poll, released that day, showed that 70 percent of respondents were opposed to any further reductions to higher education funding in California. While this does not produce funding, it is an encouraging sign of public realization that education is important to California's future.

There is significant competition in Sacramento for State funding. The University is trying to position itself as a relative priority, higher than some others. This is an ongoing effort which requires sustained activity.

There is a strong public perception that higher education is a critical pathway to a new economy. UC takes this into account in its advocacy efforts. The University is trying to bring together a variety of constituencies in a coordinated and sustained advocacy program. Mr. Dooley noted that the Regents received a report the previous month on UC advocacy activities; they would continue to receive periodic reports.

The University is focusing effort on "e-advocacy," given the importance of the internet as a communications tool. The "UC for California" website has been redesigned. Almost 300,000 individuals are registered as "e-advocates" for UC. Of that number, about 14,000 individuals have actively responded to the University's request to send email messages or make telephone calls. There have been approximately 34,000 to 35,000 communications to Sacramento as part of the e-advocacy program over the past few months. The University will continue to build this effort and has engaged consultants to improve it. As an example, the University would like to be able to identify individuals

in its database with contacts to policymakers. The Office of the President is working with campus alumni associations and the Alumni Associations of UC (AAUC), sharing information that they can communicate to their membership.

The University has embraced social networking media with some vigor. President Yudof is making use of Twitter and Facebook and appears in online videos. A video in which President Yudof discussed the Governor's proposed budget, posted on YouTube, received 18,000 viewings. The President has approximately 1,800 followers on Facebook and 2,000 followers on Twitter, likely more than any other leader of a higher education institution in the U.S. In addition, about 5,000 individuals now keep abreast of UC through a Facebook link to the UC for California website. These tools are proving to be an effective means of communication with supporters of the University. The University has also placed advertising on Facebook, which allows targeting of specific populations, such as the 70,000 to 80,000 self-identified UC students and self-identified alumni on Facebook.

President Yudof has engaged in a variety of specific activities, with assistance from the Regents, to cultivate contacts with influential individuals who are willing to engage on behalf of the University with State lawmakers.

Mr. Dooley stated that the University has an important responsibility to develop its internal communications and internal advocates more robustly. It is working with faculty and staff to develop internal UC advocates. As part of the systemwide advocacy effort, the Office of the President has been working with the campuses on the creation of local teams, composed of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and others, who can engage in their communities with candidate forums and meet with elected officials in their district offices, where it is often possible to have more substantive conversations. Another task is to develop means of identifying candidates likely to be elected to the State Assembly or Senate, so that the University can develop relationships with prospective future legislators. This illustrates that UC advocacy efforts must be a sustained program rather than episodic. A sustained program will build a stronger cadre of supporters in Sacramento.

Since the beginning of the year, the University has had over 62 meetings in Sacramento, almost daily. Each campus has a lobbying day planned in Sacramento. The Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources has developed a separate advocacy network of UC supporters in the agricultural community.

Mr. Dooley recalled the day of activities in Sacramento on March 1, which represented a coordinated approach with students. It was effective in demonstrating the joint interest of the University and students in securing stable funding. Students, President Yudof, and a number of Regents and chancellors participated in delivering a unified message. After initial organizing meetings and a robust discussion, there were a number of joint meetings in the Capitol. The message in these meetings was focused on the continuing importance of the Master Plan for Higher Education, the need for improved investment in the University in order to support quality and student affordability, and the critical role of Cal

Grants in ensuring access. The highlight of the day's events was a meeting with the Governor, who expressed a commitment to higher education and willingness to help the University amid multiple budget challenges. In the afternoon, students held further meetings with legislators. Mr. Dooley described this as an effective day for the University to tell its story in Sacramento as a unified front.

Mr. Dooley informed the Committee of a joint advocacy day in Sacramento planned for April 27, in coordination with the California State University and the California Community Colleges. A selected group of stakeholder leaders from the three higher education segments will meet with 120 members of the Legislature and the Governor's Office. There will be approximately 275 participants from the three segments. Mr. Dooley invited the Regents to participate in this event. April 27 is also the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Donahoe Act, the legislation which initiated the Master Plan for Higher Education. It is important for the three segments to invoke the symbolic importance of this date for a discussion of continuing the Master Plan into the next 50 years. Mr. Dooley noted that arrangements for the day were under way and he anticipated that it would be a productive event.

Mr. Dooley called attention to the importance of the federal government to UC. While it is not the source of core funding for the University, the federal government provides billions of dollars in funding. The University's Washington, D.C., office is engaged daily in ensuring that UC is well represented there. Groups representing the University regularly visit Washington, including stakeholders, chancellors, and President Yudof. President Yudof and some chancellors would be there in the latter half of April to attend Association of American Universities (AAU) meetings.

Finally, Mr. Dooley noted that the University is preparing a significant campaign. More detail would be provided in the coming weeks. The campaign would complement the activities he had just discussed and create a template for a sustained UC advocacy program. The Division of External Relations is working with other divisions at the Office of the President to explore alternative funding mechanisms.

Regent Bernal emphasized that the UC constituency is the most powerful voice to advocate for UC. He noted that last year the UC Student Association (UCSA) registered over 40,000 students to vote in California. This was the largest non-partisan registration in California and the largest student-led effort in the U.S. The Santa Barbara campus has the highest percentage of registered students in the nation. He commended the students for their success in mobilization and coordination of intersegmental effort. The University was successful in putting forth a united message on March 1 and in having meetings with legislators, the Governor, and the Speaker. Regent Bernal expressed students' appreciation for Speaker Pérez's acknowledgement of higher education, commitment to fighting for the higher education segments, and prioritization of student needs in his inauguration speech. Regent Bernal stated that peaceful student mobilization should be supported by the University and the Office of the President. There should be more support for grassroots student organizing. Students responded in thousands to the Regents' call to take UC's message to Sacramento. He introduced Ms. Malaika

Singleton, president of the Graduate Student Association (GSA) at UC Davis, and Mr. Juan Carmen, president of the Associated Students of UC Merced.

Ms. Singleton called attention to an ongoing concern of graduate students. As the State defunds higher education and fees increase, graduate students are forced to borrow more in loans. The loan period for federal loans may be shorter than the length of their program, and so graduate students turn to private lenders with higher interest rates. The high debt upon graduation discourages graduate and professional students from seeking public sector jobs.

GSA regularly participates in UC Day. The previous year, GSA's activities on UC Day were focused on the budget, including lobbying visits. GSA meets regularly and works on lobbying efforts with the undergraduate student government organization, Associated Students of UCD. Students meet weekly to hone their lobbying skills and make routine visits to the State Capitol.

At its February meeting, GSA had a presentation on the UCD budget by UCD Associate Vice Chancellor Ratliff and a presentation on advocacy by UCD Director of State Government Relations and Advocacy Murphy. GSA carried out lobby visits on March 1 and March 2 with all four local representative offices, visits which effectively communicated the concerns of graduate and professional students.

GSA is also involved with the Davis campus-city liaison commission. GSA supported the efforts of Yolo County to provide early voting on campus in October 2008. GSA works with the liaison commission on rental and housing issues and on encouraging symbiotic relationships between students and local businesses. Other topics addressed by the commission include police-student relations, lighting and safety issues, sustainability and carbon footprint reduction, measures to reduce the risk of alcohol-related problems, and parking and transportation.

Future GSA goals are to work with the UCD Cal Aggie Alumni Association on an effort to better educate students about upcoming fee increases and on coordinated advocacy efforts, with district and Capitol visits. GSA engages in federal advocacy through the National Association for Graduate-Professional Students (NAGPS), with frequent lobby visits to local representatives in the U.S. House of Representative and Senate, guided by an annual NAGPS federal legislative platform. Significant concerns are health care reform, immigration reform regarding student visas, and interest rates on student loans.

Mr. Carmen outlined ASUCM's agenda, the goals it sets for itself during the course of the year: affordability, communication, inclusive atmosphere, civic responsibility and leadership, global awareness, sustainability, and student well-being. ASUCM promotes communication on campus, with other campuses, and in the region. It is developing an organization, Students for the Great Valley, to address regional issues. ASUCM is working to build relationships with the City and County of Merced so that it can address issues of concern with the Merced City Council and the County Board of Supervisors. It encourages community service and volunteerism, fosters leadership development, and

registers students to vote. ASUCM advocacy efforts are focused on State and national government, Students for the Great Valley, and the California State primary and general elections.

Recent ASUCM advocacy efforts were focused on March 1 activities in Sacramento. ASUCM met with State Senator Denham and Assemblymember Galgiani and with representatives from neighboring counties to foster the message that higher education is a need for the region. A few days previously, ASUCM's external office carried out lobby visits in Washington, D.C., including a visit to Representative Cardoza. A central concern communicated to legislators was the status of Pell Grants and federal higher education funding.

The aim of Students for the Great Valley is to build a student voice for the region across the higher education segments. Its other goals are to motivate students to commit to a life of public service; to generate a greater college-going culture in this region, which sends the fewest students to UC campuses; and to champion student causes at all levels, local to global.

Anticipating the June and November elections, ASUCM's voter registration efforts are ongoing. Most of the UCM student population is already registered. ASUCM works to inform students about ballot propositions. A highlight of the semester is a planned gubernatorial town hall meeting. ASUCM will invite candidates to discuss higher education issues.

Committee Chair Lozano thanked the students for their advocacy efforts. She recalled that these presentations were made to the Committee on Finance because, in order to reach its financial goals, the University must collaborate with students. There is no stronger voice than that of the students. On behalf of the Regents, she expressed the Board's commitment to support student advocacy efforts.

Regent Kieffer asked about publicity concerning the work of the Commission on the Future. This work, the University's effort to review itself as it seeks enhanced support from the State, is important and Regent Kieffer viewed it as part of the University's advocacy program. Mr. Dooley responded that his staff is working to ensure that there is communication and publicity about the Commission. He referred to an article on the Commission's work which appeared that day in the *Los Angeles Times*. Mr. Dooley recalled the broader campaign, now being developed, which he discussed earlier. One component of this campaign would be to identify major UC initiatives in areas such as sustainability, improved efficiencies, and new delivery mechanisms for highlighted publicity.

Regent Kieffer emphasized that the public should be aware of the debates and discussions of the Commission on the Future, so that when recommendations are issued at the end of the process, they do not come as a surprise. UC's debate about various issues needs to be aired, at the very least on the campuses. It is helpful when the public is aware that discussion has taken place. The University is providing a window on the debate

concerning competing issues and interests. Mr. Dooley expressed agreement with Regent Kieffer's view. He noted that the University has made a significant effort to communicate within UC about Commission proposals. There are plans to support the implementation of those proposals. He stated that he could provide more detailed information to Regent Kieffer at a later point.

Regent Schilling observed that candidates for public office typically swear support for public education, but that there are no consequences for their failure to live up to such promises. She asked about how the University would address this within its plan for a sustained advocacy effort. Mr. Dooley responded that the University is actively considering the possibility of a UC "report card" for higher education votes in Sacramento and perhaps Washington, D.C. It is important to determine which issues the University wishes to track and to ensure there is an objective means of measuring votes. He expressed his view that, in the past, UC advocacy was insufficient in addressing the "bad behavior" of politicians who did not follow through on promises. The key to addressing this is ensuring that UC has relationships with constituents so that elected officials will hear from their own constituents rather than from UC officials.

Regent Reiss reported that student leaders have an understanding of politics, realize that many pieces of proposed legislation have little chance of being passed, and therefore know that they must focus not on any particular piece of legislation proposed by an elected official, but rather on how much funding is requested for the California higher education segments. Students are requesting pledges from legislators, and their lobbying efforts are focused on the priority of securing more funding for education in the State budget.

Regent Stovitz added that UC alumni are working earnestly to support the advocacy initiatives. There has been impressive progress in the University's messaging efforts, in reaching 1.5 million alumni living throughout the U.S. and in many foreign countries. Campus-based projects at UC Berkeley and UC Irvine have demonstrated the ability to engage alumni quickly with internet-based programs. Alumni are also working to change the assumption that they engage with students only after they graduate. For several years, alumni have been working with students as they enter the University, cultivating them as friends of UC during their first year. The alumni associations are focused on advocacy and will continue this focus in the years ahead.

Committee Chair Lozano emphasized that UC advocacy efforts must take the form of a strategic initiative, not a set of independent activities. Cooperation and coordination will make the University more effective in reaching its goals.

4. **RISK SERVICES UPDATE**

This item was deferred.

5. REPORT OF NEW LITIGATION

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

General Counsel Robinson presented his **Report of New Litigation**, shown in Attachment 1. By this reference the report is made part of the official record of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

NEW LITIGATION AND ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS*Report Period: 12/15/09-2/19/10**Regents Meeting**March 2010*

<u>Plaintiff</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Nature of Dispute Alleged by Plaintiff</u>	<u>Forum</u>
<u>Employment Cases</u>			
Ascencio, Axel	UCLAMC	Discrimination and wrongful termination	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Bislamyian, Sima	UCLAMC	Discrimination (disability), failure to engage in the interactive process, failure to accommodate disability, retaliation, failure to prevent discrimination, intentional infliction of emotional distress	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Huang, Guangcun	UCSF	Fraud and breach of contract	San Francisco County Superior Court
Jones, Sebrina	UCB	Discrimination (disability), wrongful termination and retaliation	Alameda County Superior Court
Little, Timothy	UCD	Discrimination (disability, age) and invasion of privacy	Sacramento County Superior Court
Samuels-Blalock, Celestine	UCLAMC	Breach of settlement agreement, fraud in the inducement, negligent misrepresentation	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Thackeray, Gary	UCB	Discrimination (age), wrongful termination, intentional infliction of emotional distress	Alameda County Superior Court
<u>Professional Liability Cases</u>			
Albo, Marlene	UCDMC	Medical malpractice, wrongful death	San Joaquin County Superior Court

Aquino, Rick (decedent) Erlinda Aquino	UCIMC	Medical negligence, loss of consortium, wrongful death	Orange County Superior Court
Baker, Matthew J.	UCDMC	Medical malpractice	Sacramento County Superior Court
Booker, Sandra	UCLAMC	Professional negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, strict products liability, manufacturing defect, design defect, failure to warn, negligence, breach of express warranty, breach of implied warranty	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Burd, Bobbie Lee	UCLAMC	Personal injury, medical malpractice-general negligence and loss of consortium	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Daly, Scott	UCIMC	Medical malpractice	Orange County Superior Court
Doe, Jane	UCSFMC	Violation of California code section 56.10 of the confidentiality of medical information, public disclosure of private facts, negligence, negligent and intentional infliction of emotional distress	San Francisco County Superior Court
Dundee, Carolyn	UCLAMC	Medical negligence	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Equistar, LLC and Kathleen Marshall	UCD- Veterinary MC	Veterinary malpractice, breach of contract, and negligence	Yolo County Superior Court
Evans, Jennifer and Carl Stolnacke	UCDMC	Medical malpractice, professional negligence	Sacramento County Superior Court
Gonzalez, Henry	UCLAMC	Medical negligence and loss of consortium	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Gutierrez, Sandra	UCLAMC	Professional negligence, loss of consortium	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Hack, Bryan	UCLAMC	Medical malpractice	Los Angeles County Superior Court

Kaplan, Robert	UCSDMC	Medical malpractice, loss of consortium, dependent adult abuse/reckless neglect	San Diego County Superior Court
Kwan, Michelle	UCLAMC	Medical malpractice	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Lewis, Jason	UCLAMC	Medical malpractice	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Lopez, Rosa	UCDMC	Professional negligence	Sacramento County Superior Court
Moorman, Jimmy (decedent), Martha Moorman	UCLAMC	Medical malpractice, wrongful death	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Nakhla, Therese; Atef Nakhla	UCLAMC	Dental malpractice, fraud, personal injury, loss of consortium	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Rieckermann, Ralph	UCLAMC	Medical malpractice	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Sang, Kuan, an incompetent adult, Emily Sang, guardian ad litem	UCLAMC	Medical negligence, loss of spousal consortium, elder abuse and negligent infliction of emotional distress	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Scalf, Austin	UCSDMC	Medical negligence, battery and loss of consortium	San Diego County Superior Court
Song, Yi	UCSDMC	Breach of medical professional obligation, lack of informed consent	San Diego County Superior Court
Wilson, Beverlie	UCDMC	Damages	Sacramento County Superior Court
Wood III, Ewell	UCDMC	Medical malpractice, wrongful death	Sacramento County Superior Court

Other Cases

Campbell, Andrew	UCD	Writ of mandate (review of petitioner's thesis)	Yolo County Superior Court
------------------	-----	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------

Carnabatu, Christopher	UCSB	Personal injury, motor vehicle	Santa Barbara County Superior Court
Goldbaum, Michael H.	UCSD	Writ of mandate, declaratory relief	San Diego County Superior Court
Kemp, Henry	UCSF	Violation of 1st, 4th Amendments & ADA, UCSF arrest without probable cause	U.S. District Court, Northern District of California
LaFreniere, Zakariah	UCB	Injunctive relief and damages, violation of California False Claims Act	Alameda County Superior Court
Martino, Dominick, et al.	UCB	Dangerous condition of public property, negligence, intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress, strict liability for ultra-hazardous activity, public nuisance, trespass, reckless breach of obligation, inverse condemnation	Santa Clara County Superior Court
Miranda, Faustino; Fernando Munoz	UCSB	Class action complaint for unfair business practices, labor code violations	Santa Barbara County Superior Court
Navarro, Daniel; Alex Jacome	UCI	Personal injury, premises liability, general negligence	Orange County Superior Court
Williams, Barbara J.	UCLAMC	Personal injury, negligence, premises liability	Los Angeles County Superior Court

Public Employment Relations Board (“PERB”)
Unfair Practices Alleged by Charging Party

CUE (Coalition of University Employees) LA-CE-1080-H	UCSDMC	Charge alleges employee was terminated in retaliation for an investigation regarding missing money.	PERB
---------------------------------------------------------	--------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------

CUE SF-CE-928-H	UCSFMC	Charge alleges retaliation. Employee's hours, duties, and office location were changed because of complaints about her supervisor. Employee was denied request for union representation in a counseling session.	PERB
CUE SF-CE-924-H	UCIMC	Charge alleges UC violated its duty to bargain in good faith by unilaterally implementing a mandatory flu vaccination program without first bargaining to impasse and exhausting mediation and fact-finding procedures.	PERB
CUE SF-CE-929-H	UCI	Charge alleges that UC committed unfair labor practices by making a unilateral change to the terms and conditions of employment for CUE members. Further alleges that UC did not follow progressive discipline processes and did not bargain with the union over the change.	PERB
CUE SF-CE-930-H	UCSF	Charge alleges that UC has violated HEERA by denying an employee her right to union representation and retaliating against her for her union activity. In addition that UC has failed to provide information relevant to representing the employee, and otherwise failed to bargain in good faith.	PERB

SETC (State Employees Trades Council) SF-CE-926-H	UCI	Continuing grievance challenging UC conduct that is ongoing in implementing reductions in time. The parties had agreed to meet to discuss a possible furlough program but UC instead acted unilaterally. Alleges the reductions in time are discriminatory and retaliatory.	PERB
SETC SF-CE-925-H	UCM	Charge alleges UC engaged in direct dealing with SETC employees and made unlawful unilateral changes to compensation and hours of work.	PERB