



EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT—
BUSINESS OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200
510/987-9029

June 1, 2010

VICE CHANCELLORS - ADMINISTRATION

Dear Colleagues:

In keeping with our recent efforts to identify new and better ways to operate more efficiently as a university, I write to solicit from you ideas that we, at the Office of the President, can help explore. You will recall that at our meeting on April 22, Sam Morabito led the group through a review of the “Building Administrative Efficiency” report from July 2008 (sometimes referred to as the Morabito report). Our Issues Management, Policy Analysis and Coordination (IMPAC) unit has been looking at the 19 initiatives in the “Opportunities for Legislative Relief” section of the report (attached), as well as some others that were uncovered in the process.

While IMPAC continues to track the initiatives in the report, at this point, two years after the report was released, I think it would be helpful to come up with a fresh set of initiatives. As such, **I am asking each of you to recommend one or two new initiatives that could be pursued or explored as part of an “Opportunities for Legislative Relief, 2.0” effort.** As IMPAC discovered, some of the original initiatives did not require legislative relief so much as policy changes either within the University of California (UC) or at the State level. For example, we contacted the State Department of Finance (DOF) to determine if there was a way to automate our State claims process on post-expenditure reimbursements (UCLA is currently reviewing an option we received from the DOF to determine its viability for our campuses). As another example, an initiative concerning the simplification of vacation and sick leave reporting turned out to be a UC policy issue (UCOP Human Resources is exploring this and has been in touch with campuses directly). Thus, this is an opportunity to explore various areas of administrative relief. Campus initiatives might fall in four broad categories:

1. Legislative- Requires action from the Legislature to change existing, or propose new, law.
2. State policy- Requires a change to existing State agency policy or procedure.
3. UC policy- Requires a change in, or creation of, UC policy.
4. UC process- Requires a change in the way UCOP exchanges information with the campuses.

These ideas can be from any sector of your administration (HR, Finance, IT, etc.), and again, we are seeking only one or two from each campus, though certainly feel free to include more. Please include a brief summary of the issue, the benefit of the proposed change, who would benefit (one campus, all campuses, OP, etc.), and the estimated cost savings, cost avoidance or any investment that would be needed. We will then compile the new initiatives and share them with you, and ask IMPAC to form a group to review and explore the initiatives. I ask that you forward your initiative(s) via e-mail to Matt Perry, IMPAC Director for Business Operations, no later than **Thursday, July 1.** Matt can be reached at matthew.perry@ucop.edu or via phone at 510-987-0406.

Thanks very much for your help with this important endeavor.

Sincerely,



Nathan Brostrom
Executive Vice President

cc: Associate Vice President Reese
Executive Director Kao
Director Perry

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 1: Streamline California Coastal Commission Review and Approval Process | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Proposed By: UCSB | Responsible OP Department: BCR /Purchasing/OGC | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Public Resources Code, Division 20. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=prc&group=29001-30000&file=30000-30012 | <p>Revise, or find within, existing laws or regulations a method to provide the Regents with the authority to act as the Coastal Commission on University property;</p> <p align="center">OR</p> <p>Revise, or find within, existing laws or regulations a method to provide the Regents with the authority to act as the Coastal Commission on University property within the "appeals jurisdiction" of the Coastal zone (California cities and counties have this authority; presumably the Regents could exert the same authority).</p> | <p>For those campuses within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission (UCSB, UCSD, UCSC), each construction project must go through an additional bureaucratic review and approval process by the Coastal Commission. This typically takes at least one year (which costs both the University additional money and renders little value from an environmental perspective). This additional review period drives up construction costs and often adds additional construction constraints.</p> | <p>Contact(s): Marc Fisher Senior Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services UC Santa Barbara marc.fisher@vadmin.ucsb.edu 805-893-3132</p> <p>Ron Cortez Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services UC Santa Barbara ron.cortez@vadmin.ucsb.edu 805-893-8291</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 2: Eliminate the Staffing List | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed By: UC Davis, UCSF | Responsible OP Department: BCR | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| The Corporate Staffing System (STF) contains payroll and provision data for academic and staff positions, representing permanently budgeted workforce. ("Provision" refers to positions that are not filled at the time of submission.) Campuses produce and submit files for STF five times annually. These files are merged with data from the Corporate Personnel System, the Corporate Account Fund Profile, the Title Code System, and the Corporate Budget System. It is a unique system that summarizes permanent staffing budget versus actual staffing expenditures. | Eliminate the list. One suggested possibility- Use new compensation reports developed in response to 2006 task force to meet state reporting needs about University compensation (or develop something from the corporate database). | Reduction in administrative burden. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Determine if the personnel listing is required by State law or by agency regulations. Find out what CSU provides. Determine if the Department of Finance or the LAO uses the information in the listing. Determine how many campuses use STF as an analytical tool. <p>Contacts:</p> <p>Kelly Ratliff Associate Vice Chancellor, UC Davis kmratliff@ucdavis.edu 530-754-6170</p> <p>Nancy Walters HR Director, School of Pharmacy UC San Francisco waltersn@pharmacy.ucsf.edu 415-476-3292</p> <p>Eric Vermillion Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance UC San Francisco evermillion@finance.ucsf.edu 415-476-1224</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 3: Use of “In-House” Labor | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Proposed By: UC Davis | | Responsible OP Department: BCR | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Public Contract Code 10505 http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=pcc&group=10001-11000&file=10500-10506 | Amend the PCC provisions related to the use of “in-house” labor. Seek to allow in-house labor on large capital project beyond the current threshold limit of \$50,000 per project. | Provide greater ability for campuses to undertake work with internal forces in order to reduce overhead and provide greater value for the funds expended. | Contacts: John Meyer Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Resource Management UC Davis jameyer@ucdavis.edu 530 752-7941 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 4: Extend/Expand Best Value (Construction) Program | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Proposed By: UCSF, UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: BCR | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Chapter 367, Statutes of 2006, Senate Bill (SB) 667, was signed into law on September 20, 2006. It established a five-year Best Value Construction Pilot Program (“Pilot Program”) for University of California, San Francisco (“UCSF”). The Pilot Program allows UCSF to assign a “qualification score” to each bid solicited under the program, which could, when divided into the bidder’s price, impact determination of the lowest cost per quality point based upon five statutory factors. It does not change University selection or bidding in any other respect. | Expand program to other/all UC campuses. | As identified in the Legislative Record, “...to the extent the best value process results in a reduction in contract delays, change orders and claims, there will be a savings both in contract costs and administration.” The five factors are: (1) Financial Condition; (2) Relevant Experience; (3) Management Competency; (4) Labor Compliance; and (5) Safety Record. | <p>Contacts: Michael Bade Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor Capital Projects and Facilities Management UC San Francisco Michael.Bade@ucsf.edu 415-502-6460</p> <p>Tom Lollini Associate Vice Chancellor, Physical Planning Design and Construction UC Merced tlollini@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4475</p> <p>Copy to: Diane Caton Management Services Officer Physical Planning Design and Construction UC Merced dcaton@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4475</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 5: Executive Design Professional Agreement | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed By: UCSF | Responsible OP Department: BCR | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| <p>OP required that project budgets be formalized before campuses could sign architects and engineers to contracts using the Executive Design Professional Agreement (EDPA). Concurrently, OP has to sign off on the selection of architects when projects require Presidential or Regental approval of the budget. Paradoxically, budgets – even P budgets – are not usually approved until long after the project gets underway at the campus level. To get around this, campuses select architects to do programming phases of projects (and also to develop the project beyond THE Programming phase in order to develop a reasonable budget) using a Professional Services Agreement with the EDPA attached, and then sign the EDPA once the budget is approved. This is a cumbersome work-around.</p> | <p>Remove restrictions on the use of the Executive Design Professional Agreement, including use of agreement before budget approval and without Professional Services Agreement work around.</p> <p>Restructure EDPA in a modular way, so that campuses don't have to prepare work-around. Furthermore, as the UC system configures our project delivery models to take advantage of improvements such as Integrated Project Delivery and Lean Construction we will want to rethink the traditional design services model embodied in the EDPA, and reconfigure it so that the early input of contractors as well as of consultants can be better supported. If policy requires that OP sign off on architect selection that can be done when the architect is selected, before the project becomes an approved project.</p> | <p>Reduced administrative burden.</p> | <p>Contact: Michael Bade Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor Capital Projects and Facilities Management UC San Francisco Michael.Bade@ucsf.edu 415-502-6460</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 6: Change Stull Act Limits on Mini Form and Brief Form Contracting | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Proposed By: UCSF | Responsible OP Department: BCR | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Current law limits use of mini-form to those projects under \$100k and brief form for those projects under \$1,000,000. | Seek increase of mini-form contracts to at least \$400,000 or, ideally, \$749,999 – and brief forms going from \$750k (the definition of a major capital project) to \$2-3 million or even \$5 million. | Greater flexibility on capital projects. | Contact: Michael Bade Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor Capital Projects and Facilities Management UC San Francisco Michael.Bade@ucsf.edu 415-502-6460 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 7: Seek UC exemption for “feed-in” tariffs up to 20 megawatts | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: BCR | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Limits grid-connected, self-generation renewable energy system-size to 1 MW for net-metering and 3 MW for feed-in tariffs. These limits are far below what is needed for campuses to achieve significant deployment of renewable energy. Also, the current feed-in tariff is too low to incentivize renewable energy systems. | Seek UC exemption up to 20 megawatts. | Compelling public interest of enabling universities to move rapidly toward zero net energy, support CEC and PUC recommendations to increase the eligible renewable energy system-size under feed-in tariffs to at least 20 MW, and support a technology-differentiated tariff that would incentivize solar development. | Contact: John Elliott Assistant Director, Energy and Sustainability, Facilities Management UC Merced jelliott2@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4124 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Initiative 8: Allow state general funds to be used on state-funded capital projects for sustainability enhancements | | | |
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: BCR | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| In annual Budget Act, section 6440.001.0001, Provision 2. See 2009-10 Budget Act for example. | Allow state general funds to be used on state-funded capital projects for sustainability enhancements (such as rooftop solar arrays). | Operational cost savings, thereby creating a defined payback schedule for the sustainability enhancement. | There is language in the budget act that does allow for such spending, specifically for cogeneration and energy conservation projects. Contact: Jim Genes Special Assistant to the Vice Chancellor of Administration, UC Merced jgenes@ucmerced.edu 209-228-4368 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 9: Appropriation and Administrative Approval Processes | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: BCR | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| There are standard processes in place (in accordance with the State) for funding and approvals of capital projects. | Streamline funding appropriations and administrative approval processes between UCOP, DOF, LAO and campuses on capital projects. | Greater efficiency on capital projects. | <p>There is streamlining already available for projects, however it requires advance approval in the budget act at the time of appropriation.</p> <p>Contact: Tom Lollini Associate Vice Chancellor, Physical Planning Design and Construction UC Merced tlollini@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4475</p> <p>Copy to: Diane Caton Management Services Officer Physical Planning Design and Construction UC Merced dcaton@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4475</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 10: Capitol Project Reporting | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: BCR | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| There are different project reporting processes in place for different types of projects (e.g., state funded vs. UC funded projects have different processes). | Consolidate and streamline capital project and construction project reporting at the UCOP, including private use activity forms, quarterly and annual capital project reports, business case analysis compliance/project planning guides, contracts and grants facilities reports. | Greater efficiency in capital projects. | <p>There are already efforts underway to streamline most of the project reporting elements identified. These will be rolled out over time.</p> <p>Contact: John White Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Development Capital Planning and Space Management UC Merced jwhite@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4454</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 11: Budget Limit for Minor Capital Improvement Projects | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | Responsible OP Department: BCR | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| The budget limit for projects to be considered a “minor capital outlay” project had been \$400,000. | Increase the budget limit to \$1,000,000. | Would allow for greater flexibility for campuses on capital projects. | <p>The budget limit for non-State projects to be considered a “minor capital outlay” project was recently increased to \$750,000. The minor cap ceiling for State projects will be raised to \$750,000 in the 2010 Budget Act when it is signed.</p> <p>Contact: John White Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Development Capital Planning and Space Management UC Merced jwhite@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4454</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 12: State Funding Processes | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: BCR | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| It used to be the case that OP, and campuses, would receive funding for capital projects from the State Treasurer’s Office as an advance, rather than as a reimbursement, allowing for STIP investment and revenue generation. | Change state funding process to cash up front from cash reimbursement system (avoid negative STIP). | Reduce administrative and project expenses and generate revenue through STIP. | <p>The State Treasurer’s Office has closed the PMIA (Pooled Money Investment Account) program which provided advances to campuses. The STO has no plans to reinstate the PMIA program.</p> <p>Contact: John White Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Development Capital Planning and Space Management UC Merced jwhite@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4454</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

Initiative 13: Establish a single, coordinated UC Systemwide request-for-information schedule and, to the degree possible, an annual calendar for the requests.

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: BCR/IR/APPC | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Redundant requests for the same (or largely the same) information is a frequent occurrence by various UCOP entities, creating a significant and unnecessary duplicate workload at the campus level. Campuses are often managing competing and duplicative deadlines regarding requests for information from UCOP. | While it is understood that UCOP is often responding to ad hoc requests and cannot control the coordination of all reports and information items, it would be useful if a master calendar of expected or routine, annual submittals, such as those for Budget and Capital Resources, be recorded. | This would help UCOP understand when units are juggling multiple deadlines or being asked for similar information by several UCOP units. On a small campus, such as UC Merced, the same few people are generally charged with responding and it can mean missed deadlines, delayed deadlines, and rushed projects. | Contact: Kathy Jefferds Director, Budget Office UC Merced kjefferds@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4632 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 14: Best Value Methodology For Competitive Bids | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Proposed By: UCLA | Responsible OP Department: Purchasing | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Public Contract Code (PCC) Section 10507.7 the University shall let all contracts involving an expenditure of more than \$50,000 to the lowest responsible bidder. | Amend the PCC to allow the University to utilize a “best value” bid evaluation methodology. | <p>This would provide the University with increased flexibility in our bid process and would allow UC to utilize and participate in bids/agreements executed by other public agencies and Group Purchasing Organizations.</p> <p><u>Cost Saving</u> Potentially upwards of \$514,000 annually</p> | <p>This proposal was included in the UC Sponsored Legislation portfolio for 2010 along with 2 other purchasing related changes to the PCC. Although those two provisions, including increasing the bid threshold, are currently in written into SB 1122 (Wright), the best value language was not included into the sponsored bill because 1) the author’s office questioned its political feasibility and 2) SGR did not want to risk the passage of SB 1122 by amending in additional provisions.</p> <p>UCOP Purchasing is aware of this and will be working with SGR to introduce sponsored legislation for this proposal in 2011.</p> <p><u>Contact:</u> Bill Propst Director, Purchasing UCLA wpropst@finance.ucla.edu 310-794-6027</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 15: Revise Sole Source Justification Language | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Proposed By: UCLA | | Responsible OP Department: Purchasing | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Public Contract Code Section 10508 states, in part: The requirements of this article shall not be applicable when the regents determine that a brand or trade name article, thing, or product or proprietary service is the only one which will properly meet the needs of the University of California because the item or service is unique, available only from a sole source, or is designated to match others, used in, or furnished to, a particular installation, facility, or location. | Revise the sole source justification to change “match existing” justification language for software to permit “match existing software used at other UC campuses” to achieve economies of scale and streamline the purchasing process for these items. | Expanding the “designated to match existing” language to cover software purchases from different locations can be effective in enabling different campuses to collaborate, utilizing the same applications, and increasing the possibility that different locations can consolidate similar processes. <u>Cost Saving</u> \$50-\$200K annually | <u>Contact:</u> Bill Propst Director, Purchasing UCLA wpropst@finance.ucla.edu 310-794-6027 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Initiative16: Increase Competitive Bid Threshold to \$100K | | | |
| Proposed By: UCSF | | Responsible OP Department: Purchasing | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Public Contract Code Section 10507.7 requires the University to conduct a formal competitive bid for all contracts for goods and services involving expenditures greater than \$50,000. | Increase the threshold amount to \$100,000. | \$780,000 in cost savings annually in administrative costs associated managing a competitive bid. | <p>This proposal is currently included in the UC sponsored bill SB 1122 (Wright) Public Contracts: University of California: competitive bidding and employment.</p> <p>SB 1122 was supported by the University and was signed into law by the Governor on September 30.</p> <p>Contact: Eric Vermillion, Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance UCSan Francisco evermillion@finance.ucsf.edu 415-476-1224</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 17: Use of Competitive and Single Source Agreements | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Proposed By: UCSF, UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: Purchasing | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| For formal bidding has been that unless requirements (usage by all proposed parties, i.e., campuses or departments) have been built into the bid at the front end for consideration, the awarded contract cannot be used by other UC affiliated entities or departments in lieu of doing their own bid. | <p>Change policy to allow "piggy-backing" another UC location's Competitive Source Agreement or sole source w/o Competitive bid or new solicitation.</p> <p>Policy should be written to allow another UC affiliated entity to use an existing contact in lieu of additional bidding.</p> | The underlying benefit of "piggy-backing" is to minimize administrative costs and time delays associated with not being able to take advantage of existing contracts. It also encourages aggregation of business and the requirements we buy. | <p>Contact: David Kolsom Director, Procurement UC San Francisco dave.kolsom@ucsf.edu 415-476-6324</p> <p>Cindy Deegan Director, Purchasing Business and Financial Services UC Merced cdeegan@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4083</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 18: Equipment Purchases | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Proposed By: UCSF | Responsible OP Department: Purchasing | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Equipment requisitions provide a very short window of time before the commitment must be made, thereby resulting in one-off buys with limited negotiations or quick quotes. | <p>Encourage UC to adopt a policy guideline that would foster a practice of providing an annual budget notice of intended equipment purchases over 25K to Procurement. Information needed would include the type of equipment, suggested manufacturer, proposed model (optional), budget \$ estimate, anticipated purchase period (could be by Qtr.), and unit contact info.</p> <p>Gathering of the budget info could be tied to existing budgeting process; another source could be from Contract and Grant management.</p> <p>The purpose of the notice of intent to buy can be used to leverage forward looking requirement forecasting, which in turn would provide leverage for better pricing on Strategic Sourcing agreements.</p> | The budget spend information would support “pool purchasing”, where by the University gathers up similar requirements by commodity or vendor and aggregates spend into a volume bid for deeper discounts or leverages the higher spend in a negotiated process. | <p>Contact: David Kolsom Director, Procurement UC San Francisco dave.kolsom@ucsf.edu 415-476-6324</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 19: Use of Strategic Sourcing Agreements | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | Responsible OP Department: Purchasing | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| <p>From Stratetgic Sourcing fact sheet:</p> <p>Strategic Sourcing is a process that reduces the total cost of purchased products and services by fully leveraging the University’s combined purchasing power. UC launched the Strategic Sourcing initiative to harness its enormous buying power in the marketplace in order to gain lower costs, improve product quality, and obtain better service levels from its suppliers.</p> <p>The Strategic Sourcing Initiative was designed as a comprehensive program to achieve significant cost savings and to build an internal infrastructure that can sustain the program and drive continuous improvement.</p> | <p>Establish UC policy mandating the use of both local and systemwide strategically sourced agreements to the fullest extent possible.</p> | <p>Increased systemwide efficiency and cost savings.</p> | <p>Contact: Cindy Deegan Director, Purchasing Business and Financial Services UC Merced cdeegan@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4083</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 20: Centralized List of Vendors | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Proposed By: UC SD | | Responsible OP Department: Purchasing | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Currently, four campuses utilize SciQuest to deliver procurement activity to end users, and are gaining efficiency from having a single common management of vendor catalogs and provision of spend information to the Purchasing group at UCOP. | Provide a centralized list of vendors to leverage our buying power resulting in better deals and opportunities across the system. | Substantial efficiency and hard dollar savings could be attained with the standardization of the Purchasing and savings delivery process throughout the University system. Further, contracting would be enhanced by campuses being either incentivized to use the contracts, or dis-incentivized for not using them. The combination of all ten campuses ultimately using the same portal with varying degrees of complexity and functionality (which the vendor does provide), and all campuses actively supporting the use of specified contracts should yield significant efficiencies in administration and in hard dollar savings from purchases. | Contact: Donald Larson Assistant Vice Chancellor/Controller UC San Diego dlarson@ucsd.edu 858-534-0386 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 21: Eliminate Payroll Distributions | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Proposed By: UCSF | | Responsible OP Department: Payroll | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Currently PPS design is based on combining financial and HR information into "pay distribution lines" -- information about the type of pay owed to the employee as well as labor distribution amongst multiple funds. | Cost allocation can be separate from payroll functions and we understand that other Universities with sponsored projects separate the two functions. | Reduces administrative burden. | <p>This is one of the changes being reviewed by the PPS Functional Requirements Work Group, which will be making recommendations to the campus Controllers in connection with the PPS replacement project.</p> <p>Contact(s): Nancy Walters, HR Director, School of Pharmacy UC San Francisco waltersn@pharmacy.ucsf.edu 415-476-3292</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 22: Simplify Travel/Entertainment Policy | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Proposed By: UCSF | Responsible OP Department: Finance | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| The UC Travel and Entertainment policies are long, complicated, and take a great deal of effort to insure compliance. Consequently, new employees come into our University, either as Business Travelers, or Travel Arrangers and Reimbursement Form Preparers, and have a very difficult time getting up to speed. These employees end up calling the Controller’s Officer, asking co-workers, or simply doing the best they can without fully understanding the policies and the consequences for not following them. | <p>The Travel and Entertainment Policies should be rewritten, incorporating best practices and simplifying the entire process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policies should be written first explaining the rules for the 80% of travel situations, then an addendum for the other 20%. 2. Implement daily per diems for domestic travel (meals and incidentals). 3. Change our culture so that receipts are only submitted for expenses \$75 and over (current policy but seldom followed). 4. Allow direct billing for all travel expense (currently only airline tickets can be charges directly to the University). 5. Eliminate travel advances. Replace with Corporate Credit Card cash advances through ATMs. 6. Make it easier for travelers to understand what is allowable and what is not. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Today the policies are written with an attempt to cover all situations. This makes it very difficult to learn the basics. 2. There is a real cost to the individual meal expense process (keeping receipts, recording actual expenses, attaching receipts, reviewing receipts, and AP scanning receipts)that could be avoided by using per diems. 5. These advances also cost us a great deal in administration. | <p>Contact: Rob Cotterman, Assistant Controller for Disbursement Accounting UC San Francisco rob.cotterman@ucsf.edu 415-476-8702</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 23: Deficit Spending | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| Proposed By: UCSF | Responsible OP Department: Accounting | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Accounting Manual C-173-13 Cash: Balances of Individual Funds http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/policies/acctman/c-173-13.pdf | Revise C-173-13 to include restrictions to prevent run-away spending; no time restraints on correcting or addressing deficit. | Cost savings. | Contact: Doug Ward Finance Manager Neuro Surgery Administration UC San Francisco wardde@neurosurg.ucsf.edu 415-353-3822 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 24: Timesheet Reporting | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: Payroll | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Currently there are four payroll cycles within the UC system. | Implement bi-weekly timesheets for all non-exempt employees. | Benefits include standardizing and simplifying timesheet processing, reduce overpayment risk due to timelier reporting of actual time worked and reduce compliance risk by enhancing timeliness of overtime payment. | There is a PPS replacement project underway, and this is one of the issues it is currently considering. Contact: Sheryl Ireland Director of Controls and Accountability, Business and Financial Services UC Merced sireland@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4090 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 25: W-2 and Direct Deposit Paychecks | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: Payroll | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Currently employees can only choose, not be mandated, to receive their pay via direct deposit and their W-2s electronically. | Mandate “opt-out” for electronic W-2 forms and direct deposit paychecks. | Relief of administrative burden and some cost savings. | <p>Federal law prohibits mandating electronic receipt of W-2s. State law prohibits mandatory direct deposit of employees (except for student employees).</p> <p>Contact: Sheryl Ireland Director of Controls and Accountability, Business and Financial Services UC Merced sireland@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4090</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Initiative 26: Centralize cost accounting regulatory functions for all campuses. | | | |
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: Cost Accounting | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Centralizing cost accounting regulatory functions may require approval from OMB or HHS because cost accounting standards are public law. Some entities have the ability to combine their disclosure statements, however, educational institutions requiring disclosure statements are specifically listed in Appendix A of OMB A-21, and specific UC campuses appear to be separated out. | One disclosure statement and indirect cost proposal with one negotiation while still maintaining separate rates for campuses. | Significant cost savings could be realized if the UC could combine disclosure statements for all sites because: (1) a single disclosure statement would reduce administrative costs of 10+ separate disclosure statements each requiring preparation and negotiation, as well as requiring updates when regulations change; and (2) much of disclosure statement content is the same for every site since we rely on UCOP for benefits, depreciation and amortization, and policies/procedures, especially related to direct and indirect costing principles and financial statements. | Contact: Sheryl Ireland Director of Controls and Accountability, Business and Financial Services UC Merced sireland@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4090 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 27: Academic Lab Rule | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Proposed By: UC Berkeley | | Responsible OP Department: Risk Services | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| <p>The US EPA promulgated in 2008 under Subpart K of its hazardous waste generator standards in 40 CFR Part 262 a new, more flexible and performance-based approach to managing hazardous waste in academic laboratories. The Academic Lab Rule (ALR) is an option that can be used by universities if they wish, or they can elect to manage hazardous waste under the traditional and less flexible Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) method, which was originally developed for large industrial facilities.</p> | <p>UCB has not been managing waste under either of these rules, because the campus has been operating under a consent agreement with Cal-EPA since 1994. The consent agreement procedures formed much of the basis for the creation of the ALR. As such, the ALR is most consistent with how UCB manages hazardous waste. Although the ALR is allowed by federal rule, and many states that manage their own hazardous waste programs have adopted the ALR, California has shown no interest in allowing the ALR to be used by colleges and universities within California. UC should encourage the State to adopt the ALR as a waste handling option in academic labs in California.</p> | <p>This change will reduce UC's compliance risk (fines up to \$27,500 per day), although it is not anticipated to reduce operating costs.</p> | <p>Contact: Mark Freiberg Director, Office of Environment, Health and Safety, UC Berkeley freiberg@berkeley.edu 510-643-8676</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 28: PCBs in Building Materials | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Proposed By: UC Berkeley | Responsible OP Department: Risk Services | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Recent studies have shown that polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are found in caulk present in many older buildings, including most likely many UC buildings. US EPA currently prohibits the use of PCBs in building materials (when present at 50 ppm or greater), however the agency has issued in the April 7, 2010 Federal Register (75 FR 17645) an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) regarding a reassessment of PCB use restrictions. | UC should encourage US EPA to allow PCB caulk that was installed in buildings prior to July 2, 1979 (and any substrate material impacted thereby) to remain in place for the useful life of the building. The removal of such material can be achieved only with great difficulty and at considerable expense. US EPA has the authority to create such a “use authorization” under 15 U.S.C. § 2605(e) (2) (B). | Cost Saving Because there are dozens of impacted buildings on the Berkeley campus alone, the systemwide cost savings would be in the millions. | Contact: Mark Freiberg Director, Office of Environment, Health and Safety, UC Berkeley freiberg@berkeley.edu 510-643-8676 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 29: Mixed Waste Management | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Proposed By: UC Berkeley | | Responsible OP Department: Risk Services | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| <p>“Mixed waste” is waste that contains both radioactive and chemically hazardous components. In CA, mixed waste has dual regulatory schemes, making it much more difficult and costly to manage than in other states. The Berkeley campus radioactive material license allows the campus to decay (store) less-than-120-day-half-life mixed waste for 10 half-lives, monitor, and if no longer radioactive, manage the waste as hazardous chemical waste. However Cal-EPA requires the disposal of chemically hazardous waste within 90 days. This negates the option to decay and render mixed waste non-radioactive, thus being able to manage it in a safer, more cost effective manner. US EPA regulations (40 CFR Part 266) conditionally exempt low-level mixed waste (LLMW) from chemically hazardous waste disposal timelines during storage and treatment.</p> | <p>UC should encourage California to adopt this exemption.</p> | <p>Cost Saving \$100,000 per year plus provide a considerable reduction in compliance risk (fines up to \$27,500 per day).</p> | <p>Contact: Mark Freiberg Director, Office of Environment, Health and Safety, UC Berkeley freiberg@berkeley.edu 510-643-8676</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 30: Criteria for Demolition of Buildings Formerly Containing Radioactive Materials | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Proposed By: UC Berkeley | Responsible OP Department: Risk Services | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Buildings that have contained radioactive materials must be “released” by the California Department of Public Health, Radiologic Health Branch (CDPH-RHB) prior to demolition. This requires that UC prove to the agency that only safe levels of residual radiation remain in the structure. However, because CDPH-RHB has not implemented the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s (NRC) dose-based criteria for release of such buildings disposal of the demolition debris is costing Californians a disproportionate amount of money for an insignificant reduction in risk. | UC should alert the Governor that failure of the CDPH-RHB to implement dose-based decommissioning criteria has cost the Berkeley campus more than \$1,130,000 in the last few years and costs Californians many more millions each year. UC should specifically request the governor modify Executive Order D-62-02, such that when CDPH-RHB grants a release, there are no additional radiological restrictions on disposal of the demolition debris, as permitted by federal regulations. | This practice has resulted in delays from 30 days to one year and a significant increase in cost to UC when we need to demolish buildings where radioactive materials were used. When CDPH-RHB grants a release, it does so without regard to the additional disposal limitations imposed by the Executive Order. Thus, when a building released by the CDPH-RHB is demolished, the debris typically must be sent to a licensed low level radioactive waste disposal site, resulting in significant costs (e.g., a typical cost of \$13,800/ton versus \$55/ton). | As the result of a 2002 lawsuit, the CA regulations that were intended to be compatible with those expressed in NRC (10CFR20) were thrown out in court. In response, Governor Davis issued Executive Order D-62-02 that: 1) defined decommissioned materials, 2) ordered the State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards to impose a moratorium on disposal of these materials, and 3) ordered CDPH-RHB to adopt regulations establishing dose standards for the decommissioning of radioactive materials by its licensees. CDPH-RHB has not adopted the dose-based standards required by the Executive Order; instead the agency considers each building release application individually. Contact(s): Mark Freiberg Director, Office of Environment, Health and Safety, UC Berkeley freiberg@berkeley.edu 510-643-8676 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 31: Revisit extended sick leave policy | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Proposed By: UCSF | | Responsible OP Department: HR | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| From the Absence from Work Policy- Extended Sick Leave is provided to an eligible employee who has exhausted his/her accrued sick leave and is unable to work due to a work-incurred injury or illness. An employee who has exhausted accrued sick leave may be eligible for extended paid sick leave of up to twenty-six (26) weeks for any single work-related injury or illness. Extended sick leave payments constitute an advance against permanent disability payments. | Curtail leave benefits that significantly exceed legal requirements. | Cost savings. | Contact: Susan Wright Manager, Compensation and Rewards UC San Francisco swright@hr.ucsf.edu 415-476-2571 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 32: Simplify Seniority Rights Process | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Proposed By: UCSF | | Responsible OP Department: HR | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| <p>Personnel Policies for Staff, #60</p> <p>There are specific processes and intensive steps that require any employee whose position is governed by these policies and is targeted for layoff to have seniority rights, based upon seniority within a "layoff unit" among others in the same job classification.</p> <p>Because job classifications are often generic (e.g. "Administrative Analyst") and cover a range of skills, this process of review and seniority rights consideration can absorb considerable time and effort. Similarly, upon notification of layoff, policies dictate that employees may exercise rights to preferential consideration for future vacancies within this same broad title structure, again consuming considerable administrative resources to track and manage the process.</p> | <p>While these broad and complex policies have many components that could be streamlined, our primary recommendation is to provide a voluntary option to an employee in such a position targeted for layoff to be able to forego further consideration for "bumping" or preferential rehire by receiving some premium severance payment beyond the normal requirements of policy.</p> | <p>Reduces administrative burden.</p> | <p>Contacts Richard Secunda Director of Administrative Service, School of Medicine UC San Francisco secundar@medsch.ucsf.edu 415-502-6705</p> <p>Mike Tyburski HR Director UC San Francisco mtyburski@hr.ucsf.edu 415-514-2036</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 33: Re-Appointment of Staff Retirees | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed By: UCSD | Responsible OP Department: HR | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| <p>1) Currently, UCOP requires that each UC location submit a quarterly report of re-appointed staff retirees. Preparing this report consumes about a week of time among the areas of Benefits, HRIT and Employment. There are paper forms required by UCOP that must be converted to PDF and security encoding that must occur before the documents can be forwarded.</p> <p>2) In addition, the current policy for the re-employment of staff retirees requires that the position that the retiree is proposed to return to must be posted as an open recruitment, even if retirees are returning to positions from which they retired and even if position duration is only for several days.</p> | <p>1) This report could be made much simpler and the frequency of submission should be reduced to a semi-annual cycle. This suggestion was shared with Nathan Brostrom when he visited the campus recently and he seemed to share the perspective of the CHRO's that the current reporting requirement is inefficient, burdensome, and of questionable value.</p> <p>2) The CHRO's asked that this policy be changed to allow that any assignment under 1000 hours be excluded from the posting requirement, which would comport with the recruitment requirements of non-retiree appointments as well as conform to the appointment limits imposed by UCRP pension rules.</p> | <p>Reduces administrative burden.</p> | <p>UCOP did agree to provide a temporary exception to the posting requirement based on current budget difficulties, but did not agree to change the policy. Given the limited nature of these appointments, the posting requirement hinders the utilization of a flexible and budget conscious staffing strategy in calling back retirees. Further, it creates a sham recruitment as it will be next to impossible for other job applicants to compete successfully with retirees who are proposed to be re-appointed to their former positions.</p> <p><u>Contacts</u> Thomas Leet Assistant Vice Chancellor UC San Diego tleet@ucsd.edu 858-534-0286</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Initiative 34: Eliminate or streamline requirement for annual academic appointment renewal and streamline review process | | | |
| Proposed By: UCSF | | Responsible OP Department: Academic Personnel | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| APM 220-17 and APM 133-0 The Academic Personnel Manual- Incumbents in several academic title series are required to have annual appointments that, to be extended each year, prescribe specific process, review and approval steps that absorb considerable time and energy of department and central administrative resources. | These processes should be reviewed and streamlined to be more efficient and speedy while retaining key aspects of contractual employment requirements. | Reduces administrative burden. | <p><u>Contact(s)</u> Nancy Walters HR Director, School of Pharmacy UC San Francisco waltersn@pharmacy.ucsf.edu 415-476-3292</p> <p>Richard Secunda Director of Administrative Services, School of Medicine UC San Francisco secundar@medsch.ucsf.edu 415-502-6705</p> <p>Cynthia Lynch Leathers Director, Academic Personnel, UC San Francisco cal@acadpers.ucsf.edu 415-476-2888</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Initiative 35: Issue a State Management Memo Delineating the Invoicing Process to be Used by all State Agencies Contracting with UC | | | |
| Proposed By: UCSF | | Responsible OP Department: ORGS | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| State Agencies require substantial amount of supporting details for sponsored project expenditures to be reimbursed, specifically, for payroll. When reimbursement invoice is submitted, State Agencies require supplemental payroll detailed report on the individuals paid from the project. The report has to include employee name, hours worked, breakdown of salary and benefits. Furthermore, it has to compare the actual to the award budget and show current month and award-to date expenditures. Additionally, the format of the report could vary from agencies to agencies. These two requirements have added a considerable amount of administrative time from department and Extramural funds accounting. | These requirements should be reviewed to determine if 1) if the level of the payroll details is necessary; 2) the format of the report could be standardized across all agencies within the State. | Reduces administrative burden. | Contact(s): Susan Lin Assistant Controller UC San Francisco susan.lin@ucsf.edu 415-476-7007 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 36: Change How Federal Funding Agencies Handle the Funding of Permanent Equipment | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Proposed By: UCSD | Responsible OP Department: ORGS | | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| <p>With research grant funds, inexpensive equipment (which is also the hardest to support) is acquired and expected to perform for 10 or more years: This impacts ALL campus users (i.e. Network gear as an example).</p> <p>NSF rules regarding allowability of costs/Federal cost principles (in Chapter V of the NSF Award & Administration Guide; possibly elsewhere) state that grant funds may not be used toward the purpose of general-purpose permanent equipment, defined as equipment that can be used for non-research purposes. Traditionally, this has been read to imply network services and has hampered the use of grant funds to pay for shared networking services. This results in requests for single-lab network connections that can only be shared with campus after grants expire.</p> | <p>Update NSF guidelines to permit the use of grant funds to upgrade data communications networks to meet grant needs, even where such services could also be accessed by other groups.</p> | <p>Even a matching-funds provision would be better than the current situation. At the very least, it would ease and equalize service provision if the Allowability of Costs section specifically addressed enhancements to data communications.</p> | <p>Contact: Donald Larson Assistant Vice Chancellor/Controller UC San Diego dlarson@ucsd.edu 858-534-0386</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 37: Records Retention for Grants | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Proposed By: UC SD | | Responsible OP Department: ORGS | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| For long running grants, requirement to store and manage documents for 30 years. | Limit required historical retention of backup documents for five or seven years from transaction date not “end of grant” date. | Reduce administrative burden. | Contact: Donald Larson Assistant Vice Chancellor/Controller UC San Diego dlarson@ucsd.edu 858-534-0386 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 38: Uniform Billing Process for State Contracts and Grants | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Proposed By: UCSD | | Responsible OP Department: ORGS | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Contracts and grants we receive from various state agencies require much more overhead effort to bill, justify and reconcile than those from the federal government. | We recommend the state mandate a uniform billing process for all state agencies, rely on OMB A-133 requirements in lieu of requesting and receiving voluminous documentation for every billing, and allow automatic periodic draw down of funding based on University expenditures (much like the federal government allows). The state agencies should also rely on the audit work of PwC under OMB A-133, and also rely on after-the-fact audits on a sampling basis. | We believe this would save state agency administration significant dollars they incur in requesting and administering all of this information, as well as the University avoiding the overhead of providing so much detail that no one could possibly be looking at it. | Contact: Donald Larson Assistant Vice Chancellor/Controller UC San Diego dlarson@ucsd.edu 858-534-0386 |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 39: Public Records Act Requests | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: OGC | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| Government Code section 6250 is the California Public Records Act. | Implement limitations regarding Public Records Act requests. | Many requests are a nuisance—for example, for marketing purposes—and incur significant unrecovered administrative cost. | <p>There is a bill (SB 330) that the Governor vetoed on 9/30/10 concerning expansion of the public records act to include UC “auxiliaries”, including campus foundations, which the University vigorously opposed.</p> <p>Contact: Cindy Deegan Director, Purchasing Business and Financial Services UC Merced cdeegan@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4083</p> |

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF INITIATIVES

| Initiative 40: Rely on single-source and common UC policies applied to all campuses to the maximum degree possible. | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Proposed By: UC Merced | | Responsible OP Department: Business Operations | |
| Description of Current Law/Policy/Practice | Proposed Change | Perceived Benefit | Comments/Contacts |
| n/a | Minimize campus-origin policies that result in unnecessary duplication in creating and maintaining redundant policies. A single-source, common policy approach can have a significant impact in efficiency and cost reduction in policy areas common to all campuses. | Increased efficiency systemwide. | Contact: Sheryl Ireland Director of Controls and Accountability, Business and Financial Services UC Merced sireland@ucmerced.edu (209) 228-4090 |