

**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**Annual Report, 2004-2005**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) worked productively during the academic year as well as during the summer on core issues of concern to the faculty and the entire campus community. This year's committee benefited enormously from being able to draw on the expertise of prior CFW chairs and members as well as colleagues on other senate committees. In addition, CFW maintained its long standing practice of working and consulting with key administrative committees. The committee is grateful for the responsiveness of outgoing Interim Chancellor Martin Chemers as well as the enthusiasm of incoming Chancellor Denice Denton in addressing some of the key challenges facing the instructional community at UCSC.

CFW accomplished a substantial amount of work last year, especially considering that it only had four members in the fall, five during winter and a full compliment of eight in the spring (the charge is for 6-8 members). CFW acknowledges the tireless work of the Committee on Committees in recruiting members for our committee. Roger Anderson served as chair in the fall quarter. Paul Ortiz served as chair in the winter and spring. The committee was ably advised by Pamela Edwards who patiently and wisely guided CFW through transitions in chairs as well as committee members.

CFW continued its tradition of gathering broad faculty input in order to craft an agenda of issues to focus on throughout the year. The severe shortage of affordable housing for faculty and staff on or off campus quickly became the most critical issue. There is now a broad consensus at UCSC that we have reached a crisis point on the question of housing. Simply put, new faculty cannot afford to purchase housing in this region at current market rates. During 2005, the median price of a single family dwelling in Santa Cruz reached \$780,000. This crisis has been exacerbated by the failure of the University of California to award significant cost-of-living allowances over the past several years.

In addition, the housing crisis must be successfully resolved in the new Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) before the LRDP moves forward. CFW believes that early iterations of the LRDP have failed to adequately address housing. After numerous consultations with CFW as well as the administration, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) responded to the housing crisis by presenting a resolution to the full meeting of the Academic Senate during the spring quarter. The resolution reads as follows:

**Senate Executive Committee**  
**Resolution on Faculty Housing and Campus Growth**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

WHEREAS our ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty depends, in part, on their ability to obtain adequate and affordable housing, and

WHEREAS the cost of housing in the Santa Cruz area has risen dramatically over the last decade, and

WHEREAS the campus cannot support an increase in the student population without a corresponding increase in the number of faculty,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, if UCSC plans to grow beyond 15,000, then it must offer plans for sufficient and affordable faculty and staff housing. The Senate calls on the administration to provide plans by October 1, 2005.

This resolution spurred vigorous discussion and debate on the floor of the Senate. Several colleagues testified that a stronger version of the resolution was required given the fact that UCSC has failed repeatedly over the past decade to formulate a viable housing plan. A specific proposal to peg housing prices to entry-level faculty salaries to make units more affordable for junior faculty was defeated by voice vote. The stated hope of many colleagues who voted against this particular proposal was that the incoming chancellor would deal decisively and effectively with the housing crisis. Ultimately, the resolution in its current form was passed by a voice vote without opposition on May 20, 2005.

More information on the housing crisis appears in the body of this report.

During the year, colleagues frequently contacted CFW about concerns over faculty salary levels as well as the lack of sufficient campus child care capacity. Not infrequently, junior as well as senior colleagues emphasized the fact that these issues significantly overlap with each other. Lower salaries vis-à-vis our counterparts at the comparison-eight institutions impacts our ability to buy housing, and the insufficient number of slots in the campus child care facility has a detrimental impact on family budgets as well as morale and scholarly productivity.

CFW decided to “bundle” housing, child care, and salaries together as issues that need to be grappled with simultaneously. We promoted this viewpoint at Academic Senate meetings as well as in meetings with members of the administration. CFW’s winter quarter presentation to the Academic Senate on the housing crisis initiated a broader conversation among faculty about salaries and merit promotions on campus. Specifically, CFW asked the Senate to consider the following question: Is there a culture or climate on our campus that is slowing down promotions, merit increases, and accelerations? Even as we recognize that faculty salaries are in large part a system-wide (and nation-wide) issue, we ask our colleagues and the administration to consider what we can do as a campus to address salary matters. CFW feels that this question needs to be seriously revisited in 2005-2006.

Towards the end of the year the additional issue of Tuition Remission for children of faculty and staff was raised by several colleagues, and we expect to explore this issue further in the 2005-2006 academic year.

### **Housing**

A May 20, 2005 article in the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* noted: "Back in June 2001, the Sentinel ran a front-page headline that read, "New campus housing in the \$300,000-\$400,000 range." Today, the headline might be "Campus housing pricey for faculty." The 125 homes planned in 2001 for UC Santa Cruz faculty have yet to be built; the new completion date for the project, known as Ranch View Terrace, is fall 2006. The number of homes has shrunk to 80 and the price has grown to \$400,000 to \$600,000. The homes range in size from 1,747 to 2,078 square feet.

CFW received a significant amount of correspondence in the fall, winter and spring quarters from faculty and departmental chairs who were dismayed at the continuing upward movement of housing prices at the campus's proposed newest housing development, Ranch View Terrace (RVT). Indeed, the stated average price of these units increased by \$100,000 during the past academic year alone.

Deans of academic divisions, chairs of departments, and assistant professors alike expressed concern that RVT units are priced well beyond the means of most assistant as well as associate professors at UCSC. Faculty as well as members of the administration voiced frustration that the campus has thus far failed to craft viable short-term or long-term housing plans that will guarantee that our campus remains competitive with our peer research institutions in terms of recruitment and retention of talented faculty.

CFW is also troubled by the fact that many faculty who have been recruited over the past several years were given the impression that ground-breaking for a new family housing development on campus was forthcoming. However, ground-breaking has yet to occur. Needless to say, the impact of the housing crisis on faculty morale has been devastating. Some colleagues are silently admitting defeat or are polishing up their vitas for the job market.

UCSC has a public commitment to recruiting a diverse group of faculty to match an increasingly diverse student body. However, this goal cannot be achieved unless a new model for building and allocating faculty housing is developed. The absence of such a plan will prevent this campus from recruiting and retaining faculty from non-elite backgrounds. Unless we plan to post tenure-track job announcements that read: "Only wealthy individuals need apply," we must do better.

During the course of the academic year, CFW met with and consulted with numerous members of the administration including Vice Chancellors Tom Vani, Francisco Hernandez, Meredith Michaels, and Jean Marie Scott as well as Assistant Provost Charlotte Moreno in an attempt to formulate solutions to the crisis. In addition, CFW sent representatives to discuss housing concerns at Council-of-Chairs meetings in the Physical

& Biological Sciences and the Arts Divisions. In these meetings, we especially focused on Ranch View Terrace as well as MOP loans and the campus housing wait lists.

Recognizing the need to work overtime on this crisis, members of CFW met and consulted over the summer of 2005 with key members of the administration. Specifically, Ted Holman met regularly with Vice Chancellor Jean Marie Scott in order to assess the progress of Ranch View Terrace and possible options for the future. These meetings have been productive but as of yet we are still looking for effective plans to deal with the housing crisis at UCSC. We are optimistic given the current administration and their genuine desire to solve this important issue we can improve the faculty housing environment at UCSC.

### **Child Care**

Child care continues to be a crucially unmet need for many faculty. This year, of the 105 spaces currently available in the four programs run by Child Care Services, 35 were occupied by children of faculty or staff (grouped together for administrative purposes), while 101 faculty/staff parents languished on the waiting list. Demand was highest for care for children under 2, with only one spot in the Infant/Toddler Center currently occupied by a faculty/staff child. The message to faculty seems clear: if you choose to start a family, you're on your own.

Despite a clear consensus that child care is important for recruitment, retention, and overall morale (according to a 2004 survey, over 90% of faculty feel child care is important for the campus as a whole, even though the issue personally affected only 37% of respondents), little progress has been made in creating new spots in the past decade. Moreover, UCSC lags significantly behind other UC campuses in providing child care spaces for faculty who need them, and in locating matching funds that would allow us to utilize a million-dollar building grant offered by UCOP for this purpose some years ago.

One positive development this year was the establishment of a capital fund specifically earmarked for building a new child care center, seeded by a fundraising event organized by Psychology Professor Faye Crosby. CFW continues to urge the administration to make this building a fundraising priority, and to think creatively and with urgency about creative ways to expand on-campus child care.

### **Faculty Salaries**

During its winter quarter presentation on housing CFW asked the Senate to consider if our departments are doing enough to promote, as well as accelerate, qualified faculty. In addition, CFW consulted with members of CPB and the SEC on the issue of faculty salaries. A question raised in Senate and non-Senate forums during 2004-2005 was: is there a cultural climate at UCSC which has caused some departments to promote their colleagues slower than peer departments at other University of California campuses? If so, what is the cause of this phenomenon, and how should it be addressed? CFW raised

the issue of faculty salaries with incoming Chancellor Denton and welcomes further dialogue on this problem.

### **Parking**

High parking fees continue to be a problem for faculty at UCSC. Compared with many of our peer institutions, faculty at UCSC pay exorbitant fees for the right to park at our place of work. In addition, parking spaces in core areas of campus have been disappearing as new buildings are erected. CFW is concerned with the existing high parking rates for faculty as well as the possibility of future increases. We are equally concerned with the increasing difficulties that faculty face in reaching classrooms. This is an especially daunting task for faculty who must transport special teaching materials such as audio-visual aids to their classrooms.

CFW representatives participated in Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) discussions regarding the implementation of night-parking user fees at UCSC. Ultimately, TAC voted to implement broader night-parking user fees on campus beginning in September, 2005. CFW representatives expressed reservations about this decision on two levels. First, we thought at the time this decision was made that the concerns of the Senate Graduate Council as well as those voiced by the Graduate Student Association were not adequately addressed. In addition, CFW believes that Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) has not adequately articulated its rationale for raising parking fees at UCSC. Certainly, no one would have a problem with such fees if it is known that they will be dedicated to increasing safety at night for those who are on campus—a laudable goal. However, the plan to implement broader night-parking user fees has been discussed on this campus over the past two years variously as an equity issue (in the amounts day vs. night parkers pay to park), a budget necessity, and even as a way to preclude raising day fees. It may be that there is a grain of truth in each of these explanations. However, CFW continues to hope that TAPS will more clearly articulate the rationale for current and future rate structures. CFW and other members of the advisory committee asked TAPS to study the actual implementation of this policy as well to monitor its effects on graduate and undergraduate students.

The Lower Campus Parking Project was finalized, in conjunction with the Emergency Response Center (ERC) that is under construction. This project included some parking associated with the ERC and paving the shuttle parking lot. CFW believes that in the future, all capital projects funded by TAPS revenue should first be discussed in user committees such as the TAC and their recommendation should be included with the project papers during the approval process and that major projects should be preceded by more substantial Senate consultation. The lack of such consultation is a breach in the principle of shared governance at the University of California.

### **USA PATRIOT Act Resolution**

During the academic year of 2003-2004 CFW co-sponsored a resolution on the USA PATRIOT Act with the Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) that required the

administration to consult with the Senate on a regular basis about the PATRIOT Act's impact on members of our campus community. CAF and CFW continued to monitor the administration's compliance with this resolution during the 2004-2005 academic year. CAF and CFW representatives met jointly with Interim Chancellor Chemers to discuss the resolution. CFW will continue to work with CAF to monitor the campus's compliance with this important resolution.

### **Briefing of and Initial Meeting with Incoming Chancellor**

During the spring quarter, CFW scheduled a special meeting with incoming Chancellor Denice Denton to discuss issues of common concern. This meeting was very productive. CFW prepared reports in advance on housing, child care, and faculty salaries. Chancellor Denton listened attentively to these reports and shared her ideas on each issue. Members of CFW applauded Chancellor Denton's stated willingness to listen to faculty concerns. In addition, we discussed a range of other issues including parking rates, the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), and connections between diversity and excellence. This was a very fruitful meeting. CFW looks forward to continuing our dialogue with Chancellor Denton.

### **University of California Faculty Welfare**

CFW sent a representative to system-wide University of California Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meetings during the academic year. Major issues raised in UCFW meetings with UCOP administrators included: lagging faculty salaries vis-a-vis comparison-eight institutions, health care, and proposed changes in the retirement system. In particular, the committee urged the administration to do all in its power avoid a two-tiered retirement system that would disadvantage incoming faculty members. Senior faculty members of UCFW stressed that UC's benefits package for incoming faculty must be preserved in order to ensure faculty morale, scholarly productivity, and future recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty.

### **Long Range Development Plan**

CFW carefully read over the existing Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) draft in the fall. Throughout the year and in various venues, we discussed our concerns over different aspects of the plan with incoming Chancellor Denton, Business and Administrative Services (BAS) Vice Chancellor Tom Vani, and Associate Vice Chancellor of Colleges and University Housing Services Jean Marie Scott among other members of the administration.

On March 15, CFW met with Vice Chancellor Vani to discuss parking-related issues in the LRDP. We sent questions in advance to Vice Chancellor Vani. Among the most important questions were:

- 1) The current system is to take inexpensive parking and convert to building space. Since faculty pay for the parking, do you feel it is fair that we are not compensated for this loss of capital improvement?
- 2) Does the LRDP address the problem with how we fund parking?
- 3) Do you agree with the reassessment of the University of California charter that the UC Office of the President (UCOP) can actually pay for parking? If so, how do you suggest we pressure UCOP to start helping us pay for parking?

CFW looks forward to continued cooperation between the Academic Senate and the administration, and we hope to work together to solve the many challenges facing our campus.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Scott Brandt (F)

Margaret A. Gibson (W&S)

Kirsten Silva Gruesz (S)

Ted Holman

Hi Kyung Kim (S)

Richard Otte (S)

Hongyun Wang

Manfred Warmuth (W&S)

Roger Anderson, Chair (F)

Paul Ortiz, Chair (W&S)

November 3, 2005