

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of January 8, 2014

Present: Adrian Brasoveanu, David Cuthbert, Ted Holman, Andrew Mathews, Benjamin Read, Nina Treadwell, Manfred Warmuth, James Zachos (Chair), Jaden Silva Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: Noriko Aso, Roger Anderson

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

CFW welcomed returning member Ben Read, Politics. Ben served on CFW last year and is now returning after being on sabbatical for the fall quarter 2014.

Report from the 12/09/14 Senate-Administrative Meeting on Faculty Salaries

Chair Zachos provided CFW with a report from the December 9, 2014 Senate-Administrative Meeting on Faculty Salaries, which was called together by CP/EVC Alison Galloway by request of the Office of the President. Chair Zachos, some members of the Chancellor's Cabinet, Senate Chair Brenneis, and the chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) were in attendance. The goal of the meeting was to brainstorm actions, principles, and recommendations to address the issue of deteriorating total remuneration. The group determined that addressing salaries would be the best tool to decrease the salary disparity between UC campuses. The possible actions that the committee considered were to 1) increase overall salaries and off-scales across the scales, or 2) increase salaries on scale, leaving the off-scale up to the EVCs as has been done in the past. CP/EVC Galloway noted that there is no new money, and noted that whatever is done will come out of the existing operating budget. In the end, the committee decided that the best option would be to have a 3% increase for several years on the on-scale salaries, leaving some funding to the CP/EVC's discretions for the Merit Boost Plan and off-scale increments. Chair Zachos noted that the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) recommended a 3% increase based on total salary (both on and off-scale).

UCFW has heard that several other campuses are increasing their salaries with programs similar to UCSC's Merit Boost Plan. CFW members noted that UCSC will need to continue to address the issue of salary so as not to continue to fall behind.

Blue Shield/Sutter/PAMF Update

Chair Zachos supplied the committee with breaking news that came out in the Santa Cruz Sentinel this week. The University has failed to reach an agreement with Blue Shield for 2015. An announcement has been made that those enrolled in Blue Shield plans (UC Care, Blue Shield Health Savings PPO, and Core Medical PPO) will have a six month transition period. What will occur after that period if an agreement is not made is unknown at this time. Three UC healthcare plans are effected, including UC Care. Of all the UC campuses, UCSC has the highest percentage of employees enrolled in UC Care because the plan provides access to the Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF). Without access to Kaiser or UC medical centers, UCSC is in a unique

situation in terms of access to healthcare. During the six month transition period, the UC Care plan will remain more or less unchanged in terms of access, coinsurance payments, etc. However, with the other plans where patients pay 20% of all fees, the rate of procedures is no longer a negotiated rate and may cost more than it did previously under the contract. The out of pocket costs for those enrolled in these plans may be higher. Members commented that it seems unfair that a plan that employees originally enrolled in would change mid-stream as there were expectations when they enrolled, and noted that there may be some legal and/or contractual issues that the University will have to face. Further, members expressed frustration that they first heard about the situation from the Santa Cruz Sentinel and not from UCOP.

Members considered what issues may occur if/when employees enrolled in these plans are allowed to change plans, including incurred costs due to changes, whether such a change should be retroactive to January 1, 2015, and the fact that there is no other PPO option available, and most people will need to change to the Health Net HMO if they want to pay a stand copay, which provides access to Physicians Medical Group (PMG) and not to PAMF doctors and facilities. Members further noted that providers and facilities will likely be overburdened by Santa Cruz residents enrolled in Blue Shield plans (not just UCSC employees) trying to fit in their appointments and procedures before the end of the six month transition period. CFW also questioned whether PMG could realistically serve the large number of additional patients that may need to switch over from PAMF.

Chair Zachos commented that there should be a special open enrollment period for those enrolled in Blue Shield plans as these employees were promised something that the University cannot deliver, and believes that a special open enrollment has occurred before. The Office of the President is still trying to figure out what to do and is developing options. Chair Zachos expects to hear more at the next UCFW meeting and will point out the unique situation of UCSC with no medical center or access to Kaiser.

CFW will create a subcommittee which will gather information, speak to the unions, and draft a report with recommendations for the Senate meeting.

Transportation and Parking Services

Members received an update from the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting on December 10, 2014. TAC discussed the recent proposed rate increase to the bus pass and vanpool program, both of which are highly subsidized programs. There was much discussion about the process of vetting and how the bus and vanpool increase proposals did not get to the Senate in time for comment at the end of the last academic year. There has been a proposal that the process be changed so that it goes to the Senate and the Chancellor simultaneously for review in order to expedite the process. TAC members agreed that this made sense and the new process will be followed with the next proposal.

TAC also discussed issues with the parking pass machines that are installed in the Performing Arts parking lot and several other lots on campus. They apparently break down frequently, particularly

at night when there is no one there to address the problem. There is a software patch that is available and is compatible with iPhones that the campus is looking into. The software would allow visitors to pay for parking and park anywhere in a specified lot without a pass as the license plate would be in the system and could phase out the need for parking attendants during special events. Some CFW members expressed concern that unless a limited number of passes are sold at a time, this might affect the number of spots available for students, faculty, and staff who have annual/quarterly parking permits, and noted that in some lots parking is already scarce with drivers waiting for parking spaces to open up.

Online Education Course Approvals

This item was tabled to the next CFW meeting.

Faculty Salaries

CFW received the requested 2013 faculty salary data from the Academic Personnel Office and is planning on providing an update at the winter Senate meeting. Initial analysis has been done by CFW members charged with overseeing the topic for the year. With this data, CFW hopes to gain an understanding of how off-scale has been impacted in recent years. Chair Zachos would expect to see year to year changes with minor increases in off-scale due to the Merit Boost Plan. The report of current statistics show that 2012-2013 was slightly different than previous years, and there has been some improvement. Members noted that it may be beneficial to look at the data from 2009 when the Merit Boost was created with the goal of bringing campus salaries up to the nine campus median, which UCSC is still short of. Although the data does show that UCSC has caught up to UC Davis. During the last consultation with CP/EVC Galloway, Galloway seemed satisfied with where the campus is now in terms of faculty salary and wants to continue the Merit Boost Plan as is, but the data clearly shows that campus faculty salaries are not yet at the UC campus median. The disparity in salaries between senior and junior faculty salaries on campus remains to be an issue. The committee noted that late Associate Professors (Associate Steps 3,4, and 5) appear to have similar salaries as late Assistant Profs due to off-scale salaries. Junior faculty are hired in at market levels and may receive large off-scales for retention actions, etc., and are catching up with senior Professor salaries. A suggestion was made that the disparity could be addressed at the department level on a case by case basis and the committee discussed the process of career equity reviews. CFW also considered whether extra merit boosts might be needed to address these discrepancies.

Members further found that the data indicates that the off-scale actually goes down when approaching a step, which is counterintuitive to what one might expect that off-scale would go up when approaching promotion.

CFW discussed the graphs and considered the most effective way to present the data to Senate faculty at the next Senate meeting.

Childcare

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare is currently collecting information regarding childcare offerings at each of the UC campuses. Information on facility distance from campus, cost per month, capacity, and wait list length will be included. Currently, UCSC is the only UC campus with no childcare program for employees. CFW met with CP/EVC Galloway on November 20, 2014 and learned that a proposal to house a potential Pre-K in the Granary building at the base of campus has been denied due to issues with the building layout and the expense associated with fixing the issues. There are currently no plans to investigate childcare options for UCSC and no administrator charged solely with securing childcare for our campus. The committee also learned that a \$2 million offer from UCOP to assist with childcare may still stand as well as \$730k of promised funds from the CP/EVC. There appears to be resources to get UCSC childcare off of the ground, but not the will.

Members noted that with a lack of a facility, and plans for building a new childcare center in family student housing well off in the future, employee childcare does not appear promising. Members discussed the Chancellor's donor campaign and a suggestion was made that the campaign should also include the need for a childcare facility, which may be an enticing project for the perfect donor. A comment was made that if the campus could find a donor to rebuild a barn, then they should be able to find someone who is interested in funding a childcare center. The committee recognized that building on campus is expensive and that the option of building off-campus needs to be explored. Members questioned why childcare is not a priority for development.

Members considered the content for a post consultation memo to the CP/EVC. The committee considered a two part plan 1) renting an off-campus facility while Family Student Housing and the current student childcare center is being rebuilt (short term solution), and 2) combining employee childcare with student childcare in the newly renovated facility near Family Student Housing (long term solution). Members agreed that if they wait for Family Student Housing to be rebuilt, employee childcare may never happen. A comment was made that over eight years ago, Chancellor Blumenthal stated that employee childcare was his number one priority, and yet there is still no employee child care program available. Another option considered by the committee was a voucher program based on need and salary and distributed by lottery, mirroring the Graduate Student Employee Childcare Stipend program. The recent data collected by UCFW showed that the child care on some UC campuses is expensive and members would like those in need to be able to receive the assistance that they need. The committee determined that campus lawyers should look into the particulars of vouchers being taxed, etc.

For CFW childcare is a retention and recruitment issue. Members also noted that a dependable childcare situation, either on or close to campus, can positively affect a faculty member's rate of promotion and overall success. In the current climate of total remuneration, members agree that this may be the perfect time to focus on childcare in order to have an immediate impact and effect on faculty quality of life. With UCFW currently studying campus childcare options, and financial support available through set aside funds and the matching grant, CFW will make suggestions as to how the resources should be used.

