

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of January 22, 2014

Present: Noriko Aso (Chair *Pro Tem*), David Cuthbert, Ted Holman, Andrew Mathews, Benjamin Read, Nina Treadwell, Manfred Warmuth, Roger Anderson, Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent: Adrian Brasoveanu (with notice), James Zachos (Chair) (with notice)

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

Due to Chair Zachos's absence, Chair Announcements and vetting of minutes were postponed until the next CFW meeting.

Faculty Partner Hiring Resources

CFW member Ted Holman has been working in his department to create resources for faculty spouses/partners who are searching for employment. Holman feels it would be an excellent recruitment and retention tool for the campus if some kind of assistance or resources were made available, and noted that two incomes in a household greatly increases the quality of life in Santa Cruz. Holman reported that currently there are no resources for spouses/partners on campus but that UCSC once had a program for spousal hires, which Berkeley used as a model for a program that they have on campus. There are resources, but they are not all located in one place for faculty.

Holman envisions having a list of names with contact information for the spouses/partners of current faculty who may be willing to speak to the partners of future hires in their profession about employment opportunities and the market in Santa Cruz. The Chemistry and Biochemistry Department is on board and has generated a list with ten names. Holman will be seeking support from the Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci) and will then seek the support from the other deans on campus. Holman offered that there could also be a list created for campus alumni in order to provide information regarding the local climate for employment.

Holman noted that Associate Chancellor and Diversity Officer Ashish Sahni is currently working on a program for veterans and disabled job seekers looking for employment on campus, and Holman would like to see if new hire faculty spouses/partners can be included in the program. Right now, Holman is in the process of gathering information and would like to have CFW's support.

The committee considered some tools that could be used to assist spousal/partner job seekers including having an email alert system set up for when a job pops up on the UCSC employment opportunity page, the campus contracting with local employment agencies, and informing new hires that they can negotiate partner hires when they are recruited. Members noted that networking is key and faculty spouses/partners are not needing help with resumes, but need to get to know people in their profession in the area.

Members recognized that although CAPM 101 – Waivers of Open Recruitment may assist faculty in securing employment for partners/spouses when they are newly hired, or when there is a retention issues it does little to help faculty who are already here. Further, members noted that there doesn't appear to be a formal campus procedure for dispensing housing allowances to new faculty, which can also affect quality of life. Some divisions appear to be providing housing allowances to new recruits, whereas others are not. A suggestion was made to provide faculty candidates with a packet that includes pertinent information including information on housing allowances, so that the information is delivered directly to the hands of new faculty.

Holman noted that it has been difficult to get faculty on board with creating a list of contacts for spousal/partner employment. A suggestion was made to try to secure FTE for the purpose of developing and maintaining such a list/database in order to ensure that it continues to be an effective resource.

Online Education Course Approvals

A joint UCSC administrative/faculty committee has been created to review online course proposals for Coursera and UCSC managed courses funded by the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI). Members received an update from the Online Education Proposal Review Committee meeting of December 10, 2014 from the CFW representative. There was only one proposal for the committee to review, which was for a writing course to be managed by UCSC (not Coursera). The CFW representative noted that the proposed instructor has experience with online writing courses and the proposal was approved by the committee with the caveat of providing the committee with more details regarding course assignments. The Proposal Review Committee further recommended that the instructor request additional support and resources to develop the course.

The CFW representative reported that in meeting, VPAA Herbie Lee noted that he thought that more proposals would be submitted in the near future. The call and funding is for fully online courses only. VPAA Lee noted that the campus interest appears to be more in hybrid courses. Plenty of faculty are using online technology in the classroom, but do not appear to be as invested in fully online courses. The restricted funding for online only courses may have limited the number of proposals that were submitted.

CFW members noted that during the last academic year, Coursera was a hot issue for CFW as a campus agreement was made with Coursera without Senate input. Members spoke briefly about some of the successes and challenges of UCSC Coursera courses in the past. One course in particular received poor reviews as the filmed lectures appeared canned with little interaction, yet the real life class was excellent and apparently didn't translate online. CFW is happy to have a representative participate on the Proposal Review Committee in order to bring online education back under Senate view.

Last year, CFW attempted to stress the issue of labor involved in the creation and management of online courses, as well as issues surrounding intellectual property. Members commented that

many Coursera courses from other campuses are created and run by Adjunct faculty so faculty welfare issues may not be considered. Members referenced a recent graduate student strike on campus due to labor issues associated with classroom time and grading for a hybrid course that was consuming so much time that there was little time left to dedicate to other responsibilities.

Healthcare Update

The CFW Healthcare Subcommittee met with Campus Health Care Facilitator, Frank Trueba on January 14, 2015. Members received a report from this meeting and an update on the latest information regarding Blue Shield and PAMF/Sutter negotiations and the effects of failed negotiations for the UCSC campus, and considered possible recommendations to address the possible outcomes for the UC Care, Blue Shield Health Savings PPO, and the Core Medical PPO plans.

Following the meeting with Trueba, the CFW Healthcare Subcommittee drafted a letter to the administration of which, if vetted by CFW, they are hoping to gain SEC endorsement. The letter includes the latest developments regarding the failed negotiations with Blue Shield and offers recommendations for moving forward. For the time being, UC Care does not face any major changes. However, those enrolled in the other two Blue Shield plans (Blue Shield Health Savings PPO, and Core Medical PPO) may be immediately affected and may face greater out of pocket costs as the fees are no longer contracted. Given that employees may be incurring costs that were not known when they enrolled, the subcommittee would like to propose two options for moving forward: 1) that those enrolled in Blue Shield plans be able to immediately switch to another plan, or 2) that UC should pay the difference in costs until the end of the transition period on June 1, 2015.

Trueba informed the sub-committee that Physicians Medical Group (PMG), the network that would absorb all Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) patients if Blue Shield and UC Care specifically no longer have PAMF as “Tier One” providers, is a “virtual network”. This means that individual doctors opt in and out and it is difficult to tell how many doctors are actually in the network and are accepting new patients at any given time. Trueba stated that there are roughly 350 PMG doctors/providers in the area, but it is unknown how many of these are open to new patients.

Negotiations are still being attempted, but if an agreement is not made, there will be financial implications for those in Blue Shield plans, particularly for the 60% of employees enrolled in UC Care. Members noted the importance of having an affordable plan that offered PAMF access for UCSC employees. CFW discussed the healthcare situation at UC Santa Barbara, which continues to be problematic, as there are no UC Care providers at the closest hospital. Members noted that a similar situation may occur at Santa Cruz if an agreement is not made, and some UC Care patients may need to drive to the medical center at UCSF for more affordable care.

The CFW committee analyst recently spoke with Frank Trueba and reported that due to discrepancies in the online PMG and Blue Shield provider lists, and the Blue Shield concierge, it has not yet been possible to determine how many PMG providers are considered Tier One under UC Care, let alone who those providers are.

CFW would like to focus on “access” and find out how many Tier One providers there are in order to determine if access is an issue. The committee questioned whether PMG would be able to handle the capacity of all employees that will need to use PMG Tier One providers. The committee noted that this issue needs to be made clear to the administration and UCOP.

Members noted that there are several petitions going around on campus regarding the issue, and CFW has received word that a Senate faculty member is expected to propose a resolution at the winter Senate meeting asking for the Chancellor to advocate for the campus in terms of healthcare.

Members questioned the Office of the President’s (UCOP) role in the situation as UCOP published open enrollment documents that listed plan details that were not yet secured for 2015, and questioned the overall sustainability of UC Care and the significant premium increase to the plan this year. Members discussed the future of UC Care and the proposal to turn the plan into an HMO in order to make it a more financial sustainable program and noted that this could be disastrous for UCSC in terms of access if PAMF is not included. The UC medical centers appear to be the driving force of UC Care with the goal of increasing medical center revenue. A suggestion was made that UCOP should have healthcare policy principles in place, including a statement that UC shall provide equivalent health care services for each of the UC campuses. Members expressed concern that without a set of principles in place, UC may just go where the money is.

CFW considered drafting their own resolution to bring to light the uniqueness of UCSC in terms of access. The goal of such a resolution would be to assist the Chancellor in advocating for the campus, as the resolution could be used as a tool to illustrate that healthcare is a major concern for UCSC faculty. The committee will continue this conversation at the next CFW meeting when Chair Zachos returns.

Senate Meeting Action Plan

CFW determine an action plan in order to complete report and update submissions for the winter Senate meeting call.