

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of April 16, 2015

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

Absent with Notice: Adrian Brasoveanu, Roger Anderson

Chair Announcements

Update from the SEC meetings of March 31 and April 14, 2015

Chair Zachos provided members with a report from the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting of April 14, 2015. SEC met with the Chancellor and his cabinet and discussed diversity statements in Target of Excellence (TOE) Waiver of Open Recruitment requests, and recruitment efforts for black students. The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) would like to see statements regarding contributions to diversity in the TOE proposal files. These statements are required for normal search applicants and there does not appear to be much disagreement with the request. The Black Experience Team (BET) is trying to improve the campus climate for African American/Black/Caribbean (ABC) students and faculty. The committee met with SEC and the Chancellor's cabinet and discussed efforts to improve recruitment of ABC students and faculty.

Following the Cabinet meeting, SEC's discussion focused on the April 22, 2015 Senate meeting on the Silicon Valley Initiative. Chair Zachos reported that 6 pre-proposals have been submitted for consideration in Silicon Valley. SEC considered a process for vetting the proposals and concluded that the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) will review the proposals and send the committee's recommendations to SEC who will then provide comments to the Chancellor.

Chair Zachos encouraged CFW members to attend the Senate meeting, as it promises to be an important and interesting meeting. Faculty have posted questions and concerns for the administration regarding Silicon Valley on the UCSC Senate website. The program pre-proposals are also available online. Chair Zachos was encouraged by some of the proposals.

A CFW members questioned whether asking for pre-proposals before the specific goals, intention, etc. of the Silicon Valley Initiative are known. Members questioned how proposals can be targeted if the program is unknown. Chair Zachos noted that the strategy may have been to see what kind of program(s) came out of the proposals, before moving forward.

The online questions noted that a vote of confidence is in question and Chair Zachos commented that there may be a motion for a vote at the meeting. CFW members noted that there appears to be two separate issues. 1) Does it make sense academically and/or in terms of research to branch out into Silicon Valley?, and 2) Does the business model make sense during a time of budget issues. CFW members noted that the Computer Science Department is shrinking and questioned whether now is an appropriate time to take campus FTE to Silicon Valley. Members understand

that the administration doesn't necessarily give faculty FTE back to departments if a faculty member retires.

The bulk of the pre-proposals are coming out of Computer Engineering and appear to be well suited for Silicon Valley. A comment was made that some departments may be writing proposals specifically in order to gain FTE, not because they think it is the best idea to move a program to Silicon Valley.

Report from the April 10, 2015 UCFW Meeting

Chair Zachos reported that the University of California Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) met with the Health Care Task Force (HCTF) Chair, Bob May, during the April 10, 2015 UCFW meeting, and received an update on the health care plans that will be made available during 2015-16. There does not appear to be any significant changes to the health plans that will be offered. UCFW was informed that there may be premium increases, but no more than 5% for Health Net (Blue and Gold). UC Care premium increases have yet to be determined. Mental health coverage/care was also discussed. The committee also consulted with Vice Provost of Human Resources, Dwaine Duckett, who informed UCFW that the University is already in negotiations with providers for 2016 and beyond.

The committee also discussed the prefunding of health care for retirees. The system is now pay as you go. However, there is a large unfunded liability for retiree healthcare that will need to be reconciled. UCFW considered some possible solutions. There appear to be several options, but nothing concrete as of yet.

University of California Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Aimée Dorr consulted with UCFW regarding the systemwide review of a new draft Presidential policy that prohibits sexual harassment and sexual violence. The Office of the President (UCOP) is revisiting the policy as it has brought up several concerns regarding due process, increased workload for title IV officers, and the reporting requirements. Chair Zachos senses that there is concern that faculty and staff may be taking on a role that they are not well equipped to handle. CFW members noted that faculty are not provided with specific training on the topic and do not have legal expertise, etc. The draft policy appears to have several red flags and UCOP is asking for comments by April 20th, 2015. Chair Zachos will email the draft policy to CFW members and welcomes comments that he can then take to UCFW.

The UCFW meeting concluded with a discussion of total remuneration. There is concern that the faculty salary scales may be broken. They could be fixed, or replaced with something altogether different. A suggestion was made at UCFW to raise salaries so that the scale has more meaning and use off-scale increases as a band aide until this may be accomplished. Chair Zachos noted that some would like to abandon the scale altogether. However, many feel that the scales are important and provide a pathway for advancement and career while providing certain thresholds. Further, these campuses feel that even if the salaries associated with the scale are not working, the scales,

ranks, and steps are still important. There will be more discussion of this topic systemwide in the near future.

Consideration of the draft minutes from the CFW meeting of March 5, 2015

Members reviewed and approved the draft minutes from the CFW meeting of March 5, 2015 and noted that there is a fine line between what is confidential information from UCFW, and what may be shared publically via recorded and posted minutes. In the case of certain topics such as child care, members agreed that it is good to have a thorough and public record as there are many efforts, agreements, etc., that need to be consolidated. A suggestion was made that removing confidential information may protect the administration, but limits the amount of overall transparency, which members feel is highly important

Final Review APM-210-1-d

During the spring of 2014, proposed amendments to the language in Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 210-1-d related to evaluating contributions to diversity in personnel reviews, underwent systemwide review and a second review in fall 2014. During both reviews, CFW supported the proposed revisions. The policy is currently undergoing a final review, which incorporates suggestions made during the previous round.

Although CFW found the previous proposed revisions adequate, Chair Zachos noted that some other campuses did not. The chief area of concern in past reviews was a sentence that inferred that contributions to diversity should be given the same weight as teaching, research, and service. Some campuses and Senate committees, including the UCSC Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), felt that the sentence suggested a 4th category of evaluation. In the current review, this sentence has been reworded. Overall, CFW supports the proposed revision, but briefly discussed whether replacing the word “recognition” with “credit” in “Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations should be give due credit in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process”, may carry a different weight depending on one’s definition of the two words.

TAPS Fee Three-Year Fee Increase Proposal

Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) has proposed a three-year series of annual increases to most parking fees and program fares starting in July 2015 and continuing through June 2018. CFW and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) will advise the Chancellor on the proposed increases. The proposal differs from previous proposals as it is a multi-year plan that effects essentially all parking permits and TAPS fare programs. CFW reviewed the associated materials in order to determine if there is sufficient contextual information provided to justify the proposed increases, and sufficient clarity about the sustainability of the budget if the fee increases are implemented.

Transportation Advisory Committee representative and Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) member, Suresh Lodha, joined the beginning of the discussion and provided a handout containing some issues and questions for discussion regarding the proposal.

Lodha noted that the first problem with this proposal and TAPS proposals of the past is the process and vetting with the Academic Senate. Larry Pageler, Director of Transportation & Parking Services, requested that CFW and CPB provide their comments directly to him so that he could further shape the proposal before providing it to the Chancellor. However, the process flow chart specifically notes that CFW and CPB are to provide their comments directly to the Chancellor. Further, Lodha noted that TAPS proposals are usually rushed and pushed through quickly without adequate time for Senate review. Further, at the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings, members have been flooded with information and conflicting documents, and although they have asked repeatedly, have not been providing with a set of guiding principles for TAPS or TAPS programs.

CFW members noted that they would like to formally request to see the revised proposal that is submitted to the Chancellor, so they may see what changes, if any, were made following the review period.

Members noted that the proposal raises several concerns and questions regarding budget details (which Lodha reported CPB will address), and program support, and lacks a clear set of guiding principles to explain the proposed increases, justify programs, and guide reviewers in assessing if the proposed increases and existing programs are appropriate. Lodha stated that the proposal appears to have some “winners” and some “losers”. Lodha’s definition of the “winners” are the programs/parking permits that have less than a 15% proposed increase over the three years. The “losers” are those programs/parking permits that have a proposed 60-70% increase over three years. Lodha feels that there is no middle ground. According to these definitions, the Bike Shuttle program (which realistically costs the campus \$4.69/ride) is a “winner”, as is the “A” Parking permit. The biggest “losers” are the vanpool, bus pass, and scratcher parking permits. Lodha noted that there are principles and formulas for the TAPS programs that were created over 10 years ago and were shared with TAC, but are confidential. Lodha would like to see increases at roughly 10%.

The introduction of the three-year fee increase proposal states that the proposed increases will “generate revenue to maintain existing service levels of parking-subsidized sustainable transportation programs and fund planned and future capital improvements”. However, the proposal contains insufficient information on the current budget to fully justify the proposed increases. The Chair of CPB requested more information, and received several budget spreadsheet and the materials provided to TAC members during the March 11, 2015 TAC meeting. The additional documents contained some conflicting budgetary information.

With regards to funding planned future capital improvements, many of the projected projects are off campus, which raises the question as to why parking users at the main campus should fund off campus projects. Further, several of the projects are set to commence much further down the road, yet increases to cover these projects are being proposed now.

With regards to programs, some members questioned why the Traffic Control Crossing Guard program is funded by the parking operations budget and not the transit operations budget as it controls student traffic during peak class transit times. Lodha commented that Business and Administrative Services (BAS) and Vice Chancellor Sarah Latham decide which budget pays for each program. The committee questioned whether the installation of traffic lights at the most impacted intersections might be a more cost effective option over time. With regards to the parking pay stations in some parking lots on campus, Lodha reported that several are not working at that there is software that the campus can purchase for \$60k that may fix the issue, but there is no guarantee that the software will work.

TAPS has stated a goal of increasing revenue by \$200k in the first year. Lodha feels that this may be accomplished by reducing the Traffic Control Crossing Guard program and reducing the amount of subsidy provided to the Bike Shuttle program, which costs the campus roughly \$260k/year.

CFW members questioned why, with such a high student ridership, the Bike Shuttle Program was not partially subsidized by student money. Lodha reported that there are two operating budgets under TAPS, a parking operations budget, and a transportation operations budget. The latter of which is funded by student funds. The Bike Shuttle Program is funded by the parking operations budget, even though it is initially charged to the transportation budget and then transferred to the parking operations budget. Members questioned why parking fees should be paying for the Bike Shuttle. Further, one member noted that the shuttles that are used for the program are old and have high emissions, and therefore, the program does not qualify for grants for programs that reduce the carbon footprint. Members note that the 3/11/15 TAC materials state that previous surveys of Bike Shuttle riders showed that before the shuttle, riders rode their bikes or took the bus to campus. If the Bike Shuttle Program is not reducing parking or the carbon foot print, members question its overall goal. At the very least, it should be subsidized to a lesser degree such as the 50% subsidy target of the Vanpool Program.

CFW noted that the strategy of shifting more of the cost toward daily users, specifically the increase on the Daily Scratcher Packets, along with the proposed limit of two 50-pass packets per year could have unintended consequences and may push current scratcher users towards purchasing quarterly/annual permits, thus encouraging these commuters to drive to campus more frequently due to convenience and/or to “recoup” the cost of the permit. The committee noted that this proposal places the highest fee increases on those leaving the smallest imprint on the campus.

Further, the proposal and budgetary information assumes that there will be the same number of permits sold after the proposed increase as there is now. This may not be accurate as permit sales and program participation may be reduced following parking/fare increases. Lodha suggested, and several CFW members agreed, that there should be more research on how the proposed increases will effect behavior. The proposal also does not include the projected revenue from new capital projects such as the Ocean Science off campus parking lot at the Seymour Center, or the inclusion of the Delaware parking lot, at which Lodha reports, parking management has already been

approved. CFW members commented that they would have liked this projected revenue information to have been included in the proposal.

CFW considered the effect that the proposed increases would have on the total remuneration of UCSC faculty, and noted that the majority of the campuses that pay more in parking (as noted on a chart on the March 11, 2015 TAC materials) are also campuses that tend to have higher faculty salaries. Members considered the possibility of a tiered rate structure based on salary. A suggestion was made that those who pay more should be able to park closer to campus buildings. Currently, faculty pay the same fees as students are given identical parking access.

The committee would like to provide their response sooner rather than later and will work on drafting their comments. The discussion will be continued at the next CFW meeting on April 30, 2015.

Housing Re-Pricing Proposal

CP/EVC Galloway has requested CFW's comment on the annual Employee Housing Program: 2015-2016 Resale Pricing Program Recommendation. Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES) is recommending an increase of 1.58%. While the recommended increase fits the parameters of affordability for junior level faculty, the proposal does not clearly state the need for the increase and what the incurred fees will be used for. CFW reviewed the proposal in order to determine if there is sufficient information provided to justify the proposed increase and considered a committee response.

On March 11, 2015, the CFW Housing Subcommittee met to review the proposal. The immediate issue is the proposed 1.58% increase in pricing. CFW has raised questions previously when increases were proposed and pushed back on the proposal last year when a 2.5% increase was proposed. CFW did not recommend the proposal last year, but CP/EVC approved it with the condition that questions and suggestions that CFW made in their response were addressed prior to a request for further increases. Members of the subcommittee felt that more information was needed in order to assess the current proposal, and sent an informal request to Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services Director, Steve Houser. On April 5, 2015, Houser replied, and the Subcommittee has since sent another request for further clarification.

Subcommittee members reported that the Repricing Program is a way of covering costs that in a different system, the University would simply cover. The program covers renovations and carrying costs. Subcommittee members would like to see more transparency regarding how the % increases are determined. Members previously believed that the proposed increase was largely linked to an increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI), but recently found that this is not the case. The current proposal clearly states how "affordability" is determined, but does not say how the 1.58% is derived. Houser has informed the Subcommittee that there are a number of factors taken into account, but Subcommittee members would like to know what these factors are, and are therefore asking for more information. CFW wants to be confident that the buying power of a new

Assistant Professor is not being eroded over time. Houser claims that it is not, but CFW would like to see the metrics that make this clear.

The program has evolved since its formation in 2007. The Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) loan rate is currently low, but new participants cannot get the low rate due to new UC wide policies. Faculty on campus use to be able to get a 40 year mortgage, now it is a 30 year mortgage.

Subcommittee members reported that Houser stated that the availability of down payments are more important than price. CFW has discussed this in previous meetings, and questioned whether all new faculty on campus receive housing bonuses when hired. The committee now questioned what should be done to ensure that all new hires have access to housing bonuses so that they can purchase a home if so desired.

Members noted that campus housing services a very small number of faculty. A suggestion was made that CFW consider what it is that the committee wants to push hard on. For instance, the committee could recommend that housing bonuses are given to all faculty so that they can determine where they want to live and could request that UCFW attempt to push to bring the 40 year MOP loan back. Chair Zachos noted that UCFW has discussed the program in the past and appeared to be open to more aggressive MOP loans. Members feel it might be more effective to work on policies that affect the largest number of faculty possible. When CFW consulted with CP/EVC Galloway on April 2, 2015, Galloway stated that she would look into the policy and the campus practice of providing housing bonuses and will get back to the committee. At the time, she stated that she believed that all divisions except Humanities is providing housing bonuses, but indicated that this trend may change.

Subcommittee members asked Houser to clarify whether or not the Repricing Program is accumulating a balance. If it is, then CFW plans to determine what should be done with this balance. This opens up a broader question as to the future of campus housing and whether or not the university should be creating new housing inventory, such as Ranch View Terrace, Phase II. Last year in consultation, CP/EVC Galloway informed CFW that there may be a possibility of building off campus, but in the latest consultation, stated that the site that they were interested in is already being developed by another party. Members question what will happen in the coming years with a huge wave of projected retirements and new hires and whether the wait lists for campus housing will get longer. If there is a revenue stream from Repricing, CFW would like to determine what the best use of these funds might be.

CFW considered generating a packet for all departments containing housing options for faculty that mentions housing bonuses. One member questioned whether it might be more appropriate for Faculty/Staff Housing to create such a packet, but another suggested that they may not be able to inform faculty on policies and practices that may lie at the dean level.

After the Subcommittee hears back from Houser, they will look at the new info and review the issues and concerns raised in CFW's response to the proposed Repricing increases last year (4/22/14) to discern whether or not the concerns still have merit. The Subcommittee is also

working with Houser to create an easily understandable information packet regarding the Repricing program and how % increases are determined in order to aid future CFW committees in assessing the program. The CFW Housing Subcommittee and CFW as a whole, would like to work collaboratively with Houser to determine a set of guiding principles for the Repricing Program that may further assist future CFW committees in the assessment and re-evaluation of the program which they should be doing every year. These principles may be in addition to the original goals and objectives of the program, which CFW is also revisiting this year in order to determine whether they are relevant.

CFW will continue this discussion at the next committee meeting on April 30, 2015, will respond to the CP/EVC regarding the proposed Repricing increase, and will then continue their analysis of the Repricing Program. Members noted that the proposed % increase may appear reasonable, but they would like more clarity and transparency regarding its justification.