

**Minutes**  
**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**Meeting of January 7, 2015**

**Present:** Shelly Grabe, Melissa Gwyn, Ted Holman, Andrew Mathews, Grant McGuire, Ricardo Sanfelice, Nina Treadwell, James Zachos (Chair), Shelly Errington (ex officio), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

**Chair Announcements**

CFW welcomed new member Melissa Gwyn (ART) who will be joining CFW for the winter quarter and served as the faculty member at large on the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) in 2010, and returning member Nina Treadwell (Music), who served on CFW in 2014-15.

*Update from the UCFW meeting of December 11, 2015 - Retirement Options Task Force Report*  
Chair Zachos reported on the latest meeting of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), of which he was unable to attend, but has received a second hand report. A key issue discussed was the timing of the Retirement Options Task Force report on the new third tier of UC retirement, which is due to be released on January 15<sup>th</sup> along with the President's recommendation. Systemwide committees will be provided an opportunity to comment on the report with a deadline of February 15, 2016. There is concern that this window does not provide enough time for formal responses. UCFW will be meeting remotely on January 8<sup>th</sup> and in a few weeks in order to generate a response. Once released, Chair Zachos will distribute the report to CFW members for comment, and will take those comments to UCFW for consideration in their response.

Chair Zachos noted that the third tier of the UC Retirement Program (UCRP) as a result of agreements made between Governor Brown and President Napolitano is a given and the nuts and bolts of the program are being figured out. Chair Zachos added that the bigger issue for UC with regards to retirement will be the University's ability to hire and retain faculty. Further the health of UCRP in general is in jeopardy as there is currently a large amount of unfunded liability, and placing new members in a full or partial defined contribution plan (dc plan) will lesson payments made into UCRP once current participants in the plan retire and further increase the unfunded liability. Members noted that the long term stability of UCRP will rely on new money from new faculty. Therefore the issue of the new tier effects all, and not just new faculty.

CFW members considered whether there is a need to publicize what is happening with the retirement program on campus by way of a forum, Senate meeting presentation, etc. Chair Zachos will bring the topic up at the next meeting of the Senate Executive Committee for consideration.

*Update from the ACCTP Meeting of December 17, 2015 – Member Matthews Reports*

Member Mathews provided members with a report on the agenda items discussed at the last Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) meeting. Unfortunately, the room was locked when he and another representative arrived for the meeting and their knocks were not heard so he was unable to attend. However, Mathews reported that the agenda was an ambitious one with goals set out for the year. There was a large document on the principles of campus parking. All agenda items were focused on transparency and sustainability and did not include key faculty welfare concerns such as the effect of higher parking costs for faculty, etc.

Concern was raised by CFW members that the long enclosures and packed agenda for the ACCTP meetings may prevent members from substantially weighing in on the issues, and that meeting materials may be skewed for desired results.

CFW briefly discussed the costs and investment associated with building parking structures and the need for accessible parking for faculty. Member Melissa Gwyn offered to serve as a second CFW representative on ACCTP for the winter quarter.

### **CFW 2015-16 Goals and Senate Meeting Action Plan**

CFW reviewed and finalized an action plan for reaching desired goals for the February 12, 2016 Senate meeting and beyond.

CFW considered commenting on trends in terms of new hires and on campus housing availability and may consult with Director of Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES) Steve Houser to see what can be set in place to have the building of Ranch View Terrace II ready to go when the campus is ready and the economy is right. Chair Zachos further suggested that CFW could provide Senate faculty with an update of the pool of funds generated by the Repricing Program for increasing housing inventory and remind the camps about the intended purpose of these funds.

A suggestion was made to look at the data of Ranch View I (RVTI) and how many owners of campus housing moved over to the new homes as an indicator of how the houses were used and to determine if there is a need for Ranch View II. Members noted that the campus should not build more inventory if the demand is not there and understanding RVTI along with a look at the current wait list, may provide insight on the need for RVT2. CFW may request additional information from Faculty and Staff Housing to determine this need annually.

### **Partner Hire Resource List**

In order to ensure appropriate infrastructure to support and manage the list, CFW considered a draft guidelines document for a proposed partner hire resource list, which when finalized will then be sent to the CP/EVC for consideration. Once the CP/EVC approves the guidelines, the information will be sent to divisional deans to encourage faculty participation on the list. The guidelines suggest that the list of faculty partners who are willing to speak with new faculty spouses/partners regarding employment and career fields in Santa Cruz, should be housed on a new faculty webpage created and managed by the Academic Personnel Office (APO). This project may trail into 2015-16, and although the guidelines call for an annual call to be sent by APO, some CFW members noted their willingness to attend department meetings to advertise the resource and encourage participation.

### **Faculty Salaries – UCOP Comprehensive Systemwide Salary Data**

After receipt of the campus comparison data from the Office of the President, the CFW faculty salary subcommittee began its analysis. The full committee received a summary of findings from

the subcommittee in meeting, and considered next steps towards sharing the analysis with Senate faculty at the February Senate Meeting.

The subcommittee is using some of the same metrics that were used by CFW last year. Chair Zachos noted that the disparity between UC campuses in recent years comes mainly out of the use of off-scale salaries. The initial analysis indicates that UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles have significantly increased their off-scale amounts in the last three year, this coinciding with the recent removal of off-scale limits in the UC Academic Personnel Manual.

The UCSC Merit Boost Plan was instigated to increase campus off-scale salaries. CFW do further analysis to determine whether the plan is doing enough to keep up with sister campuses.

Concern was raised regarding salary compression on campus where new Assistant Professors hired at competitive market rates are making the same or more as more senior faculty hired previously. Members note that there is not currently a formal mechanism other than retention offers to address this problem and it tends to be a recurring and increasing trend. There Merit Boost Plan is being applied across all ranks and steps, and does not address these compression issues.

A suggestion was made to request data on when faculty received boosts and their years and rank in the system and off-scale amount, however this may be difficult or impossible to acquire due to confidentiality, etc.

Members discussed the need for more transparency regarding personnel reviews in the departments. A suggestion was made that knowing how the department recommendation compared to the final decision may assist department with further personnel review recommendations.

For the February Senate meeting, CFW will look at the UCSC median salary compared to the UC median, and off-scale amounts across the ranks. CFW will also want to report on whether UCSC's median has risen to the desired second tier of coastal campuses, which include UC Santa Barbara (UCB), and UC San Diego (UCSD). CFW may perform a cost of living analysis and campus comparison later this year in order to make the case for salaries similar to UCB and UCSD clear.

The committee will also make recommendations on the Merit Boost Plan, whether it should be continued, and perhaps adapted or increased. The committee will request that campus data on the number of years at each step in order to assess impacts of the Merit Boost Plan and to determine if last year's trend of artificial rates of promotion continue.