

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of February 4, 2016

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

Absent with Notice: Nina Treadwell, Shelly Errington (*ex officio*)

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed and approved the draft minutes from the meetings of November 5, 2015, October 8, 2015, and October 22, 2015.

Update from the SEC Meeting of January 26, 2016

Chair Zachos provided members with an update from the January 26, 2016 meeting of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). SEC members received a report from the Alumni Council, which is attempting to improve contacts with alumni to establish resources for the campus. CFW members noted that local alumni may be able to assist graduates in finding employment in the area.

SEC also received an update on international enrollments. The campus is still struggling to reach its enrollment targets. The Committee on International Education (CIE) was hoping to receive a report from the former Special Advisor to the Chancellor on International Affairs, Anu Luther last year as promised, but has not yet received a report.

SEC members discussed the report of the Retirement Options Task Force. The committee decided not to host a town hall meeting to discuss issues raised in the report. However, there will be an opportunity to discuss the report and its possible implications at the upcoming Senate meeting on February 12, 2016. Chair Zachos and Chair Rodriguez of the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) have been asked to facilitate a discussion on the topic.

Update from the CFW/CAAD/CAP Chair Meeting of January 29, 2016

Chair Zachos reported that he met with the chairs of the Committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), and Academic Personnel (CAP) to discuss inequities in faculty salaries and the campus's follow up to last year's report on UCSC Faculty Salary Equity. The meeting was called by Chair Miriam Greenberg of CAAD, who with her committee, is looking at campus family friendly policies, including childcare. The parties also discussed the merit review process including the potential bias associated with student evaluations in the process (of which CAP is aware), and the inequities between departments with regards to promotion growth and median salary growth. Chair Zachos noted that these are all CFW issues.

CAP Chair Lyndy Dean suggested that there is a need for transparency in how starting salaries are offered across divisions. CAP recently followed up on a request to the CP/EVC that CAP made a few years ago to provide divisional deans with a quarterly report of starting salaries that were being provided on campus. The response that CAP received was that the information is available and deans may request to see it if they like. A few members noted that sharing hiring data might improve overall equity on campus.

The root cause of inequities between departments with regards to promotion growth and median salary growth was discussed. Some CFW members noted that the inequities between programs are simply related to market factors. Other members questioned whether the inequities are “cultural”, at either the department or divisional level. Some departments are more aggressive with recommendations. It was noted that one benefit of a campus wide CAP (as opposed to divisional CAPSs) is that the committee does tend to act as a filter, adjusting recommendations in cases where the department or dean recommendations are deemed inadequate or overly generous given the relative strength of a file. Some members noted how the process of merit reviews can vary between departments and divisions and how this might be addressed to ensure a more thorough and fair process. One suggestion was for training of department chairs on the process of personnel reviews and drafting of departmental letters for review files so as to emphasize those metrics that CAP and other reviewing bodies weigh in their assessment.

CFW members considered what the committee could do to assist. A suggestion was made to present data or a slide at a Senate meeting showing disagreements between CAP and divisional recommendations. However, it was noted that the CAP 2014-15 Annual Report will already be included in the next Senate Call and contains statistics on disagreements with dean final authorities. Members noted the need for faculty of all departments to be made aware of the results of each file so that the departmental culture surrounding personnel reviews could change if needed. CFW may look at the CAP statistics with regards to disagreements with final deciding authorities at a future meeting.

ACCTP

CFW received an update from the January 26, 2016 meeting of the Advisory Committee on Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) from a CFW representative on the committee. The meeting included presentation and review of the general guiding principles of Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) being considered by the ACCTP, as well as a cost/benefit presentation by TAPS on campus parking spaces in terms of lots and structures with regards to costs of creation and annual maintenance. When guidelines were discussed, the CFW member questioned what users get in terms of service vs. cost. The question was met by a staff member who addressed the question as it relates to efficiency.

Following the TAPS cost vs. benefit presentation, questions arose regarding how some programs such as the Bike Shuttle cost over \$200k/year and are listed as having revenue, but is actually fully funded/subsidized by parking permits, and does not bring in revenue. The latest TAPS survey showed that Bike Shuttle only reduces 35 parking spaces per day although there are roughly 100 riders each day. Most riders who were polled indicated that if they did not take the shuttle, they would take the bus. CFW has raised concerns in the past about the Bike Shuttle being mostly used by students, yet not funded by student funds. The CFW representative informed CFW that the Bike Shuttle will be an ongoing conversation for the ACCTP, however this does raise the issue about transparency of costs which has been discussed in the ACCTP. A suggestion was made

during the ACCTP meeting that parking permit receipts list every cost and revenue associated with the TAPS programs and the parking fee, similar to when customers purchase an airline ticket.

CFW members briefly revisited the need for an app to track bus routes and bus arrival times in order to encourage faculty to use the bus more frequently. Members noted that if faculty knew when a bus would arrive at stop, they may be encouraged to use the bus more often. CFW has been informed in the past by the CP/EVC that the Metro Union is against such an app for the fear that it may be used in driver performance evaluations. CFW members noted that apps such as these are being used in many cities in California and around the country with no problem. CFW may continue to raise this need for such an app in order to increase ridership with faculty and students and improve transportation on and off campus.

One of the newly determined guiding principles of TAPS is transparency. An ACCTP committee lead is trying to focus on clarity of the information and is attempting to provide clear explanations to members. There was an opportunity to express issues of concerns from member cohorts. The CFW representative expressed concern about the income disparities in the UC system and CFW concerns about the Metro bus that stops at the East Remote Parking Lot and picks up a large cohort of inter campus only commuters. The representative was informed that this particular bus stop is geared to be eliminated in fall 2016.

The CFW representative approached TAPS Director Larry Pageler after the meeting and inquired about the new parking garage planned for SOCSi 2. Apparently it is not clear what is happening with this project. CFW members noted that new parking structures have infrastructure costs that need to be paid for and the analysis and presentations that are occurring in the ACCTP appear to be to support parking increases that will be used to cover these costs.

CFW would like to determine a set of faculty priorities with regards to parking that TAPS may take into consideration. Members assume, even without a survey, that access would be high on the list. A suggestion was made that employees should have access to lots closer to buildings and student could pay to park in another lot. Members believe this may have been the case on campus years ago. In addition, A and B lots have been combined, however the CFW ACCTP representative informed the committee that TAPS has plans to end the B parking permit program. At some other universities, patrons have to pay more to park closer to buildings and there are often wait lists. CFW noted that many students on campus have cars and appear to have no problem paying for permits and driving themselves. Chair Zachos emphasized that paying for parking creates an equity issue for employees with children who need quick access on and off campus.

CFW will consider a possible poll of UCSC faculty on transportation priorities during a future committee meeting and plans to write to VCBAS Sarah Latham, the Chair of the ACCTP, to request budget summaries in meeting materials in addition to complex spreadsheets for easier interpretation by members.

Retirement Options Task Force Report (Continued Discussion)

Chair Zachos provided the committee with updates from the retirement discussions at the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting of last week, and the Senate Executive Committee meeting of January 26, 2016.

Although CFW has already provided its comments to Chair Brenneis for the divisional response, feedback regarding the retirement options is still coming in from the various constituents. Several modifications and additional options have been proposed by UCFW and other Senate committees, which CFW can weigh in on via the UCFW response. Additionally, UCFW is expecting estimates of the impacts of the proposed plans on Total Remuneration by February 1, 2016. Chair Zachos will forward this additional information to members via email as soon as it is made available.

Chair Zachos noted that overall, the feedback regarding the report has been visceral and one UCSC Senate committee responded that they do not accept the options explored and pointed out obvious negative impacts on the overall quality of the University. Chair Zachos reported that UCFW is working under the assumption that the third tier of retirement is a given and is trying to think about other possibilities such as a defined contribution (DC) being implemented at the time of hire with a minimum of a 3% contribution, or a 6% contribution to be equivalent to the 2013 defined benefit (DB) plan. Of all the recommendations made, this one deviated the most from what the Task Force recommended. There have also been discussions of prefunding retiree healthcare and other benefits. Chair Zachos noted that a request has been made to share this report with staff and administrators as changes to the retirement plan will affect everyone in the UC community.

CFW members noted that many faculty who begin in their mid-thirties would not have enough time to build up enough equity with a DC plan in order to retire. Members noted that this is why it is so important to stress to the UC President and the Legislature that the DB plan is essential to recruit and retain faculty and attain retirement readiness.

Chair Zachos reported that the UCSC divisional response has been drafted and recommends that the adoption of the new tier be put off until the impacts of such a change may be fully explored. UCFW wants to see the impact on total remuneration for the new faculty cohort and members noted that salary projections will be needed for this analysis.

CFW considered how the new tier will affect the UC campuses and raised concerns about the new tier hitting campuses unequally. Members noted that UCSC has an expected 30% turn over in the next 7-10 years and with a large new faculty cohort, members worry that total remuneration for the campus as a whole will be below that of other campuses, and with limited endowment funds, may not be able to better compensate faculty and staff salaries to offset the reduced benefit. Members recognized that the current retirement plan is one of the main attractions for faculty to work and stay with the UC system. Members are concerned that even if the new tier does not affect recruitment, that it may greatly affect more senior faculty who if offered more money from an outside university, may be tempted to leave without a DB plan.

This issue will be discussed in detail during the Academic Senate Meeting on February 12, 2016. The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) Chair and CFW Chair have put together some slides to get the conversation started.

CFW Senate Meeting Presentation

CFW finalized oral presentation details for the Academic Senate meeting on Friday, February 12, 2016.