

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
March 3, 2016
61 Kerr

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

Absent with Notice: Shelly Errington (*ex officio*)

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

CFW Consultation with CP/EVC – April 14, 2016

CFW has requested an informal meeting with Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) Alison Galloway to discuss how the campus can move forward with securing childcare for employees. CFW would like to know if she feels that CFW is facing an uphill battle, and/or if childcare is a priority for the campus and administration. CFW is seeking the CP/EVC's advice as a colleague who is leaving her post as CP/EVC rather than as a campus administrator. Chair Zachos will send an informal email to CP/EVC Galloway to let her know what the committee is looking forward to discussing.

Members discussed the campus money currently being set aside for childcare and questioned how long the funds can be protected from being reallocated. CFW will need to think around potential road blocks to employee childcare and may want to consider and make a recommendation on what the set aside funds may be used for.

Update from the Senate Executive Meeting of February 23, 2016

Chair Zachos reported that Senate Executive Committee (SEC) members discussed the recent proposal from Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Richard Hughey to adjust course time slots. This topic was discussed in length during the Academic Senate meeting of February 12, 2016. The proposal includes an overall 25% reduction of class time and is being looked at in comparison to other UC campuses that have less teaching per credit hour than the UCSC campus. Chair Zachos noted that with the proposed reduction, UCSC is getting closer to the UC teaching per credit average. CFW members considered what the impact would be for faculty and how teaching more than colleagues on sister campuses could possibly be seen as a disadvantage. CFW further questioned whether section times would also be augmented if the proposal was adopted.

SEC also discussed college core courses and writing requirements, as well as course evaluations. Core courses and writing requirements have been handled by the individual colleges in the past, but there has been a movement to create a uniform program. The colleges appear to be pushing back on this.

The campus is looking to make improvements to course evaluations by creating a standard set of questions for all courses followed by a set of questions that may be tailored by each department. CFW may want to weigh in on the process in the future as the design of course evaluations strongly impacts responses, and hence merit reviews.

Update from the Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) meetings of February 23 and March 1, 2016

The CFW ACCTP representative informed CFW that there will inevitably be a 10% increase in parking permits fees for the next 3 years, depending on the type of permit. Guest parking will also eventually go up in a few years from \$4 to \$5. For the last nine years, permit cost increases have been minimal, partially due to faculty and staff cohorts who have argued that there have been no pay increases that would equal these increases in costs. The CFW representative reported that due to this period of no increases, there is now a crisis and a large 10% increase is needed. The CFW representative suggested that some of the need may be attributed to the anticipation of paying for a new parking structure by Social Sciences, which is a costly project. CFW noted that this is a three year projection, but there are no assurances that this 10% increase will not continue past 3 years.

The representative noted that there have been some small remedies that TAPS has come up with to increase efficiencies such as repairing equipment and vans, and possibly charging for parking at 2300 Delaware. In addition, TAPS Director, Larry Pageler, is confident that TAPS will soon have a way to provide surveillance of parking through license plates instead of hanging permits, which will prevent less fraud with scratch off permits. The CFW would like to craft a few sentences to contribute to the TAPS guiding principles that the ACCTP has been reviewing to include service and how improved service will be tied to greater costs. "Service" would include how parking spaces are used on campus and customer relations through the TAPS website and personnel. CFW questioned whether there was a plan in place to re-evaluate the amount subsidized for TAPS programs before parking fees are increased again.

Chair Zachos suggested that the 10% increase is roughly across the board for most long-term permits and that budgetary basis for such an increase should be clear. It is unknown as to whether TAPS is currently running a deficit, and CFW members noted that it would be useful to know specifically what the additional funding will cover, be it deficit, new projects, normal costs, etc. The CFW representative noted that there is a fair amount of debt service that must be covered. Chair Zachos questioned as to whether there is a total sum target after three years, and questioned whether the increase could be spaced out differently, for instance a 3% increase for 10 years, vs. a 10% increase for 3 years. CFW members questioned whether all public universities charge for parking. A comment was made that the State will not pay for parking related expenses for the University of California.

The ACCTP has noted that housing costs go up roughly 3% a year, and TAPS may get on a similar program so that there are not years of unusually large increases in the future. A suggestion was made at the ACCTP to tier parking fees relative to salaries. The CFW representative reported that TAPS is willing to consider this, but that may mean that faculty and students would be paying more than a 10% increase.

Members recognized due to the remoteness of the UCSC campus, more people have to drive and there are not many alternate options. Members assume that if the bus system on campus could be more efficient, more people might take the bus. The committee questioned whether the large UCSC ridership on the Metro buses could push to have apps put in place noting the arrival times of busses. CFW has been told in the past that Metro unions are against such an app, however, CFW considered creating a survey of faculty asking whether they would take the bus more if there was an app showing the arrival time in order to make a recommendation of the app and see if it gets any traction. Members noted that there are still issues with overcrowded/full buses. The committee then revisited the idea of having the Metro buses stop at only a few stops on campus and not at the remote parking so that the buses are used mainly for trips to and from campus, and not for inter campus commuting. Members assume that this would decrease the Metro costs to campus and prevent off campus buses from filling up with inter campus commuters.

Systemwide Review of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate

CFW has been invited to comment on the report of a presidential task force charged with examining how the University manages disciplinary proceedings for faculty respondents in cases alleging sexual violence, sexual assault, or sexual harassment following recent updates to policies on sexual violence and harassment.

Members reviewed the report and CFW's response to the recently updated Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment. Chair Zachos pointed out that the management of disciplinary proceedings for faculty respondents is a CFW issue. Members noted that there are clear rules about conduct in the APM faculty code of conduct and expressed that although all campuses have established clear reporting for these issues, not many people know what the procedures are and what to report.

Concerns were raised about the mandate for "responsible employees" to report situations of which they are made privy, and of students coming in to discuss issues with a faculty member and the faculty member having to report against the student's consent. One member noted that experts in trauma are stating that violating confidentiality is not the way to deal with these issues and other campuses outside of UC are interpreting the role of a "responsible employee" differently than the UC. Members assume that the reason for this mandate is to protect the individual as well as the institution. Members recognized that the university wants to keep data on how many cases there are and find repeat offenders and are attempting to do so while keeping confidentiality in tack. A concern was raised about faculty being punished for not reporting incidents. One member noted that in some disciplines class content focuses on gender and power and reports are received on a daily basis. Members also questioned as to whether reports from off campus including domestic violence need to be reported, and questioned how the mandate will affect student to faculty relationships.

One member shared that the Title IX Office made a presentation at a department, and it created more confusion than was present prior to the presentation. The member suggested that some faculty did not understand what it meant to be a “responsible employee”, what was confidential or not, and what counts as a report. Members noted that there are a lot of grey areas surrounding the topic and education is needed.

In the committee’s response to the report, CFW will note that in general, it appears that the Joint Committee was relatively thorough in its evaluation of the SVSH policy as it relates to faculty and APM Faculty Code of Conduct. Members feel that the recommendations are generally sound. Still, CFW raised several concerns about the requirement for “responsible employees” to report incidents shared with them and the potential for the disciplinary process to be intertwined into the personnel review process. The committee will note the critical need for outreach and education on the UC campuses with regards to requirements and available resources.

The new legislation, and interim and proposed UC processes for addressing SVSH, affect faculty welfare on many levels. The response will emphasize that CFW members raised concerns about the possible negative effect that the “responsible employee” requirement to report all incidents shared and the need to tell students (in particular) up front that all information shared will be reported, will have on faculty/student relations. Members are additionally concerned that the requirement to report may discourage complainants from seeking counsel or help. To counter potential negative effects of this requirement, CFW concurs with the report recommendations that targeted outreach focused on educating faculty and staff about requirements, available resources, and procedures is needed in order to enable them to be advocates and not just reporters of incidents. CFW members agreed that outreach and education are key if the new process is to work effectively and aid the complainant instead of hinder them.

CFW is further concerned about the Joint Committee’s recommendation to include misconduct in the personnel review process in section F of the report, which follows suggestions for changes to AMP 015 and 016. CFW will emphasize that according to APM 016, the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline, the disciplinary and personnel review processes are two distinct and separate processes except when the misconduct is directly relevant to the academic advancement process for the faculty member. (APM 016.2.3) Including SVSH misconduct in the review of merit and promotion cases would significantly alter both of these established processes, and may open the University up to litigations particularly for respondents who are on call during an active SVSH investigation. Further, inclusion of misconduct in personnel review files that are reviewed by several layers of collegial committees (department, CAP, *ad hoc* committee, etc.) would create a host of issues with regards to confidentiality.

CFW noted that the personnel review process is based on the evaluation of teaching, research, and service, and not on conduct. Members agreed that there is already an established disciplinary process that deals with misconduct, and as such, there is no need to include misconduct in personnel reviews. The potential effects of including misconduct in personnel reviews should be

evaluated in detail by the administration and legal counsel before potential proposed changes to APM 015 and 016 are sent for systemwide review. However, CFW will strongly recommend that the disciplinary and personnel review process remain separate processes.

CFW Survey of Faculty

This discussion was postponed until the next meeting due to time constraints.