Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of April 28, 2016

Present: Karen Bassi, Shelly Grabe, Ted Holman, Andrew Mathews (Chair *pro tem*), Grant McGuire, Ricardo Sanfelice, Nina Treadwell, Shelly Errington (*ex officio*), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: Jim Zachos (Chair)

Chair Announcements and Committee Business
CFW member Andew Mathews served as Chair pro tem for this meeting.

Consideration of the Meeting Minutes from February 4 and February 18, 2016
The minutes under consideration were approved by the committee.

Update from the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting of April 26, 2016
Member Ted Holman attended the SEC meeting in Chair Zachos's absence and reported back to the committee. SEC received a report that the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), the CP/EVC, and the Chancellor met to discuss the assignment of FTEs and would like to make the process more transparent. Apparently divisional deans are resistant to this. CFW members commented that some divisions are more transparent than others and agree that it would be good to make this more consistent. Member Holman reported that CPB would like to see the distribution of these FTEs more data driven and have transparency around whether they are being assigned due to enrollments, budget, etc.

SEC discussed the mandate for each UC campus to take in an additional cohort of new students. Concerns were raised about the campus's preparedness for the increase as apparently the new students are interested in majors that are already highly impacted. Holman also reported that the campus is looking for a new system to replace E-commons, which is no longer supported.

Graduate Council (GC) raised concerns at SEC that the Rebenching goals for graduate student increases are unrealistic. The goal set by the Office of the President (UCOP) are a moving target based on a percentage of total enrollment, which, with the current mandate, is constantly increasing. Apparently UCOP does not count master students towards this goal, but the UCSC campus is pushing to have these registered students included in the total.

Member Holman shared a summary of CFW's recent consultation with the CP/EVC on the new UCOP building funding model. He also raised the idea of having Senate faculty continuity on important topics such as childcare and housing, where members would act as a faculty informants and representatives on such topics for multiple years in order to retain a sense of institutional topical knowledge for the Senate. The Senate Chair noted that SEC would consider the idea.

Brief Update from the ACCTP Meeting of April 26, 2016
The CFW ACCTP representative reported that the ACCTP has been discussing Metro bus and campus transportation. Apparently Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) has a $2.5 million cumulative deficit because they are paying for both on and off campus transit. The Metro will be

reducing its bus routes in town and to campus. The CFW representative noted that UCSC students and employees are the largest cohort of Metro bus users in town. TAPS recognizes that the cuts in service will be made to routes less utilized, such as those to Watsonville, although these are some of the routes that are most needed. ACCTP members were informed that public transportation gets 20% of its costs covered by fares. This apparently is the average level of user costs vs. subsidy, and taxes may cover the rest. The amount of taxes from sales tax, etc. has not recovered since the recession, and the county is being forced to cut overall Metro services by roughly 14% to routes that our heavily utilized by campus cohorts and to 25% of Metro routes overall.

CFW members raised concerns about these cuts and noted that due to other cuts in the past, service routes already seem to be bare bones. A suggestion was made that with reduced service, this would be an opportune time to require that the Metro adopt bus tracking apps so that users may know when buses are coming and going. Members question whether a ride app such as this could possibly reduce the need for night owl shuttle services which tend to be expensive and have low ridership on campus.

Members noted that the cost of bus passes is steadily increasing although services are being reduced. CFW has questioned whether reducing Metro service stops on campus and increasing campus shuttle services might save the campus money as the campus pays for every ride taken by a campus affiliate on a Metro bus. However, the CFW representative shared that the cost for passengers to ride on a campus shuttle vs. on the Metro bus is relatively the same ($1.39 per ride) due to old campus shuttles that can only accommodate a small number of riders.

The UCSC community has been provided the opportunity to comment on the TAPS fee increase proposal. One member shared that the "reply" email address went directly to the CP/EVC, which discouraged him/her from sharing comments. Members expressed a high level of concern that the lack of a neutral address will discourage community members from sharing their concerns and thoughts, and may appear to some that the request for feedback is not genuine.

Health Care Update - Vendor Changes for Blue Shield Medical Plans
CFW discussed the recent announcement that Anthem Blue Cross will be replacing Blue Shield of California as the medical claims administrator and network provider for UC Care, Health Savings Plan, Core, Medicare PPO, and High Option Supplement to Medicare. In addition, mental health will also be covered by Anthem Blue Cross, replacing the current Optum provider. Optum will still cover pharmacy services. Members noted that it is still unclear as to whether Blue Cross will provide UCSC employees with access to the Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) as Blue Shield does. Members emphasized the need for this access due to the low number of providers in town with the alternate Physicians Medical Group (PMG) and the lack of Kaiser in the area. It is unknown what effect this change will have on premium costs during the next open enrollment. CFW members will encourage the CFW Chair to continue to voice the unique UCSC health care

concerns during UCFW discussions, particularly with regards to the necessity of having PAMF access.

CFW Faculty Salary Analysis Update
The committee was provided with a progress report from the CFW Faculty Salary Subcommittee, including information on the current data set and the metrics that will be used for the last phases of CFW's analysis. The subcommittee reported that they have been provided with the CFW analysis code that was used in 2012 as well as the data that was used that year in their analysis. Apparently CFW had more data to work with in 2012, but the subcommittee is confident that this year's CFW can still accomplish most of what it set out to do, including looking at inversion and compression by division and department. The main thing that this year's committee is looking at is how off-scale salaries have changed by rank and step over time.

One member questioned whether there is data on gender which may be an important factor. CFW noted that a campus salary equity study was done last year, and there are still concerns raised in the report that are not yet being addressed. Members considered whether they could ask for this additional information including information on ethnicity from the Academic Personnel Office (APO). If made available, the committee could look at it and evaluate it in 2016-17.

Members agree that a big factor in salary disparities appear to be related to retention offers which cause big bumps in off-scale. The Faculty Salary Subcommittee noted that the previous data set in 2012 had a column that noted whether a retention offer was made and for how much. CFW would like to have this information for the current data set. CFW may draft a request for additional data/information to APO.

Housing Repricing Proposal
CP/EVC Galloway has requested CFW's review and comment on the UCSC Re-Pricing Program Recommendation for 2016-2017. Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES) is recommending an increase of 1.55%. A CFW member charged with monitoring faculty housing provided the committee with historical context for the campus housing program, noting that the program serves as an intermediary between the buyer and seller, handles all renovations of units, and sets the cost of units based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI), new faculty salary averages, and loan rates, with a goal of making it easy for faculty to sell and buy off campus so that there is enough turnover for new faculty on campus.

Members noted that the wait list to purchase housing varies and is currently getting longer, and recognized that whether on campus housing is used for short or long term depends heavily on the outside market. CFW also discussed the renovations made to units and noted that the cost to do the work on campus is higher than it would be off campus due to union contracts. A member questioned whether the campus has any data on how many potential hires turn down offers to do cost of living in Santa Cruz. Other members agreed that this would be helpful information to know and note that this may be a bigger issue for staff.

Overall, CFW approves of the proposed increases, and notes that the housing program is effectively serving the majority of its intended goals.

During the 2014-15 academic year, CFW worked closely with Steve Houser, Director of Capital Planning and Employee Housing at CHES to improve the transparency of the Re-Pricing program and highlight the need for Re-Pricing increases in the annual recommendation packets. As a result of these collaborative discussions, CFW is pleased to find that this year's proposal includes additional graphs on program inventory and revenue, and housing costs vs. new hire monthly income that will assist all levels of review of this proposal. However, the committee noted that the factors used to determine the need and level of an increase are still not clearly stated in the recommendation.

Last year, CFW questioned the formula used to calculate proposed percent increases and were informed by Director Houser that there was not a clear cut formula, but that many factors and trends affect the need for an increase. CFW then requested that a spreadsheet be included in the Re-Pricing program recommendation packet that lists all possible factors (such as hiring trends, waitlists, unsold units, construction costs, housing dues, etc.) ranked by weight for each year, and includes a brief explanation for why they are important. Although this year's proposed increase is modest, members agreed that inclusion of this spreadsheet (as previously requested) would have shed light on how the percent increase was determined and would have greatly assisted reviewers in the assessment of this proposal. In its response to this proposal, CFW will request that future Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendations include this spreadsheet as an attachment. Also, for a more realistic market comparison, CFW would like to see inclusion of homes within a 10 mile radius of campus in computing the median home price, not just the upper West Side.

With regards to the Introduction/Program History provided in the proposal, CFW noted that the text emphasizes the use of Low Interest Option Supplemental Home Loan Program (LIO-SHLP) loans to increase unit turnover and assist faculty in purchasing homes off campus. Although this may have been a realistic solution in the early days of the program, the LIO-SHLP program is now rarely used for reasons that remain unclear, and so listing this as a viable "solution" is somewhat of a misrepresentation. With the large new faculty cohort that is expected in the next 7-10 years, CFW would like to emphasize not only the need to increase campus housing inventory (e.g. break ground on Ranch View Terrace II), but the need for the CHES to consider additional ways to encourage unit turnover other than the LIO-SHLP program. Next year's recommendation packet should note that the LIO-SHLP was initially used to increase turnover, but explain why use has dropped off, and what alternatives might be exist.