

**Minutes**  
**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**Meeting of May 12, 2016**

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

**Chair Announcements and Committee Business**

*Update from the SEC Meeting of May 10, 2016*

Chair Zachos reported that the SEC meeting of May 10, 2016 was dominated by the issue of capacity management. The mandate to accept roughly 500 additional students in fall 2016 will have large scale impacts on classroom space, housing, and majors at UC Santa Cruz. With regards to majors, after fall 2016, the campus is considering gating students at admissions for certain majors based on academic variables that have led to success for previous students (metrics for success). Some students who are several years into their major and are struggling, might have benefitted from better guidance on choice of another major in their first year. Chair Zachos added that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has extensive data on student demographics and success, and is using this to advise the campus. CFW members noted that other universities such as Cal Poly San Luis Obispo already do this.

CFW considered the pros and cons of a gating mechanism. Members noted that in STEM, there are students who are not prepared for the major, and this may be amplified with the new larger cohort of students. Members noted that the campus could be more proactive based on statistics, experience, and metrics, and recommend that some of these students consider another major. However, a suggestion was made that students are underprepared for a reason and if they do not get assistance, they may be tracked for life and gating majors may institutionalize this problem. Another member questioned whether such a gating practice was ethical. All members recognized a need for more advising and mentorship of undergraduate students.

Chair Zachos noted that there will need to be a broader discussion of the topic in the Academic Senate.

**UCFW Update**

Chair Zachos reported that the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) will meet tomorrow to consider and discuss a document that new hires will receive describing retirement plan options. The committee will make recommendations on the clarity and utility of the documentation. In addition, UC Care health plan administration will switch to Anthem Blue Cross. The behavior/mental health care will be folded into Anthem for certain plans.

**UC Salary Program (2016-17) and CFW Faculty Salary Analysis Update**

The Office of the President (UCOP) has provided details of the 2016-17 salary program. Allocation will be based on performance metrics in two parts. The first part consists of a 1.5% increase on the academic scales, a reflection of career achievement. The remaining 1.5% is discretionary and intended to address issues of equity, inversion, and compression as well as issues of competitiveness, both internally and externally. The committee considered whether these issues exist on the UCSC campus and whether the discretionary funds should be used to address these

issues. The committee was also provided with a report on the latest analysis conducted by the CFW Faculty Salary Subcommittee as it relates to these issues.

Chair Zachos reminded members that last year, an increase of 1.5% was applied to the on scale salary, and 1.5% was used applied to the total salary including off-scale salary, which is based on merit. This year, the campus will likely apply the same method for an across the board increase if the Regents approve another 3% increase. The committee noted that the UC salary scale does not appear to be keeping up with market, and this is impacting salaries at either time of hire, or in retention cases resulting in larger than average off-scales to compensate. This sometimes creates inversions in salary within departments. Discretionary funds could be used to address compression and inversion. Chair Zachos suggested that individual departments should be tracking these issues, and recommending higher off-scales where merited. Chair Zachos noted that UC Davis devised a formula to address such issues using promotion growth in a department and division. He also questioned whether this was more about being fair, then effective.

Members recognized that the career equity review process is available for faculty whose salaries are perceived to be less than equitable. A faculty member (or chair) can request to have their rank/step re-evaluated.

Members questioned whether it might be possible for CFW to make specific recommendations on the 1.5% discretionary increase based on the committee's analysis. Chair Zachos noted that this is partly intended to address inequity, and suggested that such recommendations will likely need to come from the department/divisional level, but CFW could point out anomalies to departments based on data. Chair Zachos noted that CFW does not currently have the data/analysis to make a strong case for targeted recommendations for the coming year, but could consider making more specific recommendations during the next academic year following further analysis.

### **CFW Senate Meeting Presentation**

*CFW discussed and finalized the committee's presentation details for the Academic Senate meeting on Wednesday, May 18, 2016.*