

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of October 6, 2016

Present: Ted Holman, Grant McGuire, Stefano Profumo (Chair), Ricardo Sanfelice, Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: Vilashini Cooppan, Melissa Gwyn, Shelly Errington (*ex officio*)

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

As several members were absent with notice during the first Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) meeting of September 22, 2016, members reintroduced themselves. CFW membership includes Assistant Professors to Professors, and those who own housing on-campus and those who rent and own off-campus, adding a variety of perspectives to CFW issues. Returning members noted interest in continuing their involvement in and the monitoring of faculty welfare topics from the 2015-16 academic year.

Chair Profumo reported that he met with Senate leadership to discuss CFW's pro-active agenda for the year. During the meeting, Chair Profumo reported from the summer meeting of a CFW representative with Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham on the new P3 building funding model. Chair Profumo noted that Senate leadership agrees with CFW that the building of Ranch View Terrace Phase II (RVT2) and a childcare facility should be included under the new building model, the details of which are still being determined by the Office of the President (UCOP). CFW would like to consult with VCBAS Latham on the topic during the fall quarter and considered whether the invitation should also be extended to Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) Alison Galloway as well. The committee also discussed the possibility of formally inviting VCBAS Latham to provide an update on the new P3 building model at the next Academic Senate meeting.

Committee members reviewed and agreed to the CFW Consultation Procedures enclosure.

Faculty Salaries

The "Merit Boost Plan" or "Special Salary Practice" was initiated on campus in 2008-2009 to bring UCSC faculty salaries in line with peer UC institutions. In order to determine the overall effectiveness of this program and ascertain whether salary compression is an issue on the UCSC campus, last year's CFW committee analysis examined two aspects of faculty salary; 1) overall medians across ranks and steps relative to other UC campuses, and 2) how off-scale salary as a function of years of service has evolved at UCSC over the last 10 years.

Members reviewed the faculty salary excerpt from the 2015-16 CFW Annual Report and considered the intention, questions, and angle that should be pursued with this year's analysis.

A member of the CFW faculty salary subcommittee, who served on CFW last year, suggested that the latest data shows that UCSC's salary median is now closer to other coastal campuses, but that the Merit Boost has not quite met its goal of bringing UCSC's median salary to the UC median.

Members noted that several years ago, CFW's analysis included the rate of advancement. Looking at this variable could show if there are cohorts who have not benefited from the Merit Boost plan highlighted by a salary that is not in a linear relationship with the rate of promotion. Members agreed that assessing the reason why specific cohorts may have been left behind may be challenging as there may be qualifying factors such as underperformance that does not show up in the data. Members questioned whether some of these faculty might be lost to other campuses and failed retention attempts. Members also noted that the data may be skewed due to the newer campus practice of hiring above Assistant Prof. 1 (which was once the normal practice on campus).

CFW questioned whether departments need to be educated on cohorts or individuals that may have been left behind. Anecdotal stories shared with committee members infer that some department chairs may not be familiar with the details of the merit boost program or what the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is looking for in personnel review files. Chair Profumo suggested that more transparency on the topic is needed.

This year, CFW would like to see if there is a correlation between salary and retention issues/rates. Members noted that housing issues and the cost of living in Santa Cruz may play a significant factor. The committee noted that exit interviews are now happening on campus. CFW would like to find out how the interviews are being conducted, what questions are being asked, and see the data on those who left so that the salary trajectory can be examined. Members agreed that if reasons for failed retentions could be determined, it would aid the committee in focusing on its pro-active agenda, and could motivate the administration as well. The committee is expecting that the CP/EVC will consult with CFW this year, seeking suggestions as to how the Merit Boost Plan may be improved. This year's salary analysis may give light to some of these suggestions.

Faculty Salary Transparency

In recent years, CFW has sent salary data to faculty at the beginning of the fall quarter, when departments are conducting merit and promotion reviews. These data allow faculty to see the average UCSC salaries at each rank and step and provide faculty with a better sense of what level of off-scale is typical on our campus. Last year's CFW drafted the text of an email to be sent to faculty in fall 2016, based on the committee's faculty salary analysis in 2015-16.

Members finalized the email content for this year's correspondence and determined a timeline for its distribution to Senate faculty.

The committee recognized that there are different cultures of personnel reviews in the different departments and divisions. Members questioned whether a department break down of faculty salary analysis (showing the divisional mean with a scattered plot) would be helpful to divisional deans and chairs in preparation for personnel reviews. CFW would also like to advocate for the use of standard housing allowances and start-up funds for new recruitments, which all divisions appear to be handling differently. CFW had requested a report from the CP/EVC on how the divisional deans were using these funds, but has not yet received a response.

To further increase transparency, particularly with regards to starting salaries, members agreed to draft a correspondence to the CP/EVC in support of a recent request from CAP to provide a quarterly report of starting salaries to divisional deans.

Systemwide Review, APM 190 - Continued Discussion

CFW has been invited to review and comment on the proposed technical revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 190, Appendix G – Program Description: Retirement Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary. The revisions are required to align policy for administering summer salary benefits with the new 2016 Retirement Choice Program provisions.

Members found no issues with the proposed revisions and will support the revisions in the CFW committee response.

Spousal Hire Resources – Program Proposal Follow Up

With the goal of increasing spousal/partner employment and increasing the confidence of prospective faculty in relocating their families to Santa Cruz, CFW sent a program proposal to the CP/EVC in 2015-16 for the creation of a list of UCSC faculty and their partners, who can provide general information regarding the local job market in varying fields of expertise. The committee recommended that this list be created as a campus wide resource and a tool for recruitment and retention, and suggested that it should be a centrally supported and managed resource in order to preserve its longevity and increase accessibility and usage across the divisions. Unfortunately, the committee has not yet received an official response to the proposal from the CP/EVC.

Members noted that there is a “Dual Career Resources” webpage on the Academic Personnel (APO) website, but are concerned that most faculty do not know that the resource is there. The committee will request by email that the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs (VPAA) Herbie Lee mention the webpage at an upcoming training on best practices for hiring and search committees. The committee further considered arranging a consultation with VPAA Lee and the designated Interim VPAA on the topic, and to discuss the practice of housing allowances on campus.

Members recalled that last year, divisional deans expressed an interest in using social media to platform partner hire resources. CFW’s suggestion of a contact list was more simple. Members considered the pros and cons of using social media and/or a Google group. Such a platform could require less hands-on management, but could be problematic in terms of content control and active users. For instance, in order for a faculty member to receive a response from a colleague with a spouse in a specific field, it would require the colleague to be frequently checking the social media platform to see if his/her assistance is needed.

A CFW representative will contact Dean Koch to inform him that CFW cannot envision a scenario where a social media platform could work.

Committee Issue Assignments – Continued Discussion

CFW members are expected to monitor or work on a specific issue about which they will report back to the full committee throughout the year. In some cases, this will require additional attendance of a campus committee, and for others, the analytical review of reports or data, which are provided to CFW on a regular basis. Members discussed the responsibilities of these assignments and volunteered to cover specific topics.

Chair Profumo noted that the topic of childcare is an urgent issue, but a facility (possibly under the new P3 model) may not be built for several years. Chair Profumo would like to research whether childcare voucher models are in place at other campuses and see if a voucher system might be able to act as an immediate patch to help faculty in need while a facility is secured. Members considered whether the current campus reserves earmarked for childcare should be used for an interim voucher system, or whether the money should be kept for the purposes of building. CFW had previously requested that the CP/EVC continue to make annual contributions to the fund so that the campus could take advantage of a matching grant from UCOP for building childcare facilities, but did not receive a response. Members noted that if the matching grant was secured, there would be sufficient funds to break ground on a facility if the project is included under the new P3 building model.

CFW will continue the discussion of committee issue assignments at the next CFW meeting when all members are in attendance.