

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of November 16, 2017

Vilashini Cooppan, Literature
Hiroshi Fukurai, Sociology
Tesla Jeltema, Physics
Grant McGuire, Linguistics
Nico Orlandi, Philosophy

Stefano Profumo, *Chair*, Physics
Su-hua Wang, Psychology
Yiman Wang, Film & Digital Media
Barry Bowman, *ex officio*, MCD Biology

Present: Vilashini Cooppan, Hiroshi Fukurai, Tesla Jeltema, Grant McGuire, Nico Orlandi, Stefano Profumo (Chair), Su-hua Wang, Yiman Wang, Barry Bowman (*ex officio*), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Chair Announcements

Chair Profumo reported that the Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham attended the last SEC meeting and shared the same information on P3, Student Housing West, and childcare, that she shared when she consulted with CFW on November 2, 2017. She noted that the financial planning for the childcare faculty is not yet complete, but promised to reach out to CFW with updates as they unfold. She expects to have the financials by the end of the week. SEC raised questions about how the plans were shared and noted concerns that all the meetings were held before 5pm, which made them hard to attend.

Chair Profumo discussed a recent email from the Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) Tromp that went out to faculty regarding new eligibility criteria for administrative titles. Chair Profumo noted that the transmittal stated that there was consultation with Senate leadership on the topic, and was surprised that CFW never heard about it. The Chair is concerned that this may be understood as “Senate endorsement” or approval when consultation with committees did not occur. The new criteria proposes that sexual offenders may be administrators, college provosts, deans, etc. after 10 years. A suggestion was made that this should be determined case by case, but not be *carte-blanche*.

Members questioned if there were any other policies where there is a statute of limitations. Additionally, members would like to know what the 10 year statute is intended to do. Members agreed that someone found guilty of sexual harassment and/or assault should not be in an administrative power position on campus. Further, since the old policies have been replaced with the new policies online, it is impossible for members to see what specifically in the text has been changed.

CFW will send a letter to the Senate Chair noting that the committee appreciates attention to this important issue, but has large concerns, particularly with regard to Senate consultation.

Debrief - VCBAS Consultation

The committee determined that a post consultation memo is not needed but determined that it will solicit information on the financial planning of the new employee childcare facility if it is not provided by the next CFW meeting.

Child Care Work Group Report - Wang

Member Wang will presented major takeaways from the Final Report of the Child Care Work Group from summer 2017. Member Wang noted that the final report has four main components: Curriculum, Facility, Cost, and Survey.

Member Wang noted that there is a draft cost section in the report, but reported that it is not yet finalized as the original costs structure did not include an after school program. Further, it is not yet known if the UCOPO matching fund grant will be utilized for the building of the facility. In terms of affordability, Member Wang noted that this was one of the main priorities determined in a campus survey that the Working group conducted, but added that the reality is that childcare in the Santa Cruz area is expensive and varies by age. Infant care is easily \$1600-\$2000 per month, whereas toddler care may be in the \$1500 range. An aftercare program is less expensive. Member Wang noted that there will need to be other funding to support a lower tuition.

When concerns of the expense connected to building on campus were raised, Member Wang suggested that building off campus is not cheaper, and added that every child requires a specific amount of square footage, and finding a property close to campus with these specifications would be difficult.

In terms of program and facility, the Workgroup recommended that it be based around diversity, biodiversity, socioeconomic diversity, nature based and outdoor play centered, creativity, and STEAM (Sciences, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math), and should meet accreditation through the highest standard. The report included an ambitious wish list and Wang suggested that if half the recommendations were delivered, it would be great. The facility would be broken into 3 age groups. An observation room is requested with a one way mirror, as well as teacher/administration space, and a multi-use room that could be used for research. Member Wang noted that the Workgroup felt that research could have the potential to bring in funding from observation and one to one interaction. The Workgroup recommended that the Campus Childcare Advisory Committee be reinstated in order to specify the mission and goals of the center.

CFW members noted a need for flexible hours recalling that when faculty were included in the current center, there were no other options but to register children for full time care, 5 days a week. Member Wang suggested CFW could inquire and/or request more flexibility. Chair Profumo suggested that it would make sense to look at the numbers of different scenarios for the facility and tuition structure with flexible enrollment options as the report was written with the old site in mind and the new numbers could possibly provide for building for future growth. Chair Profumo added that the scenarios could also help to prioritize the Workgroup wish list.

The report notes that roughly 36 staff will be needed to serve 140 children and there will be a close budget to cover all expenses. Members questioned whether UCSC would provide custodial services, etc., and suggested that this should be spelled out in the cost structure. Member Wang noted that the Workgroup assumed that the center would be independent and that the campus would not provide these services, but suggested that this would need to be clarified.

When questions and concerns about a third party vendor arose, Member Wang noted that it was hard to engage in conversations regarding an alternative option in the Workgroup, as the group's charge noted that a vendor would be used. The way that the group chose to get around this was to emphasize in the report the unique needs of the facility, in essence telling the reader that a third party cannot deliver. Members noted that transparency in the process to select a vendor will be very important and suggested that it would be good to have a committee of different stakeholders (including faculty) as part of the selection.

Chair Profumo suggested that the committee wait until the VCBAS provides the financial plan, before the committee follows up with questions and/or concerns.

Draft Policy Re: Conflict of Interest Related to Consensual Relationships – Continued Discussion

CFW continued its discussion of a proposed campus policy from the Title IX Office regarding conflict of interest related to consensual relationships. During its last discussion, CFW determined that the proposed policy was confusing and read as a preliminary first draft. There were also broader questions of how the proposed policy plays with APM 15, the Faculty Code of Conduct.

Although, CFW commends the desire to make potential conflicts of interest related to consensual relationships known to the campus community. Members raised several concerns, and are not convinced that the rough draft of a policy is the correct platform to address the issue.

First, CFW noted that this policy is complex in that it is attempting to cover three distinct categories of UCSC community members (faculty, staff, and students) under one umbrella, and all three categories fall under different governing policies and disciplinary processes. As far as faculty are concerned, CFW noted that the topic of conflict of interest with regards to consensual relationships is already covered under several policies, most notably the Faculty Code of Conduct (APM 015), and the newly instated UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (2016). Given this, it was not clear to CFW why an additional policy with possible disciplinary action for non-compliance is necessary.

Members noted that the draft policy states that failure to comply with the proposed policy may result in “disciplinary action”. CFW raised several concerns about this, the primary of which is that the disciplinary process for each of the three categories of constituents covered under this policy is not noted. Members were left to question if such an action for a faculty member would be reviewed by the Charges Committee for faculty, who the final deciding authority on such cases would be, and who or what office would enforce this policy. Members noted that the Title IX office, referred to in this draft, has very few FTE and an already heavy workload, and would therefore not be an appropriate office to enforce, and/or monitor compliance of this policy for the entire campus. As disciplinary action is a serious matter, members agreed that the process by which such an action will be taken should be clearly stated.

In addition, CFW members expressed concern that the mandate to report perceived conflicts of interest may result in a campus culture of micro-surveillance and hostility based on rumor and/or assumption. CFW members worry that this type of directive will not address the problem and it will, in fact, have a detrimental effect on the campus, and questioned whether there was any protection for faculty members if reported based on rumors and/or assumptions. Further, members noted that the definition of consensual relationship listed on the draft with terms such as “amorous” and “romantic”, is also extremely vague and subjective and agreed that such a policy must be able to sift out rumor from actual cases of SVSH and unhealthy power dynamics.

The committee’s response will note that overall, it is not clear to CFW how this proposed policy will add to already existing policies and guidelines on our campus.