

Meeting Notes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of March 5, 2015
Held via Teleconference

Noriko Aso, History
Adrian Brasoveanu, Linguistics
David Cuthbert, Theater Arts
Ted Holman, Chemistry & Biochemistry
Andrew Mathews, Anthropology
Benjamin Read, Politics

Nina Treadwell, Music
Manfred Warmuth, Computer Sciences
James Zachos, Earth & Planetary Sciences
Roger Anderson, ex officio, Chemistry &
Biochemistry

Present: Noriko Aso, Adrian Brasoveanu, Ted Homan, Andrew Mathews, Benjamin Read, Nina Treadwell, Manfred Warmuth, James Zachos (Chair), Roger Anderson, Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: David Cuthbert

Chair Announcements

Report from the 2/24/15 SEC Meeting (M. Warmuth) - EVC Consultation

CFW Manfred Warmuth attended the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting on February 24, 2015 as Chair Zachos could not attend. SEC met with CP/EVC Galloway and discussed international student enrollments and the campus's Silicon Valley Initiative. During the Academic Senate meeting on April 22nd, the Silicon Valley Initiative will be discussed and Chancellor Blumenthal and CP/EVC Galloway will share their background and rationale for the initiative, respond to questions via email and from the floor and will provide an update on the University Affiliated Research Center (UARC), a partnership between UCSC and NASA Ames Research Center. Warmuth reported that CP/EVC Galloway explained that the plan is to move 14 faculty FTE to Silicon Valley and convert 6 to administrative positions. The rationale behind this is to build infrastructure, library services, health care, etc. CFW members noted that the funding for these FTE comes from Rebenching funds, and questioned whether using the FTE in this way contradicts the spirit of Rebenching. Further, considered whether there may be a bigger motive/reason behind the initiative that is not known as it likely will not create graduate growth on campus and 6 of the FTE positions will not be faculty, and does not appear to be align with the stated priorities of the campus.

A suggestion was made to the CP/EVC during the SEC meeting to set up a website to submit questions ahead of time. CFW members agreed that having the questions available for all to see prior to the meeting would be beneficial and may increase accountability and transparency. CFW considered creating and submitting a list of questions related to faculty welfare. The committee noted that there will likely be faculty welfare issues for faculty on the Silicon Valley campus.

CFW noted that there is currently no representative from the Baskin School of Engineering on SEC and many of the hot topics of discussion this year, such as international enrollment and the Silicon Valley Initiative, directly affect the division.

Envision UCSC

Some members have reviewed the Envision UCSC webpage illustrating the campus's strategic plan goals derived from a collaborative planning process that began in 2013-14. Members noted that the plans and goals on the website are vague, particularly with respect to addressing workload issues. If members have any concerns or further questions, Chair Zachos offered to bring them to SEC.

Child Care Advisory Committee

In June 2003, the Campus Welfare Committee requested the establishment of the Child Care Advisory Committee. The stated purpose of the committee was to contribute to the recruitment, retention, and productivity of faculty, staff and students, by enhancing the quality and quantity of campus child care programs and services. The committee was a standing committee that served during the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 academic years. The Campus Welfare Committee no longer exists, but there have been multiple requests to reinstate it. At the Academic Senate meeting of February 18, 2015, a suggestion from the floor requested that the Child Care Advisory Committee be reinstated.

The Child Care Advisory Committee (CCAC) was instituted during the time that faculty and staff were included in the existing student child care program on campus. The committee was comprised of faculty, student, staff, and administrator representatives and worked on admission policies, student rations, and concrete details of the program. Members now envision that a reconstituted CCAC could function as a central place where all interested parties could pool their energy to push forward on securing childcare for campus faculty and staff. The logistics of bringing the committee back together, including a revised charge, would need to be determined.

There was an ad hoc committee last academic year that created a proposal for a Pre-K at the Granary. Although members are not convinced that the location is truly unworkable as it was a licensed site in the past, the CP/EVC has stated that the Granary has been deemed unsuitable for a childcare facility, and campus childcare has stalled. Members determined that there is a need for a more permanent committee so that those who are interest in childcare and are not on a Senate committee can find out information and/or get involved. CFW is currently the place where faculty come to for information regarding child care, but often has little information to report. Members agree that it would be helpful if there was a website or a committee that people could go to for more information. Last year, there was an issue at the student childcare center on campus and students expressed frustration with the amount of information provided to them regarding the situation and the delay of containment of the situation. A CCAC could be helpful in such a situation and would benefit from a pool of interests, concerns, and proposals.

In addition to the reinstatement of the CCAC, members reached consensus that there should be an administrator point person who is charged with child care. Members recall that Linda Rhodes was once the child care point person, but this may have been ad hoc as when CFW last spoke with CP/EVC Galloway, she clearly stated that she was the child care point person on campus. CP/EVC Galloway has shown interest in child care, however, there has been no movement and other priorities have appeared to have taken preference. CFW recognizes that the CP/EVC has much in her purview, and therefore determined that another administrator should be charged with securing child care for campus employees. This point person could provide reports to CFW as well as the general campus and could sit on the CCAC. A concern was raised that if the administrator is supervised by the CP/EVC there may be an issue of conflict of interest.

One member served on the Campus Welfare Committee, the umbrella committee of the CCAC subcommittee, and felt as if it was not effective as it was mostly comprised of administrators. Members commented that a new CCAC could be more action oriented and be a concrete (vs. abstract) example of the campus reaching towards the Envision UCSC strategic plan goal of making UCSC an enjoyable place to work.

Pre-Consultation – CP/EVC Galloway

On April 2nd, 2015, CFW will consult with CP/EVC Alison Galloway on the topic of Child Care. In preparation for discussion and the drafting of a pre-consultation memo, members considered questions and discussed the desired direction of the consultation. The committee would like to avoid revisiting past discussions with regards to child care and move forward. CFW is eager to hear about the obstacles with using the Granary as an on campus location for a child care facility and whether or not the location is really off the table for the proposed use. Members note that renovations to the space may be costly, but that there is money reserved for child care that could fund the renovations projects and that any renovations needed would likely be cheaper than building a new facility from the ground up. Further, the “Project Report: Planning Faculty-Staff Child Care at the Granary and Family Resource Centers at UCSC” (January 23, 2014) included a comprehensive and sustainable business plan for a child care program, if the Granary is not viable, the committee would like to speak with the CP/EVC about the business plan and discuss what parts of the proposal might be transferable to another location or program either on or off campus.

CFW would like to assist the CP/EVC in moving forward with securing child care for faculty and staff but need to know the parameters in order to offer a proposal. Members would like to know what the CP/EVC sees as a viable approach from which the committee can build from.

The committee would like to discuss the re-instatement of the CCAC, including how the previous charge might be re-envisioned. Members would like to hear why the former committee disbanded and discuss the need for having a single administrative point person other than the CP/EVC for which child care is part of their job description to respond to committee recommendations and make employee child care a reality for the campus.

With \$730k campus funds reserved for childcare, a potential matching fund offer from UCOP (which the committee would like to discuss) the latest total remuneration report, and recent research done by UCFW which once again highlighted UCSC as the only UC campus with no employee child care program, CFW firmly believes that now is the time to secure a child care program for UCSC employees. In her last consultation with CFW, CP/EVC Galloway mentioned that the Family Student Housing complex and the current student child care center will be rebuilt in the future and there may be an opportunity to fold employee child care into that project. Members noted that the campus has been talking about rebuilding Family Student Housing for several years, but if something can be done before that to address the lack of employee child care, the program has a better chance of being incorporated into any new plans for a renovation of the current child care center.

In its post consultation memo to the CP/EVC (January 16, 2015), CFW recommended that an off campus facility/site be explored and that in the interim, a voucher system mirroring the graduate student child care stipend program be implemented. CFW would like to hear CP/EVC's thoughts about this recommendation. The committee hopes that the consultation will result in some sort of commitment, either that child care is not a priority, or that it is and that there are concrete steps that will be taken to move forward with securing child care for faculty and staff.

The committee considered whether or not to include the topic of housing during the consultation but concluded that there are not currently any pressing housing issues to address.

Faculty Salaries

During the Academic Senate Meeting on February 18, 2015, CFW provided a report on the committee's analysis of the latest faculty salary comparative data from 2013. The data and report indicated that while UCSC salaries in 2013 are increasing relative to 2012 because of the Merit Boost Plan and slightly larger off-scales, they are leveling off relative to our sister campuses as they institute their own programs, and standardize their individual scales through similar boost programs. The report stated that CFW will continue its analysis of the most recent data and will consider recommendations to address UCSC faculty salary issues that may be implemented in 2015-16. Members considered the next steps of analysis in order to achieve the goal of making formal recommendations in the spring quarter.

Under the Merit Boost Plan, if a faculty member's service, teaching, and research is determined to be outstanding across the board, he/she is eligible for a greater than normal advancement with an additional increase in off-scale. During the winter Senate meeting, the committee made the recommendation to continue the Merit Boost Program and potentially take stronger measures to increase salaries across the board. When CFW met with CP/EVC Galloway at the beginning of the year, CP/EVC Galloway mentioned that a program should not target certain ranks. However, when the committee looked at the data, and in comparison to other UC campuses, members noted that there appeared to be a stall in salary for senior faculty.

CFW made the recommendation last year to address the issue that senior faculty are lagging. Members are concerned that if they make the same recommendation this year, it may not be proactive or useful. The committee does not yet know why disparities exist and/or how to deal with them, and would like to know the basis of the disparities before making any further recommendations. During the first few years of its implementation, the Merit Boost Plan special salary practice originally allowed advancement (including acceleration below Professor, Step 6) to be coupled with a greater range of possible salary increases. It was not until 2011-12 that accelerations for faculty advancing to Professor, Step 6, or above, were considered for the special additional off-scale salary component equivalent to a half-step. Members questioned if this might be part of the reason for the disparity and whether the data will change now that the Merit Boost Plan is being applied across the board. Further, members noted that there are different personnel review practices at different campuses. Some campuses no longer require letters for advancement to Step VI. At UCSC, advancement to Step VI requires external letters. The committee questioned whether such practices could have some unintended side effects which could result in retention issues. Members also noted that last year, off-scale limits were removed from the Academic Personnel Manual. UCSC still holds firm to these limits, whereas other campuses do not.

The committee determined that the CFW faculty salary subcommittee should speak with the Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel to discuss faculty salaries, merit increases, off-scale amounts, and what some of the data is showing with regards to the higher steps in comparison to other campuses. The desired goal is to gain some insight on the campuses practices and their effects faculty salary data that may assist the committee in making further recommendations.