

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of February 5, 2014

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

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

Report from the 1/09/15 University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting

Chair Zachos provided the committee with an update from the UCFW meeting on January, 9, 2015. The Investment and Retirement Task Force reported on the performance of the UC retirement program (UCRP). There was a 17% return last year and the plan is now 80% funded in terms of liability, which is an improvement. The retirement task force is looking at ways to reduce operating management costs.

UCFW consulted with Healthcare Task Force Chair, Robert May, and Dwaine Duckett, VP of Human Resources, and discussed the recent negotiation made between Sutter and Blue Shield. In previous meetings UCFW discussed a plan for UCOP Health Sciences and Services to broaden UC Care to include an HMO plan which ultimately might replace Health Net HMO. Addition of an HMO plan would help reduce the risk profile of UC Care, and thus help keep premiums down. These changes could be implemented in the near future, as soon as 2016. This raises serious issues for campuses without UC medical centers, as the access to health providers could be more limited without Health Net HMO. UCSC, in particular, does not have the Kaiser option unlike most other UC campuses. One proposed solution is to create satellite medical centers. UC-HR has been asked to conduct a feasibility study, to be completed by March 2015, on proposed changes to UC Care. CFW members noted that this seems like insufficient time to conduct a feasibility study for such a major change in plan, and recalled that UC Care was originally rolled out too soon. Chair Zachos noted that UCFW expressed similar concerns over a feasibility study being conducted in such a short period of time. A UC Care HMO plan could be a positive and money saving change, but requires careful planning.

CFW members note that UC medical centers do not have many primary care physicians on staff, and if an HMO is introduced, they may need to contract out in order to meet patient demands. Members also expressed concern about the lack of Senate involvement in these decisions and noted that the recent issue with failed negotiations in 2015 which caused numerous problems for those enrolled in Blue Shield plans, clearly illustrated that plan details must be negotiated and mapped out well in advance.

Unlike the situation for most other campuses, there are only two major medical groups in Santa Cruz County, Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) and Physician's Medical Group (PMG). Members noted the importance of having both medical groups included as plan options and questioned whether a feasibility study would take this into consideration and if it would be vetted

by a third party independent of Health Sciences. Further, members expressed concern that provider access could decline and premiums rise if UC Care ended up being the only plan option to UCSC employees.

Report from the 1/27/15 Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting

Chair Zachos provided members with an update from the January 27, 2015 Senate Executive meeting, focusing on two items, international engagement and SV initiative. The SEC has drafted a framework document for UCSC international engagement which touches on the benefits for research and education and the logistics of how it should work, including admissions, training, and recruiting and developing networks in order to bring in the best students, etc. There is some uncertainty regarding financial resources for such engagement. The document also touches on what the role of the Academic Senate should be with regards to internationalization. The document will be provided to committees for comment in the near future. Chair Zachos assumes that there will be no comment needed from CFW.

With regards to current efforts, CFW members discussed the Korean University Summer program that Engineering will be rolling out in summer 2015, as well as the Chancellor's recent visits to India and attempts to set up collaborations there. There have also been discussions about possibly offering a summer program on campus for international students in order to prep them for the school year.

The SEC also discussed the UCSC Silicon Valley (SV) Initiative. SEC reviewed program pre-proposals and considered how the proposals should be evaluated in terms of teaching, research, and financial viability. One issue for CFW is where SV faculty will be posted. One CFW member noted that his department is putting together a proposal and could use more faculty here on campus, but the call for proposals requests that faculty be posted in SV, so that is what the department is asking for. The member reported that his dean has sent a message that they do not want ladder rank faculty posted in SV and would like to have lectures following the Computational Media program model.

CFW questioned what the draw for students would be if ladder rank faculty don't teach in SV and if the administration does not have a clear vision that guides the request for proposals. A concern was raised that departments will not know what to aim for if a clear vision is not noted in the call for proposals. Further, it was noted that split campuses are not a new creation and that many have a history of acting like two different universities with occasional meetings of their administration, but they do not work together or collaborate on projects.

With regards to how a presence in Silicon Valley could benefit UCSC, members note that there has not yet been a comprehensive report on the benefits of the current University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) partnership with NASA Ames. Considerable resources went into the program and a report on fund allocation, student enrollment, research accomplishments, etc., has yet to be produced. The partnership was to include De Anza College, but it is unclear if Chancellor Blumenthal has noted that there would be a report of this kind, but one has not yet been

produced. The committee questioned how the campus can make any decisions about moving forward in SV without knowing the history and whether or not the UARC project was effective. The committee commented that the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) should be asking questions about the efficacy of this program and moving forward in SV.

Chair Zachos welcomed members to share their opinions on the topic, which he will share at the next SEC meeting.

Healthcare Update

CFW received an update on the recent negotiations between Blue Shield and Sutter Health and considered next steps with regards to ensuring equitable access and affordability for UCSC employees during the next open enrollment period. An agreement was reached and the contract will extend over the next two years. There is a question as to what this will mean for open enrollment and if the plan will be offered again as is, or in some other version. This incident has revealed a vulnerability unique to UCSC in terms of healthcare providers and access in Santa Cruz County. Members note that this incident presents an opportunity to work together with the administration to support efforts to bring UCSC's unique situation and needs to light.

Members once again discussed the need for UC guiding principles with regards to healthcare. The committee questioned whether CFW should undertake this task, or UCFW. Members noted that during Open Enrollment 2014, there was incomplete and misleading information provided to those signing up for plans, and during Open Enrollment 2015, Blue Shield plans were offered without a contract which later had issues with negotiations. A suggestion was made that there should be some kind of policy in place that enables employees to switch plans if the original terms agreed upon are changed, assuming such a policy does not already exist.

The CFW Healthcare Subcommittee will consider the issue of healthcare guiding principles and Chair Zachos will discuss the topic with the Chair of the UC Health Care Task Force.

UCSC Faculty Salary Equity Study Report

In 2013-14, the Office of the President charged each UC campus with conducting a faculty salary equity study. Under the direction of Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Herbie Lee, UCSC created a committee which consisted of the 2013-14 chairs of several Senate committees including CFW, Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), and Academic Personnel (CAP), and conducted the study based on the metrics used by CFW in their faculty analysis of 2012, which included rate of advancement. The report noted that a cursory analysis which only looked at gender or ethnicity for the entire campus found differences in both promotion growth and salary. However, a more thorough analysis that considered data on the scale of departments, showed no evidence for biases within departments, and that the campus wide differences were an artifact of department affiliation, with lower salaries/promotion growth in departments with a higher % of female faculty. Members noted that no concrete recommendations were made in the report, except

the suggestion that it would help to diversify the departments with higher salaries and rate of promotion.

CFW considered possible steps for the committee. Chair Zachos has contacted Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) Chair, Ingrid Parker and Christina Ravelo, former Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) to get their take on the report and offered for CFW to assist with further analysis if needed. Neither had any recommendations for moving forward, but CAAD will be discussing the report during their next committee meeting.

A few members noted that the only recommendation was to increase diversity in underrepresented areas, and noted that some departments (STEM fields) are still struggling to diversify. It was noted that in divisions such as Engineering, top underrepresented scholars (i.e. females) are actively sought after, but recruitments are highly competitive. The lack of underrepresented scholars, combined with the lack of funds to compete with higher offers of recruitment, has made it challenging to diversify. The VPAA has been asked if there are funds to support increasing diversity on campus, but nothing has been offered. A comment was made that some departments are trying to diversify, but need resources in order to do so. Many departments want to recruit senior candidates that will increase diversity on campus but cannot afford it.

The committee noted that a stated goal for President Napolitano is diversity, and she requested the salary equity study. Members questioned whether there will now be support from UCOP to address issues raised and noted that a change of culture usually requires funding.

Although the report was statistically thorough, CFW would like to have seen data showing the mean promotion growth since degree by gender as well as a graph showing which departments on campus have a greater gap by gender, and a scatterplot by aggregate for those departments to support the report's argument that the differences found have more to do with the department than the gender of the faculty. The committee notes that tracking gender composition in a department over time along with advancement may also support the reports claims, but this was not shown (or not done).

The committee considered other faculty welfare issues that might contribute to the salary and advancement differences. For example, lack of convenient access to child care, and/or the lack of adequate child care could have a negative impact on productivity. Also, in considering departments and gender balance, one member noted that attributing the lower salaries, etc. to the department is missing the point. Discrepancies were found, and although the reasons behind the discrepancies may be open to interpretation, the campus is obligated to understand the source of those problems. Further analysis might be required to resolve this. Members agree that the report should in by no means be the end of the discussion, but can be a starting point for developing priorities to help identify and address issues.

Chair Zachos will contact Chair Parker of CAAD and determine if the two committees need to work collaboratively to respond to the report.

Senate Meeting Action Plan – Part Two

CFW finalized oral presentation details for the Academic Senate meeting on Wednesday, February 18, 2015.