

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of February 19, 2014

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

Absent: David Cuthbert (with notice), Roger Anderson (*ex officio*, with notice), Andrew Mathews

Chair Announcements

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Report

Chair Zachos provided CFW with a report from the SEC meeting of February 10, 2015. The meeting started with a meeting with the Chancellor's cabinet and the discussion covered several pertinent issues.

SEC has proposed a framework for international engagement, which was discussed during the February 18, 2015 Academic Senate meeting. The proposal emphasizes the need for administrative structure for management. The administration appears to have concerns due to scarce resources. For context, Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget Peggy Delaney provided a picture of the overall budget, which noted an expected 6% increase in mandatory costs with an expected revenue increase of only 4%. If this continues, in 2016, there may be a \$20 million budget deficit.

The tone of the SEC discussion on the Silicon Valley initiative reflected the tone conveyed during the 2/18/15 Senate meeting. Faculty expressed unhappiness with process of how the initiative is moving forward, the apparent lack of focus and details. The general consensus of the administration considers the initiative to be essential for the health of the campus and will be guided largely by proposals.

SEC is reviewing a Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) document regarding the Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement and writing curriculum, which prepares students for university level writing. The traditional way of addressing writing concerns has been through the UCSC college core courses, which offers classes for both students who have, and have not, passed the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) exam. Some feel that the college core courses are not the solution for writing issues as they are topical and some students struggle with the content, which makes it harder to write. Others are reluctant to altering the core courses for this purpose. Crown College is piloting a slightly different model. During the first quarter, students who have not passed ELWR take a writing class and then take a core course in the second quarter. The first course is more structured to writing needs rather than the traditional role of building community through topical study as in the core course. The initial report from Crown is that the model is working.

The topic of shared governance was discussed. Some Senate Committees have expressed issues with communications or delays in receiving requested information from the administration. CFW members recalled that committee recently sent a post-consultation memo to the CP/EVC which

included child care recommendations and never heard back or received a receipt acknowledgment. The chair noted that workload and understaffing might be contributing to the delays.

Report from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Meeting

Chair Zachos provided CFW with an update from the UCFW meeting of February 13, 2015. UCFW consulted with the chief information officer of Cybersecurity. Apparently the level of security on each campus largely depends on the individual campus's Information Technology department. UCFW voiced concerns about personal information being compromised and questioned what would happen if this occurred, and what resources are available for employees in the event of a security breach.

UCFW discussed total remuneration and reviewed a recent proposal from the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), which varies from UCFW's proposal regarding salaries. The UCPB correspondence appears to be more aggressive with a goal of getting rid of the discrepancies of the "Comparison 8", and recommends changing the salary scales so that they more credible, and significantly reducing off-scale. The document stated that the recommendations were supported by the "majority" of UCPB members.

Bob May, Chair of the Health Care Task Force, consulted with UCFW and discussed the possibility of Sutter Health costs going up and the effect that the increase might have on the UC Care, Health Savings, and Core plans during Open Enrollment 2015. UCFW also received a report that retiree health benefit costs are starting to rise and will be underfunded soon, which may mean that employee costs will need to go up. CFW members noted that retiree benefits are not guaranteed, but when looking at total remuneration, retiree healthcare is a positive benefit. If taken away, total remuneration will be further eroded.

UCFW consulted with Jack Stobo, head of Health Sciences and Services regarding UC Care. During the 2013 Open Enrollment period, the number of participants in UC Care declined by several hundred. Stobo presented a basic plan for bringing in an HMO option and increasing revenue for UC Care, which would also bring more patients to the medical centers. There was some discussion regarding campuses with no medical centers. The proposed solution would be to have other plan options as there is now, or UCSC employees could go to UCSF. Chair Zachos noted that this would not be good for UCSC. The stated benefit of adding an HMO option is it will reduce costs for UC in the long run. However, it could negatively affect accessibility and quality of care for UCSC. As UCOP considers new options for healthcare, CFW will continue to assess how impacts on UCSC inform the administration on issues of access and quality.

CFW members raised additional concerns about the addition of an HMO in UC Care as medical centers are not geared towards primary care. Members are concerned major changes in health care are being studied at a very rapid pace without sufficient consideration of impacts on employees on each campus.

The Post-Employment Benefits Task Force reported that studies were underway on the potential impact of varying projected rates of return on investments, for example, 6.5% versus 7.5% on the unfunded liability, and the time till 100% funding is achieved. The assumption of a 7.5% rate of return seems overly optimistic. In either scenario, reductions in state contributions would make it

difficult to achieve that goal. CFW members noted that the state does not put sufficient funding into UC retirement, unlike for Cal State and Community College funds.

Senate Meeting Debrief

Members received a report from the Academic Senate meeting of February 18, 2015, and the reception of the CFW presentation and reports on child care, faculty salaries, and overall faculty quality of life. Char Zachos reported that there were not many questions from the floor following CFW's presentation, except for one asking what it would cost to renovate the Granary to bring it up to code for a childcare center. CFW has questioned why the Granary has been deemed "unfit" as it served as a childcare center in the past. A proposal for childcare which included the Granary was submitted to the CP/EVC, which promoted an evaluation of the site. Members noted that there are several interested parties in the location, and agree that even if the building cannot be used for childcare, the comprehensive business plan that was included in the proposal should not be tossed out as well.

At the Senate meeting, a CFW member encouraged the administration to get the Child Care Advisory Committee back up and running. The former Child Care Advisory Committee discussed admissions, and policy issues, etc., and was dissolved when employees were removed from campus childcare. Members noted that there are several groups and individuals interested in securing employee childcare on campus, but that all interested parties need to have a central place or committee in which they can come together and pool resources and ideas.

CFW will discuss the Child Care Advisory Committee during its next meeting and will consider sending a formal request to the administration that the committee be reconstituted. The committee would like to invite CP/EVC Galloway back for a consultation in order to find out what the CP/EVC's "non-negotiables" are in terms of childcare. Members concur that it is difficult to make recommendations regarding childcare without knowing what the CP/EVC's vision is.

Framework for International Engagement

As discussed earlier, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has created a document proposing a framework for building multi-faceted global engagement in research, teaching, and service. SEC has requested that Senate committees review the document and provide feedback. Further, during the Senate meeting of February 18, 2015, the Committee on International Education Chair, Ben Crow discussed CIE's recommendations to improve the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) process for collaborations with other campuses.

Members noted that the Chancellor recently went to a university in India with the desire to form collaborations, but it did not seem to move forward. The Chancellor also went to Kiest in Korea, and there will now be a summer program bringing students to the UCSC campus. Members appreciated CIE's goal of structuring collaboration agreements with one website containing the appropriate forms.

As faculty, CFW members would like to see an expanded and quality pool of international student applicants and would like to see those students raise the level of the campus academically. Members note that many students go to schools like UC Berkeley due to their reputation and agree that UCSC will need to improve the marketing reputation of our campus. However, as a

committee, CFW has no comments to offer regarding the Framework for International Engagement document.

Housing Update

The CFW Housing Subcommittee reported from its February 12, 2015 meeting with Steve Houser, Director of Employee Housing and Capital Planning and John Thompson, Manager of Faculty and Staff Housing. The parties considered CFW's housing recommendations from 2013-14 and determined that some or no longer workable. The CFW Housing Subcommittee charged Houser and Thompson with coming up with some viable solutions. Houser and Thompson noted that there are two major issues with regards to housing that need to be addressed: financing, and down payments.

With regards to financing, Houser noted that there is not a lot of support for faculty seeking to buy homes. The Low Interest Option Supplemental Home Loan (LIO-SHLP) is no longer an attractive option for faculty and the 40 year Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) program was thrown out years ago for unknown reasons, but seemingly due to the mortgage crisis. Chair Zachos will be speaking with UCFW to see if the 40 year program may be revived. With housing market prices going up, Houser noted that there is pressure to provide more financing options.

With regards to down payments, the parties noted that some campus divisions appear to provide recruitment/housing allowances whereas other do not. The parties would like to know if there is a UC policy on recruitment allowances, as it is unknown why some divisions do not appear to use them. Houser noted that many new faculty do not have down payments, and believes that housing allowances are one of the main things that would get more faculty into housing. CFW may need to survey deans and or consult with the CP/EVC on the topic and then figure out how to move forward.

One member questioned whether the housing wait lists are giving priority to junior faculty as they did in the past and suggested that the campus housing program could be an instrumental tool for addressing junior faculty who are struggling. In past years, CFW questioned the rationale for cost increases in the Repricing program where units are being renovated in the name of equity. CFW raised concerns in the past that the renovation program may be decreasing affordability and locking out junior faculty. However, in meeting, Houser informed the Housing Subcommittee that one in three new Assistant Professors have purchased housing on campus, which was not the case in previous years.

One member raised a concern about Colleges Housing and Educational Services' (CHES) annual requests to increase Repricing costs and commented that the request may be becoming habitual when it is not clear that the increase in funds will work towards the intended goals of the program. Further, the program has been accruing money with an unknown purpose. A suggestion was made that this accrual could be used to increase campus inventory and move forward with building the second phase of Ranch View Terrace homes.

Chair Zachos noted that the committee needs to consider what the demand would be for more expensive units in Ranch View Phase II. As with phase I, some faculty in campus housing would move up to Ranch View to open up more economical units for junior faculty. There would have

to be some sense that movement of inventory would occur if Ranch View II was built. There was significant debt accrued by the campus from the building of the first phase of Ranch View Terrace, which would have to be recouped or paid down in order for the campus to move forward with Ranch View II. However, members noted that the Repricing Program accrual could be put to this purpose and serve the community as a whole, instead of sitting unused.

The committee considered the possibility of different types of housing, but noted that there could be a delay in breaking ground if new plans needed to be drawn up, whereas the Ranch View II project has already been mapped out.

A Housing Subcommittee representative noted that in the past, Houser seemed reluctant to move forward with Ranch View II due to the debt, but suggested that the debt will remain whether or not inventory is increased. A suggestion was made that the Ranch View II plans could be augmented to include an employee childcare center, although the augmentation may be cost prohibited.

Transportation and Parking

The Academic Senate recently reviewed the Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) rate approval process and has proposed several modifications to make this procedure more effective. Further, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has made a request that contextual budgetary information be provided to Transportation Advisory Council (TAC) members prior to discussions regarding fee increases. CFW reviewed the request and members agree with the proposed process, which will allow full participation in the process.

Pro-Active Agenda

Members considered possible topics for winter quarter agendas including resources for partner hires, Envision (and whether there is a way to leverage it for childcare as “making work life on the UCSC campus enjoyable” was one of the main bullet points on the strategic planning summary), and water issues on campus.