

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of April 30, 2015

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

Absent: Roger Anderson, Nina Treadwell (with notice)

Chair Announcements

Consideration of the draft minutes from the CFW meeting of April 2, 2015

Minutes were approved by the committee.

CFW Action Plan for the May 29, 2015 Senate Meeting

CFW discussed the report on Housing, Faculty Salaries, and Childcare for the upcoming Senate meeting, and created an action plan with report drafting dates, etc. in order to reach the intended goals.

Summary of the April 22, 2015 Academic Senate Meeting discussion of the Silicon Valley Initiative

Chair Zachos reported on the April 22, 2015 Senate meeting on the campus Silicon Valley Initiative, which was also a main topic at the last Senate Executive Committee meeting. A resolution/motion was made on the Senate floor to halt the discussion until specific details and a financial plan for the initiative was delivered by the administration. However, most Senate members appeared to want the discussion to continue. Chair Zachos commented that there were numerous statements in support of and against the initiative, concerns raised about the process, as well as information and experience shared that needed to be heard. Most concerns focused on issues of funding and FTE, academic priorities, and the logistics of having a stand alone campus with adequate services for students. Chair Zachos noted that a Silicon Valley campus will likely present faculty welfare issues that CFW will need to address including how personnel action reviews for SV faculty are conducted, and the differences that SV faculty might face on housing costs, and other issues.

Chair Zachos reported that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) is going to recommend that a more concrete plan for the initiative be put forward, that possibly includes one or several of the pre-proposals, with budget estimates of expected expenditures to fund programs and build the infrastructure.

A comment was made that the pre-proposals may not necessarily represent what the departments actually want, but are just an initial response to the request for proposals and what they assume the administration would want to see in Silicon Valley. Full proposals along with budgets would more accurately reflect what the departments would need to build viable programs.

At the Senate meeting, the Chancellor stated that the administration could move forward with the project, with or without faculty support. Senate Chair Brenneis has a meeting with UC President Napolitano and reported to the SEC that Napolitano is pushing Silicon Valley and wants to see UC have a presence there, whether it is UCSC or another UC campus. Regardless, Chair Zachos noted that CFW should assume that the SV initiative will go forward, and begin to consider the potential faculty welfare issues in the near future.

Members discussed what teaching in SV would mean for faculty members. A comment was made that faculty are not “lecturers” hired only to teach masters programs with no research involved. Yet, other members agreed that UCSC faculty need to think practically of ways to reduce the huge deficit caused by the divestment of State support and suggested that faculty are already teaching masters students, so it is not that much different. SV would just expand the opportunities for new funding.

At the Senate meeting, CP/EVC Galloway noted that there are already 16k students taking UC Extension classes. Members questioned who the instructors were, whether they were adjunct faculty, lecturers, etc., and questioned what the faculty welfare and working conditions are for these employees.

A comment was made that contrary to popular belief, UCSC is not a radical risk taking campus, but is quite conservative as there have not been any large scale risks taken in terms of programing, etc. for many years. The Chancellor wants to take a risk in Silicon Valley and try something new and the campus should support it.

CFW will continue their discussion on the topic at a future committee meeting.

Online Education Revenue Sharing Models

VPAA Herbie Lee has requested Senate input on online education revenue sharing models used at several universities that might guide UCSC in creating a policy to govern revenue distribution from Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Members reviewed the associated materials including the “Online Education” section of the CFW May 2014 Senate Report in preparation for discussion and considered a committee response.

In the May 2014 CFW Senate report, CFW raised some issues with regards to online education. Members noted that most of these issues and questions have since been addressed through drafted agreements regarding intellectual property, etc. The revenue sharing models provided determine what happens to revenue that comes in after the original costs to create the course have been recouped. Many follow patent agreements and provide 30-35% of revenue to the creator with the rest going to the general campus.

CFW noted that many faculty on the UCSC campus publish books and get royalties, and there is a well-structured program for the distribution of publication revenues. However, there are currently very few UCSC MOOC courses, none of which are currently active, and most of which

are taught by Emeriti, and the revenue generated from this handful of course will not be much. The committee questioned why, with so few MOOC courses, so much time and resources were being spent on making agreements for them.

Members questioned how tightly departments are, or will be, integrated with an online course and what kind of labor is involved in its management. The amount of labor and support needed for a course could range from basic to more advanced. If an existing course is “flipped” to an online course, there is an obligation for the faculty member to teach the course as they were teaching it anyway. Therefore, a revenue formula might be different if an existing course is flipped (where royalties should be less and the campus should get more) vs. if a new course in a faculty member’s expertise is developed solely for the purpose of being used as a MOOC. Further, maintenance/modification of a course may involve more than one faculty member, in which case, these revenue models with payment going only to the original creator will not work.

Although the committee noted that all of the models provided look reasonable, some members expressed that they are not comfortable with the patent model and feel that more money should go to the department, which may reduce the overall complexity of the distribution. If the money was distributed to the departments, they would know who was involved in the creation/modifications of a course, and could distribute funds and resources as appropriate.

CFW determined that due to necessary future modifications of the course and the question of ongoing labor, the model where the creator gets 30% of the royalties might not be the right model for UCSC or any campus for that matter. The issue of ongoing labor will need to be addressed. The committee is concerned that the models mix the University’s educational mission with the research mission and are attempting to apply a research model onto educational.

Members agreed that if significant revenue starts to come in from MOOCs, a large share should go back to the programs and not be a money making tactic for individual faculty, especially if these involve long standing courses, for example survey courses . The goal, just like writing a book, should be to encourage great courses and the reward should not be a large sum of money, but the honor to continue to serve as UCSC faculty.

TAPS Fee Three-Year Fee Increase Proposal – Continued Discussion

During its meeting of April 16, 2014, CFW reviewed and discussed the Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) proposed three-year series of annual increases to most parking fees and program fares starting in July 2015 and continuing through June 2018. CFW and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) will advise the Chancellor on the proposed increases. Since the last meeting, members have reviewed and commented on a draft committee response to the proposal. CFW reviewed the draft response and considered whether further recommendations/edits are needed before the committee response is finalized.

Members are still not clear as to whether the proposed increases are justifiable. CFW assumes that the goal of the parking program is to maintain parking fees at a level that supports necessary programs and improvements, but reduces the amount of parking on campus, yet is not such a high fee that it is a burden on those employees who must drive to campus. The issue is similar to the campus housing RePricing Program.

The CFW Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) representative reported that at the 4/29/14 TAC meeting, members were walked through the individual proposed increases and were asked to vote on each separate proposed fee increase. The representative abstained from voting on all of the major increases as there are still no known guiding principles for the overall program to guide the assessment of programs and fee increase proposals.

The CFW TAC representative is extremely concerned about the proposed increases to parking “scratchers” as these users have the lowest impact on traffic on campus but will have some of the highest increases in costs if the proposal is approved. TAC has been informed that scratcher permits are extremely expensive to produce and there is a high level of labor associated with printing the hard copy passes, which is why TAPS feels that an increase is needed. The CFW TAC representative has pushed for modern equipment for pay stations to remedy the issue, but there appears to be pushback from TAPS. It appears that TAC is focusing on the little details of programs, etc., but the big picture and how big items are reflected in the budget are not addressed.

If implementing new technology is too difficult or expensive, a suggestion was made that the campus could hire a third party vendor to manage the pay stations, or use technology such as Fast Track for single usage payments, or phone apps, etc., in order to make the program more cost efficient.

Members questioned whether “B” parking permits should be abandoned and noted that it makes sense that those who want to park closer can opt to pay a higher fee like some other UC campuses. Members note that fee increases are an even bigger issue for lower paid staff on campus who are forced to pay to park where they work. Members agree that it is hard to have a “one shoe fits all” system, and questioned whether staff could be charged less, but have different parking access.

The draft CFW response discusses the Bike Shuttle program and how the program, with high emission vehicles and majority student ridership who would otherwise bike to campus or take the bus, is not reducing the campuses overall carbon footprint. The committee supports sustainability programs, but needs to know the program are fulfilling their intended goals, and would like to see some of the costs shared with other units. The committee noted that reducing the subsidy of the bike shuttle or shifting its funding to student affairs would alleviate some of the need for parking fee increases for faculty and staff.

With regards to the Crossing Guard program, the committee questioned if it should be subsidized completely by parking fees, and suggested that student fees should share the cost of the program.

Overall, CFW would like TAPS to establish who is using the subsidized programs and split the costs appropriately.

Housing Re-Pricing Proposal – Continued Discussion

On April 16, 2015, CFW discussed the annual Employee Housing Program: 2015-2016 Resale Pricing Program Recommendation in which, Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES) is recommending an increase of 1.58%. Following the last committee discussion, the CFW Housing Subcommittee sent a request for additional information to Steve Houser, Director of CHES. CFW received a summary of Houser's response from Housing Subcommittee members.

CFW members noted that the methodology and rationale for the 1.58% proposed increase is still not clear. The Subcommittee had thought that proposed increases were related to the annual increase of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and that if the CPI went up, then Repricing would go up. After consulting with Houser, the Subcommittee found that this was not the case, as Repricing went up several years in the past when the CPI was either flat or negative. Houser has stated that he uses several factors in determining the increase including carrying costs, remodeling, length of wait lists, etc. However, there is no "official" formula for determining the proposed increase.

The Subcommittee wants to work with Houser in order to establish a template for future Repricing Program proposals that includes necessary background information as well as a frequently asked questions section in order to assist future CFW members in their assessment.

When the CFW Housing Subcommittee met with Steve Houser, Houser stated that the down payment is the number one obstacle for faculty buying on or off campus housing. Housing allowances have helped many of the faculty who would otherwise wait. The distribution of these funds is the main issue, and CFW is waiting to hear back from CP/EVC Galloway as to how these funds are distributed on campus.

Members considered the Mortgage Origination Program (MOP loans). Apparently, the loan can only go up roughly 1% per year. There has been concern regarding whether campus housing would be affordable for Assistant Professors if it increased drastically. However, Houser has noted that it has never increased by more than 2% in a year. If the MOP rises rapidly in the future, CFW could respond by recommending that the CP/EVC not approve a Repricing increase in that given year. Members noted that the difference between a 1.7% and a 1.58% annual cost is a big difference for faculty, and yet, may still be less than a standard loan. UCFW had discussed the MOP loan program and feels that UC could be more aggressive with them. UCFW may have to push this issue, and CFW can work on this during the 2016-17 academic year.

Members considered whether it might be possible to alter the wait list so that junior faculty get preference. Apparently the campus considered doing this in the past but there were arguments against it. Some claimed that Associate Professors did not get housing allowances when they were hired and questioned why Assistants should be given preference and not Associates. Houser has

stated that housing prices need to be set at a rate where the wait list is neither too short, nor too long.

Members question whether regulating the wait list would make this less of an issue and it may be possible to keep prices lower. Members considered several options such as organizing the wait list by income, or having the CP/EVC determine that new hires receive priority. CFW may revisit the wait list issue in 2016-17. A suggestion was made that as the wait list is currently short, this would be an opportune time to make changes.

The CFW Housing Subcommittee members agree that the proposed 1.58% increase is acceptable, but that moving forward, there should be a new procedure. CFW would like to see more detail and transparency than has been supplied with previous requests. Further, CFW would like to know how the accumulated revenue from Repricing should be spent. One of the original goals of the program was to raise funds for the Low Interest Option Supplemental Home Loan Program (LIO-SHLP) loan program, but the OP has changed conditions on the loan and is no longer a viable option for faculty, and is not being used. In the future, members would like to make a recommendation as to what this revenue may support including the possibility of expanding campus housing inventory.