

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of May 14, 2015

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

Absent: Roger Anderson

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

CFW considered and approved the minutes from the meetings of April 16 and April 30, 2015.

Chair Zachos reported on the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting on May 8th, 2015, of which, he attended by conference call. UCFW discussed the Office of the President (UCOP) July 1, 2015 mandated 3% salary increase for all faculty, and consulted with the Chair of the Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR). This year, the total contribution to the retirement fund is equal to the full annual required contribution. The total contribution includes a 14% UC contribution and an 8% employee contribution. This contribution plus the \$700 million that was recently borrowed from short term investment pool funds (STIP) equal the full contribution required have made significant progress towards reducing the unfunded liability. This is good news for the UCRP.

Members also received an update from the May 12th, 2015 Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting. SEC met with Tracy Tsugawa, Title IX Officer, and Director of the Harassment & Discrimination Prevention & Investigation Unit (HDPIU). Tsugawa consulted with SEC regarding new regulations, which have resulted in proposed changes to campus and UC policy. Tsugawa reported that the caseload of her office has doubled from last year, which may have to do with new reporting requirements. She is in the process of hiring two full time investigators which will help ease the case load.

Some CFW members expressed concern about how the office handled complaints in the past and noted that it did not appear that once a complaint was made, measurable steps were being taken to remedy the situation. With the new laws and requirements in place, there is now a clear process that will be followed. If faculty receive a report from a student, etc., they have a responsibility to report it to the office and perhaps the police. The HDPIU keeps all information confidential, however, students need to understand that if they speak with faculty in confidence, the information will be reported/passed on. Faculty now have the responsibility to report violence, harassment, etc. It is no longer confidential and needs to be reported.

CFW members expressed concern that this may shut down some communication or the reporting of such events, as students may not want to speak with faculty if they know that information will be shared. The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) is in the process of drafting

a correspondence regarding the new campus and faculty requirements.

The HDPIU has plans to provide information regarding reporting responsibility online. There is also a planned online required training for students and faculty. Tsugawa asked SEC for recommendations as to how the new requirements could be advertised. SEC would like to see more education and training for faculty and students, vs. “enforcement” of the new requirements. CFW members noted that many cases may fall into grey areas of harassment and may be a challenge for a system that is not built to deal with nuances and may put pressure on our campus in areas that we are not trained to handle and don’t excel at. Members commented that prevention through education would be more optimal.

CP/EVC Pre-consultation

CFW considered questions and then determined the desired goals/focus of the consultation.

CP/EVC Consultation

CFW consulted with CP/EVC Alison Galloway regarding the Office of the President (UCOP) mandated 3% salary increase for all faculty and eligible non-represented academic employees effective July 1, 2015.

Faculty Salaries

At the Senate meeting of February 18, 2015, CFW announced that the committee would take a second look at the most recent faculty salary data analysis in relation to the current Merit Boost Plan, and determine if changes are needed to address inequities in salary comparisons with other UC campuses, and the lag found at Step 9 and above. CFW reviewed the latest salary analysis with this goal in mind and considered whether changes in the Merit Boost Plan are needed.

Chair Zachos met with Carolyn Dean, Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), on May 7th, 2015 to discuss CFW’s latest faculty salary analysis and consider what could be leading to salary compression issues on campus. The two noted that during the past six-seven years, the campus has been hiring with market offers. The Merit Boost Plan was originally just for Assistant and Associate Professors, which also may have contributed to some of the compression with off-scale salaries. The plan has since been extended to all ranks. Further, in 2006-07, there was a salary adjustment when the UC President attempted to fix the salary scales by absorbing off-scale into on-scale salary. This may have caused some compression.

Chairs Zachos and Dean also spoke about the academic personnel review process on campus versus that on other campuses. At UCSC, central CAP reviews every personnel action for ladder rank faculty, whereas at some other campuses, central CAP only looks at major promotions and divisional CAP’s review standard merit reviews, which (Chair Zachos noted) may provide divisions with an opportunity to make equity adjustments. CFW members noted that issues with off-scale could be addressed by deans using the equity review process, but commented that the rules for equity reviews are strict and cannot correct market discrepancies. Chair Zachos suggested that this difference in review processes may also contribute to some compression issues at UCSC. A suggestion was made that perhaps the current system of review might need revision.

CFW members recognized the staggering workload of CAP and questioned why standard merit reviews should go to a central CAP, and if the central advisory role is necessary given that the divisional dean is making the final decision.

Chair Zachos reported that Chair Dean noted that the criteria for accelerations has changed with time. In Humanities, for example, the assumption was once that if a faculty member published a book, they received a full step acceleration. Now, if a faculty member publishes a book, they receive a half step. Within divisions, the way that promotions and accelerations are being handled could change, and Chair Zachos noted that this may be worth looking at.

Members received an update on the latest total remuneration data by campus which shows that UCSC fairs worse than all other UC campuses aside from Riverside. Chair Zachos suggested that this is a tragedy as the quality of research and teaching here is equal to that of other campuses. Members considered whether they could get information/data on personnel review processes on other campuses and/or look at the success of equity reviews on campus, with the idea that the data may show that the determining point is not CAP but something else.

Members agreed that the bottom line is that the current system appears to be reactive vs. proactively responding to the open market. The committee determined that the Merit Boost Plan should be continued. Members noted that the plan has not yet attained the intended goal of bringing UCSC salaries up to the systemwide median, and that other campuses are now instigating similar programs to bring up faculty salaries and may have more money and flexibility to do so due to income from medical schools, research, etc. During the spring Senate meeting, Chair Zachos will announce that the Merit Boost Plan should continue and that the next round in 2016-17 should maintain the speed of accelerations/advancement and increase the amount of off-scale (GTNs) that is currently being given.