

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of May 28, 2015

Present: Noriko Aso, Adrian Brasoveanu, David Cuthbert, Andrew Mathews, James Zachos (Chair), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent: Ted Holman, Benjamin Read, Nina Treadwell, Manfred Warmuth, Roger Anderson

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

Spring Senate Meeting, 5/29/15 at 2:30 pm – Stevenson Event Center

Chair Zachos encouraged members to attend the spring Academic Senate meeting on May 29, 2015. There will be a reception following the event and may be a high number of students in attendance due to a proposed resolution on UC divestment in fossil fuels.

COC Social, 6/2/15

Chair Zachos also encouraged members to attend the Committee on Committee's Social on June 2, 2105 and noted that it is a great way for new members to meet the committee and hear about their work.

Update from the SEC Meeting of May 26, 2015

Chair Zachos provided CFW members with a report from the May 26, 2015 meeting of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). SEC discussed the upcoming Senate meeting and the fossil fuel divestment resolution, as well as the May Revise and potential impacts if it is approved, which includes changes to retirement benefits and an initiative to decrease time to graduation. Members noted that a few years ago during the budget cuts, UCLA created a "45 initiative", reducing the number of hours that a student needs to graduate within a major.

CFW members questioned whether UCSC has a problem with students not graduating in four years. Chair Zachos noted that individual departments already assess curriculum requirements and make modifications as needed. The Regents approved the May Revise discussed later in meeting, and there may be consultation regarding how to implement it. If so, CFW will want to chime in.

SEC consulted with Vice Chancellor for Research, Scott Brandt regarding the University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) funds and the potential of a five year contract at \$50 million/year that would likely involve other campuses. VCR Brandt discussed the structural aspects of NAMs and its connection to academic programs. The campus is waiting to hear if the UCSC NAMS proposal will be selected. It is not known if funding from NASA will be made available to support NAMS.

Governor's May Revised Budget and UCRP

On May 14, 2015, President Napolitano announced that she and Gov. Brown reached an agreement that provides UC with new revenue while capping resident tuition increases for the next two years. The agreement provides a one-time infusion of \$436 million over three years for UC's pension

debt repayment. In exchange for this infusion, the university has agreed to adopt a new pension tier by July 1, 2016. Members received an update on the regents meeting and UCFW/TFIR discussions, and considered options for recommendations.

Members noted that the \$436 million will help to return to 100% funding earlier if the constant rate of return is 7.5% and the current employee and employer contributions levels do not change, but, raised concerns regarding the introduction of a new tier of retirement benefits. A new (third) tier of benefits would follow the guidelines of the state pension program and would have a maximum cap of \$117k. Members raised concerns about how the cap would affect faculty and administrators who have higher salaries, and questioned whether the cap is the limit of the salary upon which a percentage is calculated, or if it is a total payment cap. Some details of the proposed third tier are not yet clear. The plan may be supplemented with a defined contribution plan (where the employee puts in money and UC matches) along with a defined benefit plan. Members noted that a defined contribution plan could more than compensate for loss of defined benefit plan, if it involves matching contributions from the university.

If the cap is the limit of the salary upon which the percentage is calculated, members noted that this would affect a much larger population of employees. Chair Zachos reported that the UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) is currently putting together an analysis of what the impacts will be. There have been concerns raised that the new tier may make it hard to retain senior faculty as when professor's approach step 4 or 5, they may be tempted to leave with their retirement and teach somewhere else where the salaries are larger. Members note that a defined contribution plan would be portable and could erode faculty at the height of their careers and result in UC becoming a mediocre university rather than competing with IVs and Stanford. A main concern for CFW is how a third tier will impact UC's ability to retain faculty. Further, the committee noted that having the third tier would mean that less money would go into UCRP contributions, which would further erode the current unfunded liability and the overall health of the plan and also affect those who are enrolled in the first and second tier of UCRP.

Some members expressed frustration that the media is solely focusing on how the agreement will affect students and tuition, and the third tier and how it would affect employees isn't being mentioned. Members considered how the agreement will uniquely affect UCSC if tuition increases are frozen and noted that the Chancellor's email about the agreement to employees clearly stated that even with the 4% increase in state support, UCSC's budget will still face a deficit in 2015-16. Members noted UCSC's efforts to increase out of state enrollments in order to increase income.

Chair Zachos believes that the Senate may be provided with the opportunity to comment on how the agreement will be actualized. If given the opportunity, CFW will comment with regards to retirement and total remuneration.

Final Systemwide Review of APM 133-17-g-j

CFW has been asked to comment on proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual Section 133-17-g-j, Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles. The policy was first reviewed by the committee during its November 6, 2015 meeting. CFW determined that the proposed changes were sensible and supported the revisions as proposed. The policy is now under a final review with revisions made in response to the initial fall review. While current policy provides for automatic exclusion from service limitations when leave is related to childbearing or rearing, the proposed revisions aim to establish how faculty may apply for an extension of the eight-year rule when the request is related to a serious health condition including disability, bereavement, or other significant circumstance or event.

The committee noted that the proposed revisions appear to address most, if not all of the situations for which a request to stop the tenure clock would be necessary and supports the proposed revisions.

Silicon Valley Initiative

In December 2014, CP/EVC Galloway sent a memo to divisional deans regarding the implementation of Academic Programs in Silicon Valley. The document listed some proposed goals for UC Santa Cruz in Silicon Valley, background, and details regarding the call for proposals and program selection process. During the Senate meeting of April 22, 2015, UCSC's presence in Silicon Valley was a main topic of discussion. Several comments on the floor raised concerns regarding problematic issues for current programs in Silicon Valley that shed light on some issues regarding faculty welfare that might exist if/when programs are moved to a satellite campus. Members will review the associated enclosures in preparation for a discussion of potential faculty welfare issues for SV faculty.

Members noted that the CP/EVC memo to divisional deans outlined two potential models for how faculty and/or lecturers would be brought in to initiative programs in SV. One model focuses on cluster hires of ladder rank and junior faculty. The second model, focuses on lectures and adjusts and the starting point, and depending on how the program evolves, may later include ladder rank faculty, or possibly convert some of the adjunct and/or lecturers to ladder rank faculty.

A suggestion was made that the campus should aim to bring in the best ladder rank faculty in order to get the SV campus off the ground and increase the overall appearance for the purpose of advertising and attracting students. A concern was raised that the second and more cautious and may provide the outward appearance that the campus is setting itself up for failure.

CFW members questioned what number of FTE would be necessary to have an effective program and questioned if six of the allotted FTE going to administrative positions is really necessary for such a low number of faculty. Members questioned whether some of these positions would be used for student services and noted some of the issues that the Computations Media Department is having there. Further, a comment was made that the pre-proposals may be seen by the administration as "support" for the initiative, but that might not be the case, as some departments were merely submitting proposals per the call guidelines. If the administration had asked

departments how they see UCSC engaging in Silicon Valley, the proposals may have been much different. Concerns were raised about the lack of market research done, as well as the lack of a clear administrative vision for SV programs, and questions were raised as to whether a predicted time of budget cuts is the best time to move forward with such a large project. Further, a suggestion was made that SOE proposals should not be submitted until a new dean is in place next year to ensure cohesion and make sure that the new dean supports the proposals.

With regards to faculty welfare, members agreed that tenure track faculty should teach in SV, and they will need access to PhD students in order to generate new material and research. Without this access, career and overall morale will be affected. A concern was raised that SV faculty could become second class citizens in their departments if they will not be able to stay on top of the latest developments in their field.

If the SV Initiative moves forward, CFW anticipates issues for faculty welfare regarding cost of living, (salaries should be higher), housing issues (housing allowances needed), and retention. Members raised concerns that the turnover for SV faculty could be high due to the high cost of living and lack of academic community. Further, members noted that all Health Net and “Tier One” physicians under UC Care are all located in Santa Cruz, so faculty working in SV should have access to Kaiser physicians. Members note that financial incentives to compensate for the commute will also need to be considered, as well as an adequate shuttle service to link the two campuses. Chair Zachos stated that CFW’s role is to make sure that the administration understands these potential issues so that they may be addressed and enable the campus to attract and retain exceptional faculty. CFW questioned whether there was a group looking out for the welfare of lecturers or adjuncts who may also teach in SV.

Chair Zachos noted that the full proposals will need to be honest about the resources required, and consider all program expenses, including those associated with faculty welfare. It may be costly to retain good faculty, and this needs to be considered. CFW will draft a letter to the administration to raise the issues of SV faculty welfare so that planning may consider these factors.

Senate Resolution on Divesting in Fossil Fuels

Chair Zachos informed members that during the May 29, 2015 Senate meeting, a resolution will be proposed calling on the UC Academic Council to request that all divisional Senates discuss and vote to support a memorial to the UC Regents to divest the University of California’s endowment (General Endowment Pool) from 200 companies holding the largest carbon reserves. The resolution submitted by the Environmental Studies Department will be voted on at the May 29th meeting.

Quick Childcare Update

Chair Zachos reported that Sarah Latham is investigating a child care reimbursement program this summer and will have a report finalized by the end of August. CFW is concerned that the committee note be informed of the results. Members noted that having a point person (Sarah Latham) good, but raised concerns that she has many responsibilities and may be too busy to see

employee childcare come to fruition in the near future.