

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of June 9, 2016

Present: Karen Bassi, Shelly Grabe, Ted Holman, Grant McGuire, Ricardo Sanfelice, Nina Treadwell, James Zachos (Chair), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: Andrew Mathews, Shelly Errington (*ex officio*)

Chair Announcements

Chair Zachos provided the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) with an update from the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting with the Chancellor's cabinet on June 2, 2016. Chancellor Blumenthal reported that all UC chancellors are discussing campus budget issues with the Regents particularly those related to the mandate to take on more students. SEC was informed that most campuses are already running a structural deficit. The worst case, as publicized, is at UC Berkeley (UCB), which is \$150 million in deficit and is borrowing money from the Office of the President (UCOP) to close the deficit. Chair Zachos noted that the UCB deficit will likely affect other campuses since UCOP resources will be used to assist to UCB. Space issues on our campus with regards to housing and classroom space will also be severe. SEC also discussed impact on departments due to increased enrollment.

Chair Zachos noted that amidst these hard times, there are some positive things, such as the recent 3% raise in faculty salaries. Chair Zachos added that the role of the Senate is to help the administration make the best decisions possible given the resources that we have, particularly when money is tight. CFW members suggested that the role of the committee is to protect faculty welfare and help to maintain quality of life.

Chair Zachos reported that Chancellor Blumenthal also talked about the new UCOP building funding model to bring in big contractors to bid on several projects at a time. Chair Zachos noted that the new model will greatly benefit UC Santa Cruz as builders usually prefer contracting with the larger campuses and multi-year projects and are not usually interested in smaller UCSC projects thus limiting bids. Under the new model, if multiple campuses need dorms and classrooms, contractors will bid for all the projects at one time, which will lower the cost to the campus and may enable several projects to begin construction at one time.

Post-Consultation – VCBAS Latham

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) debriefed from its May 26, 2016 consultation with Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham. Chair Zachos expressed that he felt the discussion was useful. The committee now understands that the new debt ceiling limit associated with the new building model will allow for projects to move forward. The committee would like childcare to be included. Members note that what is built is all based on the campus's priorities, and some members do not believe that childcare will happen as it is not currently on the priority list. Classrooms and dorms are high on the list now due to the UCOP mandate to enroll more students, and must be built quickly. Chair Zachos reported that he emailed

VCBAS Latham post consultation to inquire as to whether the campus ever looked at the possibility of expanding the current student child care center to include employees. Her response indicated that they had not, but that she would be happy to talk about the option, and noted that the details of the new building model are still being figured out, and it is not yet clear how existing plans could be revised. CFW members recognized that in order to include a possible childcare project, the committee and campus will need to act quickly. Members questioned whether the current center could be expanded to incorporate employee children for less than \$8 million, which was the projected cost of a new building listed in the Child Care Services Model Analysis Team report earlier this year. A suggestion was made that the footprint of the center should be expanded anyway to accommodate more student families due to the UCOP enrollment mandate. CFW noted that there are currently funds earmarked for childcare that could be put towards such a project.

Members discussed how historically, childcare has been connected with early childhood development faculty. The committee referenced the Cabrillo College childcare program that also acts as a research facility. Members noted that although there was liability associated with opening such a center, Cabrillo took the risk and is now a highly recognized program with a long wait list. Risk and liability have been road blocks to creating employee childcare at UCSC, but members noted that there are successful models in the area, and the campus would not have to reinvent the wheel set of speak. A suggestion was made that a childcare center could be pitched in the campus's fundraising campaign to raise money.

The CFW chair and a committee representative would like to meet with VCBAS monthly during the summer in order to be proactive and stay abreast of the latest information regarding the new building funding model details as they are being created. The committee wants to ensure that childcare and faculty housing are included in big project bids under the new model.

CFW discussed the possibility of working with the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) next year in order to make employee childcare a top priority for the campus. Chair Zachos would also like to know what CPB's role is in faculty housing and how CFW can participate to a greater degree. A suggestion was made to email the chairs of both of these committees to see if they would like to be involved in the discussions with VCBAS Latham this summer.

The committee will draft a post consultation memo to VCBAS Latham noting that CFW understands that the President's new building model initiative is aimed at increasing beds for the rising influx of students into the UC system and that the new model and the associated private/public partnership will allow the UCSC campus to build more within our current debt capacity. The memo will emphasize that CFW is keenly interested in how this new model may be used to address employee child care and faculty housing needs. VCBAS Latham mentioned in meeting that she had suggested to President Napolitano that if it were attractive to the developer, other projects such as these should be folded into bidding packages. CFW will recommend that this suggestion be posed as a direct question to the President to clarify what is allowable under this

new model. It is of the utmost importance to CFW, that UCSC have a clear understanding of what is allowable under this new building model, and that employee childcare and housing needs are included as construction plans based on this model are developed. CFW will also mention the possibility of extended the footprint of the current student child care center to include employee children and question whether this is a realistic option for the campus.

Tuition Remission Benefit (tabled discussion from 5/26/16)

The UC Riverside (UCR) Committee on Faculty Welfare has proposed a tuition remission benefit for UC faculty (and staff). The University of California Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) has discussed the pros and cons of requesting this benefit, which is not the first request of its kind. Members reviewed the proposal and were provided with historical context surrounding education fee waivers and considered the merits of such a benefit.

Chair Zachos reported that UCFW would like the support of all UC campuses before the committee decides whether or not it will endorse the proposal. Some UCFW members expressed that they felt that the benefit appeared to be too much political work for too little gain for something that would not benefit all faculty. UCR claims that the benefit would work as a recruitment and a retention tool, as it would kick in later in one's career and may assist UC in retaining senior faculty. The cost analysis projection that was shared with UCFW suggested that such a program would cost roughly \$10 million in total.

CFW members considered the pros and cons of such a benefit. Members noted that in terms of salary equity, the benefit would be greater for those with lower salaries as it would be a fixed benefit. Some members questioned how the benefit could affect public perception of UC if applied during a time when tuition is going up for students, and suggested that it would be better to prioritize the need for employee childcare on campus as it would have a greater effect on productivity. Others noted that other universities provide tuition remission, and such a benefit could remedy lower benefits for new faculty. All agreed that adopting the benefit now would be poor timing.

Chair Zachos noted that the proposal could be stronger and UCFW agrees that there should be a better attempt to sell the proposal. If the proposal was improved, CFW may be willing to get behind it, but the committee would want to poll Senate faculty to make sure that the committee would be accurately representing the campus.

Faculty Salaries

CFW was provided with a report on the latest analysis conducted by the CFW Faculty Salary Subcommittee. The committee has done some additional analysis but is not completely finished. Subcommittee members stated that their work will continue into fall 2016. This year's annual report will include what has already been shared at Senate meetings, but with a few additional graphs.

The current analysis indicates that salary growth does not seem to vary by division. However, there are a decent number of faculty in the Arts Division who are below the median for salary and promotion growth. If the CFW analysis identifies individual outliers within departments, this information could be supplied to departments so that they may be proactive in remedying inequities. Members noted that the data could greatly assist department chairs as those outliers might represent meritorious faculty who might be targeted with external offers, or tempted to seek another post. Members recalled that in 2014 CFW sent salary information to all Senate faculty at the beginning of fall quarter to assist faculty in the preparation of their files, and noted that department chairs could benefit most by getting information about outliers at the beginning of the fall quarter. A suggestion was made to share this information with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) as well.

Members questioned whether it might be possible to create a formula on the campus median, for which faculty could plug in their information and see how they stack up. The subcommittee stated that such a formula could be possible. A suggestion was made to include this formula in the annual report, and to host it on the CFW Senate website with the title, “CFW Salary Formula – How Do You Stack Up?”

Chair Zachos suggested that CFW should not have be responsible for generating an equity report on annual basis, and that the responsibility should fall with the Academic Personnel Office (APO). The APO stopped generating their Faculty Salary Competitiveness report in 2012, and CFW will officially request that the unit resume this responsibility.

End of the Year Wrap Up and Annual Report

During the fall quarter, members were asked to monitor specific faculty welfare issues and provide updates to the full committee throughout the year. Chair Zachos indicated that much of the topical text for the annual report could be lifted from previous CFW reports and correspondence from this academic year. Members will draft their topical sections and provide them to the committee chair with copy to the committee analyst for inclusion in the report.