

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
October 8, 2015
61 Kerr

Present: Shelly Grabe, Ted Holman, Andrew Mathews, Grant McGuire, Ricardo Sanfelice, James Zachos (Chair), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent: Neda Atanasoski, Shelly Errington (*ex officio*)

Welcome & Introductions

Members introduced themselves and noted their interests in terms of faculty welfare issues. Interests included: childcare, retention of faculty, spousal/partner hire resources, housing, salary issues, and healthcare.

SenateCruz Orientation

Members were provided with a tutorial on how to navigate the CFW homepage on the Academic Senate "SenateCruz" website and how to use Google docs for editing committee correspondence.

Chair's Orientation to Committee Business

Chair Zachos provided a brief overview of member responsibilities and procedures for conducting CFW business. The committee reviewed the Member Guidelines document and discussed committee confidentiality.

Chair Zachos represents CFW on the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). He may ask a member to volunteer to attend an SEC meeting if he is not able to attend. Chair Zachos also attends meetings of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) once a month. Many issues that are discussed at the campus level are also considered by the systemwide committee. CFW's job is make sure that UCSC faculty welfare concerns are heard at the systemwide level.

The UCSC Academic Senate will be holding an orientation meeting for all senate committee members on November 29th, 2015. Chair Zachos encourages all to attend. The orientation will be less of a training and more of a topical discussion and an opportunity to collaborate with other committees on topics that span committee purviews.

Issues and Goals for CFW in 2015-16

Members reviewed the 2014-15 CFW annual report and discussed pertinent issues for CFW that the committee will address in 2015-16. Topics included:

Faculty Salary

Chair Zachos noted that CFW has been monitoring year to year changes in faculty salaries at UCSC relative to salaries on other campuses. This close review is motivated in part by observations in the mid 2000's that UCSC had one of the lowest median salaries in the UC system, the reason of which has been speculated, but is not known. One theory is that

departments in the past did not do a good job advancing their faculty through personnel reviews. CFW members noted that more education is needed to train departments in creating effective personnel review files.

A special salary practice, or “Merit Boost Plan” was instigated at UCSC in 2008 with the goal of bringing the UC median up to the systemwide wide median. In recent years, CFW has more specifically recommended that UCSC’s median be equal to that of UC Santa Barbara (UCSB), UC San Diego (UCSD), and UC Irving (UCI), which are coastal communities with a similar cost of living to Santa Cruz. Chair Zachos reported that the Merit Boost Plan appears to be making a difference, but the campus is still not at the systemwide median target set 7 years ago.

The Merit Boost Plan was originally slated for 3 years, and has been extended every year since until the end of 2015-16. The Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) has said that should would like to continue the program, but the program might change in some way. Chair Zachos noted that the Merit Boost Plan helps to offset the flat salary scales. Faculty will be receiving a 3% salary increase this year, which may also help.

Chair Zachos noted that unless salaries increase, UCSC’s total remuneration will not be competitive. If the specific factor causing UCSC salaries to be lower is not identified and addressed, Chair Zachos fears that UCSC will continue to be below the other UCSC campuses. Some other campuses, such as UC Davis, are starting their own programs, similar to the Merit Boost Plan to increase their faculty salaries. UC is trying to address total remuneration issues in a systematic way, but remedies are easier for campuses with more resources to increase salaries, and are harder for others. State divestment in the UCSC system accentuates the problem. One of the most important factors for UCSC is the area’s cost of living.

Members noted that there has been a shift in how UC faculty are paid. Apparently years ago, all faculty were paid by the UC Office of the President (UCOP). Now each campus gets a lump some of money and the campus is responsible to pay faculty and run the campus. Due to this shift, the more a campus pas faculty, the less resources are available for other things, such as academic programing. Therefore, CFW plays an important role in making recommendations to the administration with regards to faculty salaries.

The campus breakdown of the 2014 Update of Total Remuneration Study for General Campus Ladder Rank Faculty showed that UCSC is close to the bottom. However, last year’s CFW analysis showed that UCSC salaries compared to other UC campuses is not as low on the rungs. This year, Chair Zachos would like to look into why this might be, and CFW will consider how their analysis is calculated, including the metrics used. Further, CFW may want to get a sense of the recruitment and retention rates on campus to monitor the possible effects of UCSC total remuneration.

Childcare

Childcare has been a long time issue for UCSC. Unfortunately there is no formal childcare program for faculty and employees. In fact, UCSC is the only UC campus that does not offer any employee childcare program. Last year, CFW began to press hard on this issue. There have been several campus committees that have come together to generate recommendations and plans for moving forward with a childcare center or program. All of these recommendations, which included thorough business plans, have been shot down by the administration usually due to expense and/or liability concerns.

Last year's committee determined that an on campus child care facility would be ideal for faculty. There is a student child care facility, but employee childcare is not included in the program. CP/EVC Galloway has mentioned that the center will be remodeled with the remodeling of family student housing and a new building might be constructed a few years down the road, which can house employee childcare as well. However, CFW does not know if this is a realistic possibility. Last year, CFW recommended renting a facility off campus for a child care center, and until such a center may be secured, creating a voucher program to assist with costs associated with childcare, especially for those who can least afford it such as junior faculty.

Some steps forward have been taken. Chair Zachos reported that over the summer, the administration agreed to look into some of these options, and created a "Faculty and Staff Childcare Model Analysis Team" to research the options and create a report. Unfortunately, there was no faculty representative on the committee. Members considered setting up a meeting for the team to meet with a few representatives on CFW. In addition, last year CP/EVC Galloway designated Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham as the employee childcare point person for the campus. Further, due to a request from a previous CFW committee, roughly \$700k has been set aside by the CP/EVC for childcare. Members note that CFW will want to secure these funds only for childcare in writing before the CP/EVC Galloway leaves her post in December 2016.

CFW may collaborate with the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) on the topic this year. CAAD will be focusing on family friendly policies and the culture surrounding their usage.

Health Care

Chair Zachos reported that open enrollment for 2016 health plans is on its way. The same plans as last year will be offered, but premiums might be slightly higher. CFW will want to stay alert to potential changes in plan offerings in 2017, as UCOP and some health service campuses would like to incorporate an HMO plan into UC Care, which will require negotiations with local Santa Cruz health care providers since UCSC does not have a medical center. It is not yet clear if UCSC employees will have access to all the providers that are currently available. Campuses with no medical center will need to be cognizant of any movement towards reorganization of health care.

There is currently a proposal to change the composition of the **UC health advisory committee (CORRECT NAME?)** by removing Regent members and adding chancellor's of campuses with medical centers and adding UCOP Executive Vice President for UC Health, John Stobo, who has been pushing for UC Care. Chair Zachos noted that such a change would completely remove the faculty voice, which is worrisome for CFW. There is general concern that such a change may influence the priorities of the medical centers to outweigh the general health care priorities for employees.

UC Care has been online for two years now and members would like to know if members are happy with the program, the out of pocket cost, and access to physicians through the plan. UCOP has conducted healthcare satisfaction surveys in the past and may have this information readily available.

Housing

Member Holman reported that last year's committee was fairly active on the topic of Housing. CFW worked to establish better communication with Colleges, Housing, & Educational Services (CHES) Director Steve Houser and Faculty and Staff Housing. CFW reviews and provides comment to the CP/EVC on proposals for increases to the campus Re-Pricing program. CFW did not understand the formula that was being used by Director Houser to set the proposed price. CFW worked with Houser to make this formula more transparent and to enhance the supportive documents provided in these proposals.

Last year's committee was also concerned about campus housing inventory, particularly in light of the planned increase in hires due to expected faculty retirement in the next few years. CFW considered the expansion of Ranch View Terrace (RVT) homes and building the second phase of planned homes (RVT2). Holman noted that if CFW would like the campus to move forward with RVT, CFW will need to build a case this year and convince the administration that it is necessary to move forward.

Recruitment allowances were also discussed by last year's committee. Such allowances help faculty make down payments on homes, and CFW noted that not all divisions are providing these allowances to new recruits. . Members note that the disparity among divisions in distributing such funds may have to do with the resources made available to each division, and that even with these funds, the current housing market makes it next to impossible for a new Assist Prof 3 to purchase a home off campus. Further, the rental market has increased nearly \$100/month since last year for a 2 bedroom house (averaging \$3000/month). This year, CFW may want to consider encouraging the administration to be more aggressive with providing these funds to new faculty, by collecting data on how these funds are being distributed across the divisions in order to make a case

The estimated increase in new faculty hires and the rising housing market brings up the issue of transitional housing. Campus housing use to include some short term leased condo units. When

the housing market was low, it was determined that this transitional housing was no longer needed and the units were sold off. Members note that there are a few rental units in Laureate Court that are being rented solely because they have not been sold. CFW may want to consider requesting that these units remain as rental housing and might want to consider creating transitional housing inventory on campus.

Parking & Transportation

In recent years, CFW has had a representative sit on the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). This committee and its charge may be changing this year. A new parking rate proposal is expected this year, after being pulled back after a campus review last year. CFW will want to review this new proposal closely.

Online Education

Not discussed.

Retirement

The University of California Retirement Program (UCRP) and its unfunded liability is being dealt with at the systemwide committee level (UCFW). There is a new tier for new employees, which CFW will want to look at which may be a defined benefit with a cap. UC seems to be moving towards a complete defined contribution plan which may affect recruitment and retention. Members noted that if future plans are defined benefit, and no new money is put into UCRP, it will have implications for the health of the plan and it will become even more unstable.

Chair Zachos reported that the Campus Welfare Committee (CWC) is set to be reconstituted by the CP/EVC this year and CFW will have a liaison. VCBAS Sarah Latham will be the chair of the committee. Last year, CFW has asked to see a proposed charge, but one has not yet been sent to the Senate. CFW will want to participate in the charges review and provide comment and recommendations for improvements.

Faculty Salary Equity Follow Up

By request of UCOP, in January 20115, the UCSC campus created a Report on Faculty Salary Equity at the University of California, Santa Cruz. When looking at the salary medians, the report showed that the salaries of women faculty were slightly lower, but these inequities were explained by department affiliation. There has been no campus follow-up to address findings of the report. CAAD will be looking into this further this year, and CFW may collaborate with them.

Partner Hire Resources

Member Holman reported that campus partner hire resources could be an important welfare and retention tool as partner employment can improve faculty quality of life in Santa Cruz. There was apparently a staff person on campus that housed a list of potential employers, but this was not very helpful and was not continued. Member Holman would like the campus to manage a

list of faculty whose spouses in a variety of employment fields, would be willing to speak with and advise the faculty partners/spouses about employment in their field in Santa Cruz. Member Holman will meet with the divisional deans in the near future and request their support of a list and encourage them to encourage their faculty to participate in the program. Such a program would not cost the campus any money, but could help to retain faculty.

Committee Issue Assignments

All CFW members are expected to monitor or work on one of the issue noted above, about which they will report back to the full committee throughout the year. In some cases, this will require additional attendance of a campus committee, and for others, the analytical review of reports or data which are provided to CFW on a regular basis. Members discussed the responsibilities of these assignments and volunteered for topical assignments.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Policy on Sexual Violence and Harassment

In February 2015, a draft revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence bringing UC into compliance with the requirements of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was circulated for review. The President issued an interim policy and requested that the Policy Working Group review the comments received before a final policy was drafted. The revised University Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment is now being forwarded for final review.

Chair Zachos noted that both UCFW and CFW should weigh in on these proposed revisions from faculty perspective, and consider its effectiveness, whether or not the policy provides adequate tools. Members questioned whether it was helpful or problematic to address both sexual violence harassment in a single policy, and considered whether there might be issues of academic freedom associated with the policy and the faculty responsibilities for reporting. Members further noted that if faculty will be responsible to report, training will be needed.

Members noted that there are confidential options for students and UCSC has a good orientation program for undergrads, which other campuses are learning from.

Chair Zachos invites members to send their comments and/or concerns to him by email so that a committee response may be drafted.