

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of November 17, 2016

Present: Melissa Gwyn, Ted Holman, Grant McGuire, Stefano Profumo (Chair), Ricardo Sanfelice, Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: Vilashini Cooppan, Shelly Errington (*ex officio*)

Chair Announcements

Chair Profumo will attend the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting on November 18, 2016. UCFW will receive a report from the Health Care Task Force (HCTF) as to the reasoning behind the significant increase in out of pocket maximums for the 2017 UC Care plan, which the Santa Cruz Division CFW brought to UCFW's attention. Chair Profumo has been told that the new maximums are inclusive of health, prescription, and medical maximums. UCFW will discuss the issue in meeting.

The Academic Personnel Office (APO) recently released its Annual Report of Faculty Salary Competitiveness (November 2016). The report is based on systemwide data from 2015 (which includes salary, rank, and campus.) CFW will review the report in detail at the next committee meeting. Chair Profumo shared that the report states that UCSC salaries are better than 7 other UC campuses. Chair Profumo questioned whether the analysis may lead to the suggestion that the Merit Boost Plan or "Special Salary Practice" that was instituted in 2008 is no longer needed. However, members recognized that all UC campuses strive to bring their salaries up to the "Comparison 8" campuses, and several have created their own special salary/boost programs. If UCSC ends the Merit Boost Program, CFW is concerned that UCSC salaries will quickly fall behind.

Chair Profumo stated that he has cross checked all of the APO numbers and they all look fine, but noted that the analysis does not include cost of living. Chair Profumo has been looking at cost of living comparisons online for the UC campuses with regards to location based on zip code and county. On these websites, a salary is entered in, and the software computes the equivalent salary for the area. One such example is relocationessentials.com. Chair Profumo reported that Santa Cruz is the highest cost of living across the 9 campuses aside from San Francisco, and is 30% higher than Merced. Members raised concerns about this analysis not being included in the report, as with cost of living factored in, UC Santa Cruz lags behind all other campuses by 10%.

The committee noted that although frequently discussed at CFW meetings, cost of living has never been an accepted argument or variable in faculty salary comparisons between UC campuses. Members questioned the reasoning behind the Office of the President's reluctance to include this as a variable. Members concurred that with the growing cost of housing and living in Santa Cruz, that this factor should be considered, even if it required a dramatic cultural shift to do so. Members noted that cost of living is taken into consideration when faculty are recruited,

and should therefore should be included in the analysis of faculty analysis, especially since competitive and comparable salaries are necessary in order to recruit and retain quality faculty.

Members discussed the initial salary analysis completed by Chair Profumo. The APO analysis focuses on the 75 and 90 percentile and compares the UCSC faculty salary median to other UC campuses. Chair Profumo looked at the standard deviation. UCSC has a low standard of deviation. The average is not significantly different than the median. However, Chair Profumo noted that salaries fair worse and worse as the percentiles go up, \$1,222 less at the 75 percentile for Assistant Professors, and a similar trend for Associate Professors, which is better than the 7 campus comparison, and about \$1,459 less than the 9 campus comparison. At Professor Step 1-5, UCSC fares 4% better than the 7 campus median. The standard deviation is better, and salaries are compressed. But the trend in percentiles is that UCSC fares increasingly worse, \$16,875 lag with the 9 campus comparison at the 90th percentile.

Chair Profumo pointed out that there is a significant difference when cost of living is included in the analysis. UCSC lags by 10% for Assistant Professors in the 7 campus comparison (the 9 campus difference is less significant due to UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles). The Associate Professor level lags by 5% at the 7 campus comparison, and by 8% at the 9 campus comparison. Yet, the as stated, the APO report does not take the cost of living variable into account.

Members noted that data on lost faculty would be helpful in making a case for the inclusion of cost of living to the administration. Several members commented that they frequently hear anecdotal stories, but data from exit surveys or failed recruitments that highlight issues with housing etc., could provide leverage for including cost of living in comparative salary analysis. CFW will inquire about exit survey data with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs (VPAA). CFW may consult with the VPAA on the questions of the exit survey, the data, and how the data could be used to help CFW's proactive agenda and assist the campus in setting priorities for the campus. Although cost of living has never been included in the past, Chair Profumo is hopeful that the incoming CP/EVC will be open to its inclusion in salary analysis and with regards to the Merit Boost Program or "Special Salary Practice".

The committee noted that historically, CFW has always looked at the mean and off-scale salary while doing its annual salary analysis. Chair Profumo suggested that since 100% of faculty are on off-scale, consideration of the distance from on-scale salary is less important.

A suggestion was made that means are a better measure of comparison as averages are not accurate due to the high off-scale salaries at some campuses. There are some lower and higher values that skew the median up. Members questioned why this is and how it could be connected with the Merit Boost Program. Members noted that other campuses pay their star faculty much more. The committee questioned whether this was fair and/or whether this was something that UCSC should aspire to do, particularly since anecdotal reports note that UCSC has recently lost a fair amount of top performing faculty. In such cases, junior faculty are replacing high performing senior faculty, creating "trickledown economics" in flagship departments. Members further noted that of the more recent new hires, only 2 were Assistant Professors, Step II. All others were hired at Step III or higher, which is a new trend in the last three years, as new faculty

use to be hired at lower steps.

Chair Profumo would like to have all members look at the latest data and report back on findings, trends, etc. The new data does not include information on retention.

UCSC Faculty Salary Transparency

In response to requests from both the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and CFW, the CP/EVC has committed to having the Academic Personnel Office (APO) provide a copy of starting salaries for new hires to each of the deans in early fall each year. The data will also be shared with CFW, CAP, and the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD). CFW will draft a correspondence to the Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) to emphasize that this information should be shared with department chairs as well as divisional deans as members agreed that in order for there to be full transparency with regards to salary, the data must be shared with those making the offers. The correspondence will be copied to deans and will additionally request that the information shared includes information on recruitment packages, particularly housing allowances.

During a consultation in 2015-16, CFW noted its concern about the lack of standards across divisions with regards to the use and distribution of start-up funds and housing allowances. At the time, CP/EVC Alison Galloway said that she would look into how housing allowances were being used across campus and report back to the committee. Unfortunately, CFW did not receive an update.

Pre-Consult – VCBAS Latham

Members discussed the upcoming consultation with Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham on December 1, 2016 on the new UCOP “P3” Building Funding Model. Chair Profumo is unable to attend the meeting. A CFW member will fill in as Chair *pro tem*.

The committee would like to make it clear that CFW’s priority is to work collaboratively with the administration to get the ball rolling and break ground on a childcare facility and the second phase of Ranch View Terrace employee housing. Chair Profumo would also like to discuss the issue of the \$5 million in debt from the building of Ranch View Terrace Phase I. CFW members feel strongly that the burden of this debt from legal costs should not be placed on the purchasers of new units.

The committee discussed possible roadblocks to moving forward with the building of a childcare facility. The immediate goal is to allow the new P3 building funding model to include the project in addition to student beds. Members considered the UCOP matching grant for childcare, and the request for the CP/EVC to continue to put aside annual funds for childcare (to which the committee received no response), as ways to fund the building if it is approved under P3. Chair Profumo reported that VCBAS Latham had noted that her team would be looking into the option of vouchers for childcare. Concerns were raised about spending money on vouchers if the money would be needed to build a facility. However, Chair Profumo doesn’t want the reserves to disappear along with the commitment to supporting childcare. In consultation, the committee will inquire as to

where vouchers stand and if the VCBAS has considered other options.

A suggestion was made that the UCSC Delaware building might be a good location for a childcare facility. However, others noted that the location would not be ideal for breastfeeding parents, which would require a facility closer to if not on campus. The committee, however, will inquire about the bus and shuttle transportation that is being planned between the main campus and Delaware building.

CFW would also like to brainstorm with the VCBAS possible roads forward if childcare cannot be included under the new P3 building funding model. Members noted that a CFW faculty priorities survey and exit interview data could back and help establish childcare as a campus priority.

In order to frame the discussion, a pre-consultation memo will be sent to the VCBAS.

CFW Survey on Faculty Priorities

Members finalized the survey questions, and established a project timeline.

Chair Profumo sought the expertise of Chair Greenberg of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) for the appropriate way to inquire about gender and/or ethnicity, but has not heard back. The question of gender on the survey will be optional. CFW members concluded that a question of ethnicity did not need to be included, and that the gender question would be multiple choice: female, male, or not listed.

Members determined that the survey should be sent after the Thanksgiving break and should close before the winter break. A reminder may be sent out one week before the response deadline.

Faculty Salary Analysis

Discussion postponed until the first meeting of the winter quarter, 2017.