

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of January 12, 2017

Present: Vilashini Cooppan, Hiroshi Fukurai, Ted Holman, Grant McGuire, Stefano Profumo (Chair), Shelly Errington (ex officio), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: Ricardo Sanfelice

Chair Announcements

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) welcomed new member Hiroshi Fukurai. Chair Profumo provided member Fukurai with a brief summary of the committee's work.

Consideration of the draft minutes from the meetings of October 6 and October 20, 2016

Due to a problem with Google Drive, members will review and vet the minutes online.

Update from the November and December 2016 meetings of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW)

Chair Profumo reported that the key discussion topic during the November UCFW meeting was a consultation with Laura Tauber, Executive Director of the UC Self-Funded Health Plans on the 2017 UC Care out-of-pocket maximums. Chair Profumo suggested that it was clear during the consultation that the decision to increase these maximums was made without any hard data. There was much discussion of this at you CFW and many concerns were raised. Tauber shared slides from a third party "Aliant" regarding how the increase was assessed and the possible member impact. UC care has committed to deliver a renewal no greater than 5%, but a third parties Aliant and Liliman have recommended an increase of savings of 11.5%. There is no discussion as to why 11.5% was needed. In order to achieve this savings, the out of pocket maximums for medical, prescription, and behavioral health, were combined. The member impact assessment was hard to follow. UCFW demanded that a more reasonable presentation with hard data be made in December. The Health Care Task Force has requested that Laura Tauber bring the out of pocket maximums back to the 2016 levels, but Tauber reported that she is not the one to make such a change. Chair Profumo will bring this up at the next UCFW meeting on January 13, 2017.

UCFW also consulted with the UC Academic Personnel and Human Resources officer about exit surveys. The UC will become part of a standardized exit survey program. The cost of the surveys was discussed. Each survey will cost roughly \$100. The program is being used by other universities. CFW members noted that the UCSC campus is already conducting exit surveys. CFW is currently trying to get information on the questions that are currently being asked, and where the data is being housed.

Chair Profumo noted that the UCFW consisted mostly of reporting from a Regent's meeting regarding tuition adjustments. An extra \$300 per year for families with more than 150 K of income per year will be considered at the next Regent's meeting in January. The UC Retirement Plan (UCRP) was also discussed. The plan underperformed by 2%. An unreasonable rate of 7% was the target. UCFW determined that 5% is still good, but as a source of concern. A CFW member asked about the possibility of the IRA changing to index funds. Chair Profumo reported that the head of UCRP noted that he intended to move some investments into index funds to save tens of millions of dollars and get better investments. Chair Profumo will ask for an update on this at the

next UCFW meeting and report back to CFW. Concerns were also raised about a UC bid for national labs, although opportunities for collaborating with national labs was seen as a positive.

There was also concern raised the increase of anecdotal presentations and the decrease of hard data being shared at UCFW meetings, and a discussion of a new 20% cap on non—resident students at UC campuses, which may results in less resources for all campuses.

CFW Faculty Welfare Priorities Survey – Initial Findings

The CFW survey of Senate faculty on faculty welfare priorities is complete. Chair Profumo shared a short preliminary analysis with members. The survey yielded 137 responses, i.e. a response rate of around 25% of all campus faculty. As for demographics, the majority of respondents were Full Professors (27% response rate, 82 respondents), with representation of Associate Professors (22%, 31 respondents), Assistant Professors (22%, 20 respondents), and a small representation of Emeriti (3 respondents) and Lecturers w/ SOE (2 respondents). Of the 124 respondents who answered an optional question about gender, 50.4% were male, 46.3% were female, and 3.3% were “other (not listed)”.

The preliminary results suggest that onsite childcare and faculty salaries are top priorities. Parking and transportation received several rankings of 2 or 3, but not many #1s. Tuition remission, which Chair Profumo has advocated for, also did not receive a very high number of #1 rankings, and although recognized, is perhaps not a top priority for faculty. Research resources, healthcare, and housing are also high concerns. Chair Profumo will study the aggregated results according to the average score and number of top readings, and then break it down by Assistant versus Associate versus Full, and will also look at gender and Assistant Professor females to see if there is a link with a desire for childcare.

Senate Director Matthew Mednick has requested access to the data, which CFW will provide.

Faculty Salary Equity Study Review

A recommendation has been made by the University Committee on Affirmative Action Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) criteria for looking at equity of salaries across UC campuses. Chair Profumo has reviewed the recommendation and noted that it seems reasonable, but may be difficult to put into practice. Information will be sent to members via email for review and comment.

Consultation Debrief (VCBAS Latham) – Continued Discussion from

CFW continued to debrief from the consultation of December 1, 2016 with Vice Chancellor of Administrative and Business Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham. Chair Profumo was unable to attend the consultation, but read the minutes from the meeting to get a sense of

what was discussed. CFW considered text for a post consultation memo. Members would like to ensure that's the third party evaluator "JL L" receives the correct numbers (minus the debt on the building of Ranch View Terrace Phase I) in order to assess whether building a childcare facility along with student housing is feasible. Members would also like to reiterate that there are funds available through a UCOP matching grant to fund the building of a childcare center. The CFW analyst will create a draft and circulate to members for edits and vetting.

UCSC Special Salary Practice Feedback

In light of the findings of the Academic Personnel Office (APO) Annual Report of Faculty Salary Competitiveness (November 2016), Vice Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) Galloway has requested the Senate's review and comment on two options for proposed changes to the UCSC Special Salary Practice or "Merit Boost Program".

The CFW faculty salary subcommittee provided context, analysis, and projections to guide the committee's discussion and review of the proposed changes.

Members noted that the current salary practice includes a G1, G2, and A1. A G1 requires an "outstanding" rating in one area (teaching, research, or service). A G2 requires an "outstanding" in two areas, and an A1 requires outstanding in all three areas. The CP/EVC is recommending that the practice and associated pay increase be changed/reduced.

The recent APO Annual Report of Faculty Salary Competitiveness claims that the Special salary practice has done its job of bringing UCSC salaries to the campus median. CFW members looked at the committee's preliminary faculty salary analysis based on the same raw data that was used by APO. Chair Profumo CFW's preliminary analysis does not support some statements in the APO report.

The report claimed that as of October 2015, the median total salaries for UCSC remain above the seven campus median at all ranks. Chair Profumo noted that this is not true. For instance, UCSC Professors Above Scale have a median total salary which is \$4100 (or 2.1%) lower than the median. The report also claims that UCSC salaries are the third highest in the system at Full Professor. CFW's analysis has shown that this is not true for Professors Step 1-5, or Above Scale. Further, the report claims that regular scale salaries are within 3% of the all campus median in the 75-90 percentile. CFW's analysis shows that UCSC 90th percentile Above Scale salaries are 6.2% less than the UC median. The report also claims that the original goal of the Special Salary Practice was to bring the UCSC median up to the seven campus median, however CFW contests that the original goal was to bring the UCSC salary median to the nine campus median. CFW's final

conclusion is that the report is inaccurate with regards to the lag of median salaries with respect to the nine campus median.

CFW considered a cost of living analysis. Chair Profumo noted that the relationship between the UCSC median and the 7 campus median is similar to the difference between the UCSC median and the coastal campus median (UCSD, UCSB, UCI). Overall, UCSC lags between 5-10% at all ranks. However, there are big lags at Above Scale for both the BEE and REG salary scales. The one exception is that at BEE scale Professor 6-9, UCSC is actually doing better than the median. When cost of living is considered in a 9 campus comparison, the difference is small. UCSC lags behind 2-5%. Members agree that cost of living should be taken into consideration when the campus is considering how to change the current salary practice.

Members questioned what the projected savings is for the campus if the current salary practice is to be amended. The CP/EVC has presented two options to scale down the program. Option One brings G1 to ¼ of a step of off-scale, and Option Two brings G1 to 1/3 of a step in off-scale salary. Members noted off scale salary is carried with a faculty member as they get promoted, and that there is a difference between advancing faster (A and A1) and just getting an increase in off scale (G1 and G2). Members noted that accelerations have the potential to negatively affect Assistants who may not be ready for advancement to tenure. A suggestion was made that Option One might make the most sense, but the committee questioned whether rescaling the old program was the best way for the campus to save money. All members agreed that further analysis is needed.

Members discussed the text of a committee response to the CP/EVC's proposed changes. CFW could state that it disagrees with APO's analysis, raise the cost of living issue, and could recommend that the current program not be changed. Further CFW could make the case that there should be a mechanism that truly award star performers on the campus in order to have a competitive advantage to retain them.

Faculty Salary Analysis (Postponed discussion from 11/17/16)

CFW considered foci for the committee's comprehensive faculty salary analysis. The committee will focus on historical trends, cost of living, and the effect of the current Special Salary Practice (or "Merit Boost Program") on salaries as compared to other campuses as a factor of time. CFW's goal is to have a final report for the Academic Senate in spring 2017.

