

MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of January 26, 2017

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

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) considered and approved the draft minutes of October 6, October 20, November 3, and November 17, 2016.

Update from the January 13, 2017 meeting of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW)

Chair Profumo provided the committee with an update from the January 13, 2017 meeting of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW). The meeting was held via teleconference. UCFW discussed the issue of increased maximum out of pocket expenses for the UC Care Plan with Laura Tauber, Executive Director of UC Self-Funded Health Plans who informed the committee that it is too late to make changes to the plan for 2017. The UC Health Care Task Force (HCTF) is insistent that changes be made to decrease the maximum in 2018. The committee noted that those who are really sick will pay more out of pocket in 2017. UCFW noted that a real analysis in assessing the new maximum was lacking. When a consultant was asked for details, the committee was informed that this was the only option that could save money, yet the amount that will be saved is unknown. Next year, more quantitative data is expected.

CFW questioned why the high increase in out of pocket maximums was not pointed out to campuses and/or the Office of the President. Campuses were merely informed that maximum increases in premiums would be capped at 5% as mandated by the UC President. Members noted that the HCTF was not even aware of the change and UCFW and the HCTF were alerted to the change by UCSC/CFW. Members raised concerns about the maximums continuing in 2017. Chair Stefano noted that the issue is on the UCFW radar and will be monitored.

UCFW also discussed the cap of non-resident students placed on campuses by the UC Regents. It is generally understood that non-resident tuition helps to cover the gap between state funds and actual costs for California resident students. How this gap will be covered with the newly imposed cap is unknown.

CFW Member Topical Assignments

Members nominated a new representative to replace the outgoing CFW representative on the campus Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP).

Summer Salary Proposal

CFW discussed the proposed summer session salary adjustments for 2017. The committee raised several concerns in terms of faculty welfare, equity, and possible disproportionate burden on divisions, and questioned the effect on the overall quality of Summer Session and the UCSC brand image. The committee will recommend that more information be provided in an attempt to avoid

unintentional inequities and that other cost saving options are explored.

In fall 2016, CFW conducted a survey of Senate faculty on faculty welfare priorities. The data collected showed that the strongest overall concern for faculty is faculty salaries. Members noted that the proposed Summer Session salary adjustments for 2017 aim to reduce Senate faculty salaries in order to cover the unintentional side effect of an increase in instructional costs due to reaching the desired goal of increasing enrollments. CFW is not convinced that reducing Senate faculty salaries is the best way to address the problem.

Through statistical data and anecdotal stories shared with the committee, CFW can assume that Senate faculty who are opting to teach during the summer when they could be using the time for research, are doing it out of a deep need for more income. Members noted that there may be many situations in which a faculty member would find themselves needing additional income, and CFW questions whether or not there may be an underlying equity issue, which could be exacerbated if summer salary is uniformly reduced. Although numbers of potential faculty affected are provided with the proposal, members noted that there is no additional data on the faculty members who are opting to teach in the summer. Members were left to question whether faculty who choose to teach during the summer are those with children in college, single parents, and/or new Assistant Professors or Associate Professors struggling to afford housing or other living expenses in the area. In addition, CFW is concerned that a reduction in summer salary may have a disproportionate burden on divisional needs, and in order to avoid such divisional inequities, the committee will request additional information by division of faculty who would be affected by the proposed caps so that reviewing bodies may make a more informed and accurate assessment.

The committee did not limit its concern to that of faculty welfare. As faculty, members also raised concerns about the overall quality of education for students taking Summer Session and the UCSC brand image if Summer Session is reduced to classes taught by graduate students or non-tenured teachers because lower salaries will not entice Senate faculty to teach. Further, Summer Session provides the unique opportunity for students to study and interact with senior faculty in an intimate setting with smaller classes. Members noted that such an opportunity provides a glimpse of the quality of education that is offered on our campus during the regular academic year and can encourage new fall enrollments, including out of state and international students, which is a current goal of the campus. CFW members agreed that reducing Summer Session courses to graduate student and non-tenured teachers led courses only, will not reflect the diversified and quality education that is available to our UCSC students during the regular academic year, and could have a negative effect on the overall UCSC image for prospective students.

Members further noted that the adjustment proposal offers no mention of other cost saving measures to the Summer Session program that have been explored to offset the increase in

instructor salaries (e.g. setting a minimum enrollment for course offerings, administrative and operating cost adjustments, etc.) CFW commends the administration's attempt to increase graduate student salaries in the proposed adjustment, but will urge the administration to explore alternative options before considering the reduction of faculty salaries, faculty equity, and the overall quality of education on the UCSC campus.

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 requested the Senate's review and comment on two options for proposed changes to the UCSC special salary program or "Merit Boost Program", which was instituted in 2008 to address the lagging salary median on our campus in comparison to our sister campuses.

CFW discussed the proposed revisions during its meeting of January 12, 2017. Members considered a draft response during this meeting. The CP/EVC proposal did not come with any analysis or breakdown of potential impact and before adjustments are made to the Special Salary Practice, agreed that they could not make an informed judgement call without more analysis and projections for the cost savings of both options provided. CFW will recommend that such additional analysis and projections need to be done to ensure the recruitment and retention of quality faculty on our campus.

Members also questioned whether the original goal of the Special Salary Practice should be altered to include cost of living. Members noted that cost of living is a new topic for the campus in terms of faculty salary, but should be included as it plays a significant role in a faculty member's decision to begin work or remain working for UCSC. Members agreed that the number one faculty welfare concern is salary as was shown in the recent CFW Faculty Welfare Survey results. On-campus housing serves a small number of faculty, however, faculty salary affects all. One member referenced a survey of Assistant Professors conducted in the 1980s by Dane Archer, on why new faculty were leaving. The results suggested that they could not afford housing in the area and that UCSC faculty salaries were not sufficient, so the campus created campus housing, which other campuses have since modeled. The campus housing was intended to be transitional, but became more permanent due to the constant increase of market prices and cost of living.

Members noted that the APO analysis doesn't touch on Above Scale and the 90 percentile, which is where CFW has determined there is a huge lag in UCSC salary. Chair Profumo suggested that the lag is due to two issues; 1) the loyalty penalty, and 2) the fact that longer serving faculty don't have large off-scale salaries as they started working on campus at Assistant Professor, Step 1.

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

CFW considered goals for the Committee's comprehensive faculty salary analysis. The committee will aim to assess the impact of the Merit Boost Program or "Special Salary Practice" that began in 2008.

The committee considered ways to evaluate how the proposed changes to the Merit Boost Program could be quantified and concluded that it will take a simple linear interpretation for a given bracket of ranks and populate a projection to try and understand if there was a break in trend when the Merit Boost Program began, and to compare the UCSC trajectory with that of other campuses. Members noted that faculty salaries have a moving target as sister campuses are beginning to adopt their own "Special Salary" practices and programs, which is why cost of living should be included as a factor.

The committee will request additional data from APO to assist in this analysis.