

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**Meeting of February 9, 2017**

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

**Absent:** Vilashini Cooppan

**Chair Announcements and Committee Business**

the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) considered and approved the draft minutes from the meeting of December 1, 2016.

Chair Profumo announced to CFW that he has agreed to chair one more year the committee.

*Pro-tem chair for February 23 meeting*

Chair Profumo will not be able to attend the CFW meeting of February 20 32, 2016. Member Ted Holman agreed to serve as chair *pro-tem*.

*Mother Academics in Solidarity (MAS) - New Campus Support Group for Early Career Academic Mothers*

Chair Profumo announced that there is a new campus support group for early career academic mothers. The intention of the group is to create a support network of mother academics. CFW members noted their support of the group. An announcement will be sent out to Senate faculty.

*Housing Allowances*

Previously CFW requested information from the administration on the distribution of housing allowances per division on campus. The committee has not heard back it would like to follow up on this request. One member discuss the topic with divisional chairs and was informed that the division in question must contribute 20% towards a new faculty housing allowance/start up funds. Members note that this may be costly and explain why some divisions do not provide them.

Members considered how to address the concern with the incoming CP/EVC, and would like to send a letter to the Interim CP/EVC saying that there is inequity across divisions due to this matter requirement. CFW believes there is an issue and would like to request that the policy to require matching funds from the divisions be revised. In addition, members agree that there should be a campus-wide policy to provide housing allowances to all new hires and not to leave it at the discretion of divisional deans.

*Update from the ACCTP meeting on February 7, 2017*

The CFW representative on the ACCTP was absent and could not provide an update in meeting.

*Parking Update*

This year, CFW has received complaints from faculty regarding the lack of parking on campus, particularly on Science Hill, and during rainy weather. A CFW member looked into the issue and found that undergraduate students do not have access to purchase AV permits. The member noted that at all other UC campuses, faculty have preferred parking over undergraduate and graduate students. The member noted that at UCSC, faculty pay more for a permits but fight for the same spots as undergraduates and graduate students. Members noted that there are a few parking lots on campus that are for A parking only. This may raise concerns regarding equity, and Chair Profumo noted that it is a faculty welfare issue, particularly for faculty who may have small children and need go to and from campus several times a day. Members shared frustration over paying up to \$1000 per year for parking and not being able to park. An additional concern was raised regarding the fact that there are 20 members on the ACCTP with only two faculty representatives/votes. Members agree that there should be more faculty representation on ACCTP.

Chair Profumo suggested that the committee request that Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Latham look into reverting to how other UC campuses handle parking with dedicated parking for faculty/staff, and bring the issue to the CP/EVC.

Members noted that state funds cannot be used for parking, and that the construction of new parking structures require an increase in parking fees in order to carry the debt. Members raised concerns about the history of the campus purchasing surface parking lots from TAPS for a small amount of money, and then building large buildings on them that require more parking, which once built, increases the cost of permits and parking on campus once again. Last year, parking fees were raised, and members noted that CFW had many conversations questioning what the increase would be used for.

### **Academic Senate Faculty Welfare Priorities Survey**

CFW reviewed the results from the fall 2016 survey of Senate faculty on campus faculty welfare priorities, and considered how the findings will shape and refine the proactive agenda of the committee for the remainder of the academic year.

Chair Profumo conducted a preliminary analysis on the results in shared his findings with the committee. There were 137 responses to the survey. Most respondents were Full Professors, and there was a small representation of Assistant Professors and Emeriti. The gender breakdown was 46.3% female, almost 50% male, and a small percent “other”. Chair Profumo broke down the results by 1) Assistant and Associate Professors, 2) female Professors, and 3) junior female professors.

For junior faculty, the order of top priorities were: salary, childcare, research resources, childcare finance, and housing.

For female faculty, the order of top priorities were: childcare, research resources, salary,

healthcare, housing/childcare finance.

For junior female faculty, the order of top priorities were: childcare, research, salary, healthcare, retirement. Chair Profumo noted that the sample size of junior female faculty, at just 26 respondent was rather small.

Chair Profumo noted that male faculty members were more interested in salary and for females childcare was number one.

Members questioned whether knowing respondent divisional affiliation would have been telling. The committee did not ask for divisional affiliation on the survey.

Overall, the committee noted that faculty salary was a top priority, childcare was a top priority for female faculty, and research resources were a priority ranking high for junior faculty and female faculty. Housing and healthcare were noted priorities for all ranks and gender. Tuition remission and parking were lower priorities.

A blank space for feedback on the survey contained a range of comments including the need for smaller class sizes, cleaner buildings, housing, off-campus housing towards the city, more staff support, and enhanced sense of community, workload concerns, boosting Assistant Professor salaries, childcare, partner hires, research resources, service loads, disability support for faculty, paternity leave, paperwork concerns, internal campus transportation, summer salary, housing assistance, work-life balance, funds for book production, family-friendly resources, and resources for an increase in student population.

CFW members agreed that the results of the survey and a list of top faculty welfare priorities should be shared with the CP EVC in correspondence. CFW will use the survey as the basis for this official “top five” priority document for the incoming CP-EVC. A suggestion was made to bring the document to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) in order to influence Senate priorities, which will in turn influence campus priorities, which the committee notes is where campus resources are directed.

### **P3 – “Option B” Action Plan**

Although the committee’s original idea was to encourage the campus to link the building of a childcare facility with student housing, CFW has been informed that P3 consultants have advised the campus to break student housing and faculty housing and childcare into two separate requests for proposals (RFPs) in order to move quickly on increasing student beds. Members considered a plan of action to make a second proposal of housing and childcare attractive to developers by:

- Ensuring that the correct budget numbers for each project are given to the third

- party evaluator.
- Following up on CFW's prior request to continue placing funds in the campus's childcare reserves in order to meet UCOP matching grant requirements for childcare building funds.
  - Utilizing faculty survey results to establish that faculty housing and childcare are campus priorities.

CFW considered crafting a letter to the VCBAS Latham, the Chancellor, and the CP,/EVC stating that employee childcare is just as important as student beds and to reiterate that a childcare facility should be included in the RFPs. CFW would like the administration to come up with a financial plan for employee childcare, and is willing to assist in this endeavor. Further, the committee would like more of an explanation from the CBA as Sibley from as to why it is not possible to combine childcare and student housing. Members concurred that a consultation with VCBAS Latham would be optimal accompanied by a formal request for a written plan to secure employee childcare.

Members noted that there is a building priority list on campus, which appears to be governed by the Chancellor. Student beds are top priority now. However, members questioned how the list is organized with the introduction of the new P3 model. Chair Profumo will speak with the chair of the Committee on Planning and Budget for more information.

Concerns were raised about the new P3 model and privatization. Members agreed that CFW will need to monitor the situation and ensure that P3 works.

### **Special Salary Practice and Faculty Salary Analysis Update**

CFW has received information on projected savings for the two Special Salary Practice revisions proposed by former CP/EVC Galloway, which CFW responded to on February 1, 2017. Members considered the new information, and received a faculty salary analysis update from the CFW Faculty Salary Subcommittee.

Chair Profumo noted that the new information estimates that there will be a maximum savings of \$200,000 per year if the Special Salary Practice is augmented/reduced by way of one of the two proposed options. Members agreed that the savings are small, and not worth the progress made by the program and the potential for the UCSC faculty salary median to slip behind the UC campus median.

The latest analysis from the CFW Faculty Salary Subcommittee showed that although CFW was initially worried about Associate Professors being left behind, the cohort has benefited dramatically from the Special Salary Practice. Members noted that the data may be used to show that the campus has been successful in increasing the UCSC faculty salary median. However, it is unknown how the overall UC median will be affected by similar special practices at sister

campuses. In addition, Chair Profumo looked into cost of living as estimated by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (bea.gov) in addition to estimates based on two other independent websites (<http://livingwage.mit.edu/> and <http://www.relocationessentials.com/>), which showed that when the cost of living is considered, UC Santa Cruz salaries lag 10% behind the UC campus median. The committee noted that the goal of the original Special Salary Practice of making UCSC salaries competitive against other UC campuses is thus far from being complete.

Members agreed that the campus needs to establish a new goal for the Special Salary Practice of having the UCSC faculty salary median be 10% about the campus median (not equal to, which is the current goal). Members further noted that without data from other campuses regarding their special salary practices, it is hard to determine what the lag will be for UCSC in the coming years. The committee will therefore oppose the proposed changes to the Special Salary Practice at this time.