

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**Meeting of March 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**

*Update from the ACCTP Meetings of 2/15/17 and 3/01/17*

Chair Profumo was contacted about a possible “motorcycle penalty” with regards to parking passes. The issue was forwarded to the ACCTP. The CFW representative on the ACCTP reported that Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) has responded stating that it will try to be more flexible.

The CFW representative reported that there are issues with bottle necking in the West Core parking garage due to meters. A survey was conducted which showed that metered spaces are being used all day and for long periods of time. The ACCTP raised the need for meters for visitors, etc. In addition, some claim that there are many department vehicles in the parking structure that remain in their spots at all times, and perhaps should be parked elsewhere. The proposed solution is to turn the basement level into meter spaces with its own entrance.

In order to increase parking in the Digital Arts parking lot, a parking median will be removed in order to gain six parking spaces. A plan to extend the lot to an adjacent road is being considered and could be implemented in the next year.

The building of a new parking lot by the campus fire station has been halted due to expense. CFW members noted that the building of this lot was one of the reasons why TAPS noted that parking fees needed to be raised recently. The ACCTP representative will follow up on the topic with the ACCTP.

The CFW representative was asked to begin a conversation at the ACCTP about faculty and staff permits and whether faculty and staff should be given preferred parking over graduate students as at some other UC campuses.

*CFW Follow Up to Request to Grow Campus Childcare*

Members noted that would like to follow up on their request for the administration to continue making annual contributions to the campus childcare fund initially created by former CP/EVC Galloway at the request of CFW. Members further noted that next year’s campus “Giving Day” should include the option for the community to donate to “employee childcare”. This will be made as an additional request.

*Report from the Academic Senate Meeting on 3/08/17*

A CFW provided members with an update on the Senate meeting of March, 8, 2017. In his announcements, Interim CP/EVC Lee, mentioned the new UCOP P3 building funding model and

suggested that increasing student beds is a number one priority. Interim CP EVC (ICP/EVC) Lee also noted that childcare is a top priority for CFW. CFW informed the ICP/EVC last week of the results of the Senate faculty welfare survey, and CFW members were pleased to hear the results referenced in the Senate meeting. During questions a CFW member expressed concerns about not linking the building a faculty housing and employee childcare to student beds, but was told that this was not possible. However, ICP/EVC Lee did note that it was a priority. The member then referenced the campus childcare funds set aside by former CP/EVC Galloway and asked if the administration is continuing to contribute to the funds. ICP/EVC Lee stated that he was not aware of continued contributions. The CFW member then commented that Bright Horizons, a childcare third-party vendor that UCLA has contracted with, has made childcare costs extremely expensive and suggested that owning the childcare building is key.

CFW members questioned what the campus is planning to do with the current student childcare facility on campus. Members note that the administration has informed CFW that there are currently no plans to expand the square footage, and that any renovations will be on the same footprint of the building. A suggestion was made for CFW to seek clarification on his plans.

The CFW member who attended the meeting noted that he did not ask about using the P3 model for faculty housing as it will not work for that project. Instead, he suggested to CFW that there are two options for dealing with the debt from the building of Ranch View Terrace Phase I (RVT1): 1) Continue to carry the debt, or 2) Build Ranch View Terrace Phase II (RVT2) and start to pay the debt down.

#### *Special Salary Practice Update*

CFW and the Senate recently commented on proposed changes to the campus's Special Salary Practice as proposed by former CP/EVC Galloway. Chair Profumo informed the committee that ICP/EVC Lee is expected to come back and request that the Senate choose one of the 2 options proposed. Members noted the complexity of the issue due to the interim administration and a new CP/EVC arriving to campus in June 2017. Members considered pointing out in a follow up response that the committee has already commented on both options and does not approve of them and would like to hold off until there is some analysis of the possible outcomes/effects of both options. Asking the Senate/CFW to choose one raises issues of shared governance for the committee.

#### *Continuity of Members on Historical Knowledge of Hot Topics*

A concern was raised about the continuous rotation of members and the loss of institutional memory particularly, topics of housing, childcare, etc. Recently, a CFW member suggested to the Committee on Committees (COC) that there be a volunteer ad/hoc consultant on each topic who can consult with CFW each fall to get the group up to speed, consult throughout the year, and participate on campus committees on said topics. A request was made to have Chair Profumo and the committee analyst look into the possibility of such a position.

### **Pre-Consultation-Interim CP/EVC Herbert Lee**

Interim Vice Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Herbie Lee requested a meeting with CFW to discuss the committee's January 13, 2017 correspondence regarding transparency of faculty starting salaries. Members considered questions and possible additional discussion topics for the consultation on April 6, 2017.

In terms of faculty salary transparency, Chair Profumo emphasized that department chairs need to be made aware of other offers across campus as they are the one's making the offers and are not currently aware of what their colleagues are doing. Chair Profumo further suggested that not having starting salaries and startup funds transparent in this way may create issues with fairness and distribution in terms of housing allowances. Members noted that limits for recruitment allowances are created by the Office of the President (UCOP). The allowance has been capped at \$75k for several years and CFW members noted that the cap should be adjusted for inflation.

Members agree to consult with the ICP/EVC on faculty salary transparency, housing allowances, the Merit Boost Program/Special Salary Program and cost of living, and will request a summary on exit surveys of failed retentions of faculty who have chosen to leave the campus.

### **Faculty Salaries-Subcommittee Update**

The committee received an update on the latest salary analysis and considered content for a spring quarter report on faculty salaries to the Academic Senate.

Chair Profumo's latest analysis showed that the Merit Boost made a big difference in the UCSC relative to that of other members questioned if there is enough data points to generate a reliable analysis. Chair Profumo considered the data both with and without the Merit Boost program and found that UCSC increased from 0 to 9%. He then made a similar calculation for all the UC campuses and the average growth with regard to rank was smaller. Members noted that the latest UC data is from 2015, however other campuses have since begun in similar special salary programs.

The committee discussed the importance of the inclusion of cost of living as a factor and considers ways to convince the campus of administration to get on board. Chair Profumo suggested that the most strategic plan would be to address concerns with the upper percent and make the Merit Boost program more merit related in order to retain high performers. However, concerns were raised about shifting the program to benefit a select few. Overall, members noted that a key factor in the analysis is off-scale, which is being considered in total salary.

The committee would like to know what other campuses have special salary programs and when they began. Chair Profumo will check in with sister campuses at the next University CFW (UCFW) meeting.

### **Pro-Active Agenda and Deliverables**

CFW was scheduled to consider its proactive agenda and committee goals for the spring quarter and the end of the 2016-2017 academic year, however due to time restraints, the majority of the conversation was postponed until the first meeting of spring 2017. The committee did, however, determine that a CFW report on faculty salary would be drafting and include cost of living, campus comparisons, and the Merit Boost Program. With regards to housing, the committee will review the annual CHES proposal to increase the cost of the Repricing Program. The committee will also report on the findings of the Senate faculty welfare priority survey. Chair will request to have the

survey and its results placed on the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) agenda for discussion. The committee plans on reporting on employee childcare and the P3 funding model in the end of the year report and hopes that it has something to report with regards to progress. Members questioned how P3 effects the building priority list on campus and would like to inquire with Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Latham.