

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of February 1, 2018

Present: Hiroshi Fukurai, Tesla Jeltema, Grant McGuire, Nico Orlandi, Stefano Profumo (Chair), Su-hua Wang, Yiman Wang, Barry Bowman (*ex officio*), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Consultation - CP/EVC

CFW consulted with Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Tromp, VCBAS Latham, and VPAA Lee on the topics of childcare and CFW's involvement in the childcare facility development, faculty salary equity, housing, and partner hire resources.

Members introduced themselves and their topical charges for committee. Chair Profumo shared some prepared slides in order to start the conversation.

Chair Profumo emphasized that CFW performed a survey of Senate faculty last year to determine the faculty welfare priorities for the campus and the number one priority for all faculty was salary. The second priority highlighted by the survey, which was number one for junior and female faculty, was childcare. The third was housing, followed by healthcare and research resources, which were ranked particularly high for female faculty.

Childcare

In terms of the development of childcare services on campus, Chair Profumo noted that CFW would like to know how to expect CFW to be involved and when the Child Care Advisory Committee will be reinstated. In terms of faculty housing, and the building of Ranch View Terrace Phase II, Chair Profumo noted that moving forward with the building is a huge priority for CFW due to the cost of living in the Santa Cruz area.

Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham said that she absolutely agreed about housing and added that the Child Care Advisory Committee (CCAC) charge will be a little broader this time around and the CP/EVC will determine the scope, which may be on family related issues more generally. In terms of involvement with the development of childcare services on campus, VCBAS Latham noted that there was workgroup involvement last summer (2017), which focused on building space, etc. Members of that workgroup have been involved in meetings about actual square footage and design. However, VCBAS Latham emphasized that moving forward, our input will be feedback focused versus decision making or ownership of decisions. VCBAS Latham noted that the campus is working with a developer and a third party vendor, and licensing will be the main driver. She added that it all must fit into the budget and square footage available. In terms of feedback, VCBAS Latham suggested that the campus will have sessions that will include CFW representation and other summer workgroup members to bring them up to speed. In terms of decisions over personnel, etc., VCBAS Latham

stated that “we” will not have that authority, emphasizing that there will be feedback and consultation but no ownership or decision making as a campus.

The CFW childcare representative thanked VCBAS Latham for including her in the process, and raised concerns about being the only faculty member involved in the process. She questioned whether there was a way to increase the number of faculty involved, noting that the summer workgroup included representatives from the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), etc. The CFW childcare representative would also like the administration to initiate conversations with junior faculty to better represent the views.

VCBAS Latham replied that the campus is still in confidential aspects with developers and service providers, and suggested that once that phase is complete, they could seek more feedback from broader groups. VCBAS Latham noted that the campus has a stakeholder engagement plan for the Housing West building project and suggested that the same could be done for childcare. She noted that she would follow up with Sue Matthews that day to develop a stakeholder engagement plan with steps.

VCBAS Latham reported that for the Student Housing West project, they were able to bring options to focus groups and ask, “What do you value more?” VCBAS Latham suggested that these focus groups were effective in gathering in depth feedback and provided an opportunity for developers to follow up with questions. VCBAS Latham suggested that this model could be used for childcare stating “Let’s commit immediately.” VCBAS Latham suggested that a list of potential focus groups could be run by CFW and the committee could determine if a particular stakeholder was missing from the list.

CFW childcare representative noted that the summer childcare workgroup had not been updated on the childcare projects since September 2017, and suggested that it would be beneficial for them to receive an update.

The VCBAS noted that in the fall, all they knew was the block that would be the childcare center with no details and suggested that when they had more details from the architect, the CFW childcare representative was included. VCBAS Latham noted that there was an absence of action, but suggested that perhaps it should have been shared that nothing was happening. She suggested further that they could have done a follow up with that group when an announcement regarding childcare was made to the campus.

Members raised concerns about only being able to provide feedback, particularly if the third party childcare vendor turns out not to be ideal. VCBAS Latham questioned whether there the concern

about the third party vendor was a fundamental concern, or a disagreement. She added that she has reviewed much feedback regarding vendors and some of it is positive. VCBAS Latham suggested that it all depends on the feedback and unless there is a specific example of negative feedback, it is hard to say what will happen.

VCBAS Latham noted that with anything the administration does, they are trying to navigate what faculty think is needed, and weed through what can be worked on and what can't. VCBAS Latham said people rate values differently. For her, she noted that affordability, access, and safety are priorities. To others, she suggested, it could be curriculum, etc. The VCBAS noted that at times there will be trade-offs. She also added that it is important to point out what is not up for feedback, discussion, and or change, noting that at times it may cause more consternation for people if there's a false understanding of what changes are possible and what is at play.

VCBAS acknowledged that when feedback is given and there is no response, it can be hard. She suggested that they have experienced this with students as well adding that how you take in the feedback and do follow-up can always be improved. The CFW representative suggested that for this reason, it is important to go back to those like the summer working group who made the recommendations, and pointed out that this was missing. VCBAS Latham agreed.

CFW members noted that the committee has made recommendations on the Child Care Advisory Committee in the past. VCBAS Latham suggested that those recommendations would be a great starting point, instead of starting from scratch and asked for the recommendations to be forwarded to her. When asked when the CCAC would be reinstated, CP/EVC Marlene Tromp reported that they are in the process of drafting a charge, but would like CFW input. The CP/EVC shared that she has asked staff to look at the structure of similar committees across the UC system, and reported that some of our family welfare committees. She is questioning whether it would be ideal to have a narrow or broad focus, and would like CFW's input.

When asked if faculty would be able to provide input on the childcare program and what types of care would be offered (for example aftercare). VCBAS Latham suggested that this was the intention of the childcare summer workgroup in 2017, and emphasized that the campus is looking to open the childcare center in fall 2019 and therefore will not be revisiting the work group's recommendation unless it does not work from a budgetary standpoint.

Chair Profumo emphasized the importance of emergency childcare for faculty productivity and suggested that faculty might pay for the service. He further noted that other Senate committees have echoed the need for emergency childcare. VCBAS Latham suggested that this type of care could be done in a separate fashion not connected to the on site care. She added that the campus

is locked in with parameters for square footage of the facility, and noted that at other campuses emergency care is usually a separate service.

CFW childcare representative noted that the summer childcare workgroup did not have the option to consider whether there was a need for full time versus part time care. The workgroup brought up questions about part time care, but was not asked to provide recommendations in this regard. VCBAS Latham reported that the campus is investing in a large subsidy for employees each year and suggested that the program will evolve each year due to need. She added that if there is not enough campus demand for childcare, enrollment spaces will be opened up to the greater community, and emphasized that the campus is locked in to the recommendations of the summer workgroup with regards to program and facilities.

When asked for an update on the site environmental report, VCBAS Latham reported that nothing has changed. There are still many site tests that need to occur on that site and also the Student Housing West site and the campus community should expect to see people at the site testing “permanently”.

Housing

VCBAS Latham reported that the campus didn’t want to make the same mistakes that they have before with building faculty housing, and are thinking about the Request for Proposals (RFP) structure, financing, etc., and lessons learned from the Housing West project. She noted that the housing and childcare project once separate, are now under the same developer, and indicated that the childcare facility has to be ready before family housing was over. VCBAS Latham reported that they would like to do a fall RFP and would like an inclusive committee formed to work with JLL to do a feasibility and demand analysis. VCBAS Latham indicated that the first thing that will be done is a reconsideration of the RVT2 design. The type of units, sale and lease, demand, and campus needs for recruitment and retention will need to be considered. The VCBAS added that the campus will need turnover units and this may be attention point for the committee. She is looking to constitute the committee in spring 2018. Jones, Lang, LaSalle Americas Inc. (JLL) is currently working on feasibility and will have models to offer for feedback. The RFP will go out to the same eight developers that were approved through the UC P3 funding model.

When asked if higher density housing was being considered, VCBAS Latham reported that they will have to wait and see. She added that density and the ability to maximize square footage is a key issue of critical concern, but added that there must also be demand. She again emphasized that there may be tension between what employees want and what the campus needs are for expected retention and recruitment.

Faculty Salary

Chair Profumo shared that a primary issue for CFW is cost of living, and reported that the first salary study with cost of living included was conducted last year. CFW included three different methodologies for salary at rank and step. For each of the nine campuses, CFW conducted a comparison analysis. The results indicated that UCSC is close to the system-wide median dollar to dollar. However with cost of living included, UCSC lags significantly behind by 10%, and this lag is even more extreme when compared with campuses outside of California.

Chair Profumo reported that this year, CFW will focus on the issue of equity. The committee would like to understand what drives salary growth, determine if it is correlated with merit, and if anything can be said about diversity and gender equity. The first analysis that CFW conducted made it clear that salary growth mostly correlates with retention actions. Chair Profumo shared that out of the 20 fastest growing salaries on campus, 85% had retention actions. The median salary growth for faculty with retention actions is 20% faster than those without. Chair Profumo shared that CFW would like to look into whether this equates to an equitable/fair system. Chair Profumo noted that already, members are seeing data that suggests that current the system (of having to undergo retention actions for salary increases) is inequitable. Chair Profumo added that when median salary is broken down by ethnicity, there is some disparity that will have to be looked into. Chair Profumo noted that the committee also looked at annual median salary growth, and noted that retentions outpace everything else.

Chair Profumo shared that retention actions are not spread equally across the divisions. The Division of Social Sciences has twice as many as the Humanities Division. CFW also noted that there is a different retention rate for male versus female faculty members. Chair Profumo indicated that he was expecting a larger disparity, but suggested that there is still a significant difference, even when accounting for the fact that there are more male faculty on campus. Chair Profumo noted that all of this can translate into equity issues in salary across campus. With regards to ethnicity, chair Profumo noted that the data shows that Asian faculty are 3x less likely to seek retention than Latinx faculty, which illustrates that retentions are an unfair mechanism for salary growth and distribution.

CFW would like to bring this to the attention of campus leadership and encourage the campus to consider whether there could be a better way to reward meritorious faculty other than through retention actions. Chair Profumo noted that last year's CFW analysis showed that the original Merit Boost or Special Salary Practice was effective in keeping the pace of growth with comparable levels systemwide and mirrored what other campuses had in place.

VPAA Lee emphasized the recent systemwide 3% faculty salary cost of living adjustments, and suggested that is important to take these increases into account as some of the data may have been affected by this increase, and not just the Special Salary Practice. Chair Profumo noted that the 3% increase was distributed fairly homogeneously for all campuses and noted that the key issue is that if the Special Salary Practice is eliminated or significantly down-sized UCSC faculty salaries will move slower, adding that the Merit Boost Program/Special Salary Practice is barely keeping us in line with system-wide salary growth. VPAA Lee agreed with the statement.

Chair Profumo informed the VPAA that CFW advocates for stronger Merit Boost Program, and not a curtail as was done. Chair Profumo encouraged all parties to think strategically about what can be done to reward merit more effectively, citing that UCSC tends to pay top earners roughly 5-10% than the systemwide median for this cohort, and this without taking cost of living into consideration.

VPAA Lee noted that there are a few things in process. He reported that he just sent an additional Negotiated Salary Option to the academic Senate for review. The Negotiated salary Pilot Program is being expanded for another four years and may be an opportunity for UCSC to pay faculty more. The Senate is asked to provide feedback as to whether or not UCSC should join in on this UC systemwide pilot program. Chair Profumo suggested that as a committee, CFW is supportive of participating in the program, but noted that there are equity issues in that the program is advantageous to only certain sectors on campus. VPAA Lee agreed. Chair Profumo added that if there is a way to provide more money to faculty with zero cost to the campus, it is welcome.

VPAA Lee noted that the second thing in process is a possible systemwide faculty salary increase. VPAA Lee reminded all parties that in the last three years, there has been a 3% systemwide faculty salary increase, half of which was mandated, and half of which was left to campus discretion. VPAA Lee noted that if there is another increase, the UCSC campus can do something different than they have done in the past, and would like CFW's feedback. Possible options could be rewarding those who did not go out for retention actions, addressing equity issues, etc. Chair Profumo suggested that CFW would be happy to provide this feedback.

CP EVC Tromp added that there has been a recommendation that the salary increase be larger than 3%, as there is a lag in salaries when compared to the "Comparison 8" campuses. The campus EVCs want to make sure that the mandate is funded by the Office of the President. If not, there will need to be cuts in staff that will have negative impacts on our faculty and increase their labor. However, if funded, CPEVC Tromp noted, the proposed 5.7% increase for three years would be amazing for the UCSC campus and could address these equity issues.

Gender Salary Equity

Chair Profumo shared that CFW's analysis indicates that there is a significant gender gap (roughly 10%) on salary equity overall, but not much of a gap at the Associate Professor rank and at Professor, Steps 1-5. Chair Profumo emphasized that the largest surprise was that female Assistant Professors are making 5.7% less, inferring that the campus is hiring female Assistant Profs for less than their male counterparts.

CP/EVC Tromp noted that national data shows that women negotiate salary differently from the outset and suggested that there is a gender gap in negotiation practices. She added that deans are in a difficult situation as the money they spend affects their unit, and this may be why there is a gap at Prof 6-9, as these hires were made when people weren't even talking about equity. CP/EVC Tromp suggested that women get paid way less over the course of their careers, and at the middle level, people are going for retention offers and asking for equity. She further suggested that the campus needs to think about how we help prepare our job candidates.

CFW members vehemently disagreed and suggested that this way of thinking puts the blame on the candidate. One male member noted that he did not trust the data that insinuated that negotiations are to blame and shared that in his field, the only people who had room to negotiate were those who had outside offers, which are rare. CP/EVC countered that this does but the onus on faculty, but also on deans. She stated that she did not think it was true that people don't have room to negotiate if they don't have an outside offer and suggested that there is flexibility, but many people don't ask. She added that the campus can make institutional decisions about how we hire too.

Chair Profumo shared a slide on salary growth by gender and division and suggested that the big issue is hiring salary. He noted that certain divisions with mostly male faculty have quick salary growth, but in Humanities and the Arts, there is very little gender difference. CP/EVC Tromp suggested that she would be willing and happy to have CFW provide a presentation to the deans, with support efforts from the center, to heighten awareness of these issues and help them understand the complexities. She noted that not all may be conscious of these inequities and suggested that having a conversation with deans on how we structurally encourage equity (perhaps with some of the questions used in searches) might be a valuable conversation to have with deans.

CP/EVC Tromp noted that she hoped that review committees would think about these issues within the context of Strategic Academic Planning. She suggested that campus values are equity and justice, then perhaps some money should be preserved to address these issues and not be used for FTE.

When asked if the administration has information on failed recruitments, CP/EVC Tromp noted that her experience is that it has to do with housing issues, as do many of the retentions. She shared that she has been personally looking for housing for over a year and cannot afford a home on her salary in the Santa Cruz community. She added that it is important that she has had this experience as it helps her to understand what faculty, staff, and students go through. She noted that she has never before seen in her career retention actions where the campus had to figure out how to manage housing issues for faculty, and this is happening at UCSC. CP/EVC Tromp recognized that Santa Cruz is the most expensive city to build in in the country right now. On top of the real estate market, construction is hugely expensive, and there are environmental concerns as well. CP/EVC Tromp noted that it is hard to build on the UCSC campus, but emphasized that faculty housing is a big priority for her as it is a number one faculty welfare issue. She further suggested that if UCSC can't provide a decent lifestyle for faculty, and if faculty cannot afford a house to live in, then we cannot retain them. CP/EVC noted that she has consulted with provosts in New York City, which has similar issues as Santa Cruz, and they noted that they are buying off campus housing every chance that they get. CP/EVC Tromp noted that there is a different political issue here and suggested that if UC Santa Cruz did the same, the campus would be hated even more by the community for taking over housing in a limited market.

A member raised the issue with using medians vs. averages in salary analysis and suggested that medians understate the problem. The member suggested that there use to be a difference between medians and averages due to on-scale salary, and questioned if this is still the case. VPAA Lee noted that APO just released their annual salary comparison analysis and suggested that there are some campuses where off-scale salary goes up and down. For instance, Davis uses ½ step for a period of time until it approaches a step and then goes away, whereas UCSC off-scale salary is permanent. Due to this, VPAA Lee suggested that looking at off-scale is not an apples to apples comparison.

Partner Hire Issues

Chair Profumo informed the CP/EVC that former CFW member Ted Holman has initiated a spreadsheet of volunteers with contact information and the field of work of their partner. Chair Profumo shared that CFW has long determined that two incomes vs. one can make or break a recruitment or retention action and suggested the spreadsheet is a working model that could be embraced by the administration and would act as a tool for department heads and negotiators. CFW expects that updated the spreadsheet would take a minimal commitment, perhaps five hours/year. The spreadsheet has a high number of faculty from the Social Sciences and the Physical and Biological Sciences divisions, but only one representative from the Humanities.

Members emphasized that the vision is to have faculty opt in to enter their data and the document would be a protected document that department administrators could have access to and provide to those being recruited. VPAA Lee stated that something akin to this list existed roughly 10 years ago in the Academic Personnel Office and required more like a ¼ FTE staff commitment to keep it updated, which was a big cost to the campus. VPAA Lee suggested the list was rarely effective in helping people find jobs and set up an unrealistic expectation that caused additional negative feedback from the campus. VPAA Lee added that the campus lost some recruitments as some people had thought that a partner job was promised. As such, VPAA Lee has concerns about such a list as the issues raised with the previous resource were so significant that it had to be discontinued.

Chair Profumo suggested that the list would be an additional resource, not a promise, and members suggested that maintenance of the list may be easier now due to tools such as Google Drive. VPAA suggested that if faculty do not constantly edit/update their information, then APO had to contact faculty, make the changes, etc. Chair Profumo noted that he heard the VPAA's concern, and suggested that there could be a working model where this resource could be optimized in terms of staff commitment, perhaps by having department heads send out a request to update information and have faculty edit themselves.

CPEVC Tromp thanked CFW members for their service and noted that she looks forward to collaborating and learning from the committee.

Consultation Debrief

CFW debriefed from its consultation with the CP/EVC. Members discussed the proposed faculty salary increase and noted that in the past, UCOP has given campuses 3% where 1/5% was to be given across the board and 1.5% was discretionary. Chair Profumo added that UCFW met with the President and informed her that UC salaries were lagging. Members noted that if the UCSC campus does not continue with a strong special salary practice / “merit boost program”, UCSC will lag even more. In addition, members agreed that if these routine increases from UCOP stop, UC salaries will lag further behind.

A member raised concerns about the term “employee housing” vs. “staff and faculty” housing being used by the administration and the campus. The member suggested that the language used changes the culture.

Members raised additional concerns about the VCBAS stating that they already got all the feedback and information that they needed from the summer childcare workgroup, aside from the fact that they did not seek or get information on the specifics of the program including aftercare,

part time vs. full time spots, etc. The CFW Childcare Representative noted that these topics did come up in follow-up childcare meetings, but stated that there were no faculty in the meetings aside from her, and suggested that another faculty member/representative should have been included.

Chair Profumo noted that VCBAS Latham was clear that CFW would not be involved in the decision making process, but could provide feedback. Chair Profumo suggested that CFW think about strategies to rally the Senate around the fact that faculty are being left out of the decision making process.

In terms of salary, CFW would like to look at the differences across divisions for salary growth and disprove that the crux of the issue is way that male vs. females negotiate salary, as was suggested by the CP/EVC. Members noted that negotiated salary would not help the Humanities and other divisions as it does not address the problem of salary growth, cost of living, etc.

In terms of partner hire resources, members were appalled to hear today that APO had such a list as CFW has spoken to VPAA Lee on several occasions on the topic and he never mentioned that there was a list/resource 10 years ago. Members agreed that management of the list could be low cost now with Google docs. CFW would like to be strategic and smart about this topic. A suggestion was made that if the resource fails, that is better than having nothing. CFW considered sending a separate post consult on the topic and seeking input from the campus's past experience.

Members were pleased to hear that the CP/EVC understands UCSC's unique housing issues, and suggested that even if building cannot happen now, financial support could.

Members noted that neither the CP/EVC nor the VPAA mentioned anything about cost of living and questioned whether this was intentional as they do not feel that they can do anything about cost of living adjustments. A suggestion was made that it might be helpful to look at how much money is lost by the campus if we lose a faculty member and have to rehire. At the recent Senate meeting, Chair Profumo pointed out that it doesn't cost much to continue a strong merit boost program, even though VPAA contends that the cost multiplies each year. Chair Profumo noted that the administration has failed to provide failed retention data and only shares information on positive results.

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

Consideration of the draft minutes from the CFW meeting of January 18, 2018

The draft minutes were approved.

Brief Update from the Campus Leadership Meeting of January 29, 2018

This conversation was postponed due to lack of time.

Systemwide Review – Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations - continued discussion from 1/18/18

CFW has been asked to review and comment on a new draft policy developed in response to a request from the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC). Currently, there are two systemwide UC open access policies designed to ensure access to UC-affiliated scholarly research: one for members of the Senate, and the other for all non-Senate authors while employed at UC. There is, however, no policy for ensuring open access to UC graduate student' theses and dissertations. The proposed policy would provide systemwide consistency for these works.

Members raised concerns about the proposed embargo period, noting that the needs for, and length of, an embargo period varies across the divisions. CFW will recommend that the policy provide graduates, when they submit their Theses/Dissertations, with the option of an embargo period to protect their work, including an option to extend the embargo indefinitely until the candidate requests termination.

Systemwide Review – Proposed Revisions to APM Re: LSOE – 2nd Round - continued discussion from 1/18/18

CFW has been asked to review and comment on the second round of proposed revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135, and 235, which include proposed changes to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series in terms of title, academic expectations and evaluation, and limits of use of title. Members noted that much of the policy being revised has to do with the expectations and evaluation of the series, and as such, will defer to the expertise of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). However, while acutely aware of the effect that cost of living in Santa Cruz has on the recruitment and retention of faculty and lecturers on our campus, members applauded moving LSOEs to a salary scale that parallels that of tenure track faculty, with the hopes that the LSOE series will continue to sustain teaching on our campus.

REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY PROFUMO, 7/12/18