

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of February 15, 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)

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

Update from the UCFW Meeting of February 9, 2018

Chair Profumo provided CFW members with a report from the recent University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting. UCFW was informed that Health Net has once again won the bid for the Blue and Gold UC healthcare plan and is currently in negotiations. However, other bidders came close to winning the bid, which is new this year. UCFW discussed concerns of providers, such as Dignity Health, that have objections to providing certain procedures due to religious objections. Some UCFW members noted that they felt strongly that the UC should not use such plans. However, Chair Profumo noted that the only hospital in Santa Cruz is run by Dignity Health. Chair Profumo noted that suggesting that the University not contract with providers who have religious objections seems the obvious and appropriate thing to do, but noted that it is more complicated in practice.

UCFW also discussed a plan that the Office of the President (UCOP) Academic Personnel Office (APO) created to cover the salary gap of UC faculty when compared to the “Comparison 8” campuses. The plan would include a large salary increase of effectively 3% per year for 3 years. Chair Profumo noted that the question of how much of the increase would be a funded mandate is unknown and reported that UCFW would like to see as little campus discretion as possible in the allocation and is considering how to work with the President to implement. Chair Profumo noted that the trend for past increases of 3% was to limit campus discretion to 1.5% of the increase. Although CFW members noted that more discretionary power could assist chancellors in addressing campus inequities, Chair Profumo suggested that the danger in more discretionary power is that the allocation may not cover the gap with the Comparison 8 campuses as intended, and emphasized that it is a role of CFW to point to the level that would make up for the current lack of salary competitiveness. Chair Profumo further noted that if the mandate is unfunded, campuses will have to appropriate accordingly, which will present large reductions in other campus funds.

A CFW member suggested that salary lines could be used for temporary instructors reducing the number of ladder rank faculty and releasing funds for salary increases. Members recalled that during a recent consultation, CP/EVC Tromp suggested that choices would need to be made regarding campus faculty lines.

Chair Profumo shared that UCFW also reviewed the systemwide review of proposed policy on Open Access for dissertations and theses, that CFW recently considered. UCFW noted that the 2 year embargo period is a default and that individuals could then request extensions. CFW's response noted that depending on a graduate's field, one might need a longer embargo period and this appears to be writing into the policy.

UCFW also considered policy changes with regards to LSOEs. Chair Profumo reported that there were strong feelings that the newly revised draft policy diluted the expectations placed on LSOEs as well as concerns about the working title of "Teaching Professor".

Backup Childcare Proposal

The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) and the Resource Group on Academic Mothers (RGAM) have drafted a letter to the administration in support of a back up care childcare program to support faculty when they need to be at work and their regular child/adult/eldercare is unavailable. Chair Profumo reported that the topic of backup childcare for faculty was discussed during the last Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting and that there is widespread support. SEC would like to have a Senate leadership cover letter for letters from other committees such as CFW and CAAD. There was a question as to whether letters should be included from other groups on campus, or limited to Senate committees.

During the SEC meeting, Chair Profumo raised concerns about the lack of shared governance and participation with regards to decision making with the building of the new childcare center and the program that it will house. Chair Profumo noted that a third party vendor was already chosen to manage the childcare program before the 2017 Child Care Work Group met, although the workgroup was not informed of the development, which could have had an effect on their specific recommendations. The CFW Childcare Representative noted that she has heard that the campus will make the announcement that it has chosen a third party vendor within the next few weeks. Chair Profumo suggested that CFW should follow up with Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham to see if the 2017 Child Care Work Group report is ready to be shared with the campus community, in particular, with those who served on the workgroup. The CFW Childcare Representative noted that she is receiving requests to see the report from faculty.

Chair Profumo suggested that CFW should ask for clarification as to why the specific vendor was selected after the campus announcement is made. The committee would like to know why there was no official Request for Proposals (RFP).

When asked if there are concerns about the chosen childcare vendor, the CFW Childcare Representative suggested that the company does not have a great reputation and noted that staffing appeared to be the number one problem with open forums on line raising concerns about low wages and bad benefits for center staff. There are also more abstract concerns about using big corporations that are for profit and the possibility of fees becoming unaffordable. Members note that there is a recent correspondence from the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) that cited some of these concerns. The representative suggested that it might be too late to change the vendor as the campus already appears to be deep in the contract process.

All CFW members noted their support for the CAAD/RGAM letter and agreed to sign onto the letter with relative endorsement from SEC. Members noted that such back up care may need to be in home care as a sick child cannot go to a facility. Members suggested that the chosen provider will need to have a sufficient network in order to cover such care needs. Chair Profumo noted that he is not totally on board with the costs that may be associated with such a service, but suggested that if made available, faculty might be willing to pay for the service, or at a minimum, pay a copay.

Proposed Adjustment to Further Above Scale

CFW has been asked to comment on a CP/EVC proposal to adjust campus salary increase standards for Professor Above Scale. The adjustment would include a standard further Above Scale salary increment of 11% of the published Step IX rate on the applicable scale instead of the current \$16k flat amount. Members appreciated that the change would link salary increase increments to salary scales, which are constantly updated and hopefully tracking cost of living and inflation as opposed to a fixed dollar amount. CFW will respond noting that it strongly supports the proposed adjustment.

Report from the ACCTP

The CFW ACCTP Representative provided the committee with an update from the February 13, 2018 meeting of the Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP). The ACCTP Representative reported that she sent CFW transportation and parking topics for discussion to Transportation and Parking Director, Larry Pageler, as suggested by the committee. The topics included a concern regarding faculty experiencing difficulty in finding A&B parking before 9am, and a suggestion to sponsor faculty shuttles that go up the coast and to San Jose in order to reduce the number of cars parked on campus. During the 2/13/18 ACCTP meeting, the Representative was informed that these items would be placed on the next agenda for discussion.

Chair Profumo noted that parking is a huge faculty welfare issue and suggested that there should be parking permits and spaces specifically for faculty. Members discussed the A and B parking permits on campus. The ACCTP Representative noted that when B permits for graduate students

were introduced, graduate students were given the choice to have a lower price (lower than A permits) and have restricted parking access, or pay the same fee as A permits and have access to the majority of parking spaces on campus. The cohort opted to pay more for the ability to have more access to parking.

CFW members questioned the need for two separate permits (A and B) if they are the same price with the same access. There was no consensus for creating differentiation between A and B permits. Instead, members agreed that it would be best to merely state the problem and ask the ACCTP and TAPS to address the issue. The Representative noted that she briefly proposed the idea of family parking permits and spaces to assist those who needed to leave campus to pick up/drop off children at the ACCTP meeting, which is an idea that CFW has considered in the past, but the idea did not catch on.

CFW members noted that many of the pay stalls in the Core West parking structure have been removed, and that there is a new sign outside of the structure that notes how many parking spots are available, which members claimed is helpful. However, faculty still report having difficulty parking in the structure. When considering solutions, members noted that there is no incentive for faculty to carpool, and that full buses and shuttles passing by encourage faculty to drive themselves. A suggestion was made to offer a direct shuttle from downtown and/or the Delaware parking lot, that can shuttle faculty and graduate students to campus. Members noted that faculty may take advantage of such an option if parking passes in the shuttle lots were cheaper than campus parking.

The Representative reported that the ACCTP discussed the Bike Shuttle and a new referendum for the student ballot to increase transportation fees (an amendment to Measure 24). The ACCTP was informed that Bike Shuttle usage has decreased steadily since 2012-13. CFW members questioned whether this was at all related to the fact that there are fewer routes and shuttle trips being offered. Members noted that the real question is how many seats on each shuttle are empty. Members referenced a 2015 survey of riders that showed that 87% of riders were students, and 13% were faculty/staff. 71% of the students were graduate students, 18% were seniors, and 9% were juniors. Riders also indicated that if they didn't take the shuttle, that they would take the bus, indicating that the program is not reducing the parking on campus.

The ACCTP were informed that 27% of services were cut and ridership dropped 16% in 2016-17, which may in part be due to the rain. The cost of the shuttle in 17-18 will be \$150k. The committee was asked whether the service should continue to be funded or cut, and whether riders should be charged per ride. There was also a proposal to fund it by parking and not other programs. The CRW Representative noted that the Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services, Sarah Latham, was in support of keeping the shuttle program, even with decreasing numbers. CFW

members suggested that there should be an updated survey. Members also commented that paying for rides may be inconvenient, but it would not influence their use, however, no current members of CFW use the shuttle. Members agree that an updated survey should include a question about fees to gauge whether or not ridership would decrease if fees were collected from users. Members recalled that the outdated vehicles used for the program do not qualify for grants. A suggestion was made for the Representative to ask what it would cost to upgrade the vehicles so that the program could be more self-sustaining.

The CFW Representative reported that the remainder of the ACCTP meeting was focused on the draft ballot for a student transportation fees amendment that will affect both undergraduate and graduate students. The increase would be \$42/quarter -19, then \$12/year, \$11/year, and \$10/year. These proposed fees may be adjusted. The intention of the increase is to decrease the deficit and make transportation more sustainable with the increase of students on campus. Language for the proposal was discussed. In addition, a Student Fee Advisory Committee (comprised of students) will meet to determine whether other sources of funding may be found so that the fee may be reduced or eliminated.

There has been no explicit mention of cuts to TAPS services that might occur if the measure does not pass, although the Bike Shuttle program may be considered.

APO Report on Faculty Salary Competitiveness 2018

The Academic Personnel Office (APO) has published its 2018 Annual Report of Faculty Salary Competitiveness. The intention of the report is to monitor UCSC faculty salary relative to other UC campuses as mandated by the 2008 Joint Senate-Administration Task Force on Faculty Salaries. Assistant Vice Provost McClintock has noted that she welcomes comments.

The CFW Faculty Salary Subcommittee looked closely at the report and suggested that it did not jibe with the CFW analysis using the same data set. Chair Profumo conducted a quick analysis comparison and noted that some of the calculations appear to be off. Chair Profumo expressed concern about looking at absolute values and medians, which due to the sample size of some calculations, can create skewed results. Instead, CFW looked at averages.

Chair Profumo noted that the APO consistently does not include Above Scale Professors in its analyses, which dismisses 8% of the UCSC campus faculty, and continues to look at the 7 campus comparison, which as CFW noted in the past, is not a useful or interesting metric. Members questioned why Above Scale was not included, particularly when the UCSC faculty median lags vastly in comparison to sister campuses when the cohort is included. Chair Profumo reported that

the CFW calculation shows that UCSC lags more than 8% on both salary scales. Members recall that during a recent consultation with then Interim CP/EVC Herbie Lee, Lee suggested that some off-scale isn't permanent. However, Chair Profumo claims that this doesn't matter as the analysis is merely a snapshot of annual salary. Chair Profumo also found very different numbers when looking at the 75th and 90th percentile. CFW found similar issues with the report last year.

Members expressed concern about the possibility of a skewed report and findings influencing CP/EVC decisions and resource allocations. Chair Profumo would like to look at the numbers again and then draft a memo that emphasizes the need to include Above Scale and the 9 campus comparison and to discuss concerns about the reports calculations.

Systemwide Review – Senate Bylaw 128, Conflict of Interest

CFW has been asked to comment on a proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 128 to include a new section governing conflicts of interest (COI) on Senate committees, subcommittees, and task forces. Members raised issues concerning the vagueness in the proposed amendment surrounding specific actions recommended in cases of specific COI (i.e. what a chair will do) and recognized the difficulties of having one policy that fits all possible instances of COI. However, in all, the committee determined that the amendment is a non-prescriptive policy that should be included.

Strategic Planning

The Academic Senate has obtained a revised deadline for committees who may still wish to opine on the request for feedback from Interim Associate Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Martin Berger on campus strategic academic planning. Members recognized that there are several barriers to research and teaching that are related to faculty welfare that have inequities. CFW has already addressed recruitment allowances, however there are still reservations about sharing data on salary with department chairs. Parking, childcare, and inequities in teaching load (which varies by division) are also barriers. In addition, members noted that the desire to increase the number of graduate students and masters students with no resources to support them greatly impacts resources and research. Members also noted that the indirect pressure to teach large classes with few Teaching Assistants (TAs) instead of small seminars is not optimal for some disciplines and affects teaching as well as time available for research.

A draft response based on the discussion will be circulated for review and comment.