

Meeting Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of April 12, 2018

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

Absent with Notice: Hiroshi Fukurai

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

Consideration of the draft minutes of March 15, 2018

The minutes were approved.

Chair Announcements

Chair Profumo shared that he has received queries regarding the building of Ranch View Terrace, Phase II (RVT2) from faculty who are in dire need for housing. He shared with those inquiring that there is no scheduled timeline for the construction, but noted that the CP/EVC appears to be on board to move the project forward.

Chair Profumo and Member Cooppan recently met with Senate Chair Einarsdóttir to prepare for an upcoming meeting with the Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) regarding their ideas for a possible new health care plan for Santa Cruz. The meeting was requested by PAMF. CFW has not yet been provided with an agenda for the meeting.

Report from the ACCTP

The CFW ACCTP Representative provided CFW with a report from the Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) meetings of March 13 and April 10, 2018. The representative was unable to attend the meeting in April, but was provided with the meeting notes. The representative shared that the committee is currently focused on getting a student referendum on the ballot. Suggestions about parking and shuttles have been postponed until after the referendum. The representative is getting the sense that faculty are not being heard at the meeting and noted that when issues and concerns are brought up, there is an expectation that those raising concerns will also have the solution.

The student referendum will be voted on by ballot in Spring 2018 and includes the consideration of a fee increase for undergraduates and graduate students. A campaign was launched on April 9th and voting will take place from May 17 – May 23. The fees from fall 2019 – fall 2023 will be \$26 in FY19, \$23 in FY20, \$13 in FY21, and \$10 in FY 22, and \$10 in FY 23. The measure appears to have support from undergraduates and may pass. The representative shared that graduate students in ACCTP suggested that the fee is unfair as many graduate students do not use the buses since the cost of living has forced them to live further away from campus and commute by car.

There is no option to opt out of the fee. A suggestion was made during the ACCTP meeting to provide graduate students with a discount on parking permits, but faculty representatives pushed back on this as parking is already difficult and suggested that another solution may be to provide shuttles for faculty and graduate students and allow them to park at the Delaware building at discounted rates. The response to these concerns and proposed solutions was that the committee needed to wait and see what happens with the referendum.

The representative noted a need for alternatives to assist with campus accessibility such as a shuttle from the Delaware lot to campus or a shuttle from San Jose to campus. The representative noted that there is a 2:1 desired student to transfer student ratio, however the inaccessibility to campus is not encouraging transfers to come here.

The representative brought CFW's idea to the ACCTP of having a family permit parking of some kind so that people with children could leave campus to pick up children and return to campus. The representative shared that the suggestion was not well received. CFW members noted that having to leave campus and finding parking when returning is a big problem. A suggestion was made to move all Zipcars down to the Delaware lot and provide a shuttle. The CFW ACCTP representative noted that she will continue to pitch the idea of shuttles to the Delaware lot and petition for a need to address concerns for those who need to leave campus and return.

Report from Faculty Salary Analysis Subcommittee- Continued Discussion

The committee continued its discussion of February 15, 2018 on the Academic Personnel Office Report on Faculty Salary Competitiveness (2018) and CFW's latest analysis, and considered content for the committee's "Update on Faculty Salaries" report for the May 4, 2018 Academic Senate meeting.

CFW reviewed slides prepared by Chair Profumo and the latest analysis and its comparison to the APO analysis. Chair Profumo noted that APO continues to conduct its analysis based on numbers from 7 UC campuses, removing UCLA and UC Berkeley, and did not include Above Scale salaries, which account for roughly 8% of UCSC faculty. The CFW faculty salary subcommittee contends that this is problematic and doesn't make sense. CFW found that there was a 15% lag in salaries for both the 76 percentile and 90 percentile, which includes Above Scale salaries, and was ignored by APO. In addition, Chair Profumo noted that CFW worked with the same data set, but the resulting numbers/calculations were different in several instances.

A suggestion was made that much of the lag in salaries at UCSC have to do with the campus culture. Members noted that some campuses go for large off-scale salaries in personnel reviews, but the UCSC culture seems to say "that's too much". Chair Profumo suggested that faculty pay

a premium due to the location and the cost of living and noted that with retention offers, faculty often hear that the main benefit of staying at our campus is that “you get to live in Santa Cruz”. However, with the high cost of living, some members suggested that this is not enough and that the campus needs to start thinking in a different way. Members emphasized that retention actions do not take cost of living into consideration, noting that the standard practice is for retention actions to match dollar for dollar outside offers. Members also noted that the campus has lost faculty as other offers are much better, including exchange rates for out of county retention offers. Members recalled that during a recent consultation, CP/EVC Tromp suggested that faculty can negotiate salary when hired, but CFW members strongly disagree, and noted that the only way to get a pay increase is through a retention action. Chair Profumo suggested that cost of living/exchange rate considerations for retention actions should be looked at systemwide.

Members noted that the campus does not have data on why faculty have chosen to leave the campus and questioned whether cost of living was a factor. During a past consultation, former Interim CP/EVC and current VPAA Herbie Lee suggested that the campus was losing faculty due to salaries and a lack of jobs for partners. CFW noted a need for an exit survey for faculty.

The CFW Faculty Salary Subcommittee also considered equity and ethnicity. The committee found that the average salary for non-white faculty vs. white is actually higher for Assistant Professors Step 1-6, and at Above Scale. However, white faculty appear to be making more in Associate 7-11. Members noted increasing diversity in recent years and noted that many faculty of color on campus are requested to do more service in order to increase representation on campus and the possible effects of this service on time to tenure. The Faculty Salary Subcommittee would like to calculate standard deviation in order to make a statement.

The latest analysis did suggest that there was a gender salary gap rank by rank. At Assistant Professor, the average for male faculty is \$99k, whereas it is \$93k for female faculty, which is a large gap. Chair Profumo shared that this is true for all ranks, aside from Above Scale, where the gap is 1% and relatively insignificant. Members agreed that the gap found in Assistant Professors is most worrisome.

In terms of salary growth, which is the average percent salary growth year by year, white faculty are at 1.3% and non-white are at 1.1% at the Assistant rank. In terms of gender, the data suggested that female faculty salary growth is a bit more at the Assistant rank, and a bit slower at the Associate rank, but not significant.

Chair Profumo noted that there may be a correlation between average salary and the fraction of women in a given department and salary disparity may be divisional and specifically due to gender.

Members questioned whether this is an equity issue and noted that the salary disparities between the Humanities and Science faculty is a conversation that many on campus would like to have.

With regards to whether there may be a correlation between salary and a fraction of non-whites, the analysis showed no apparent ethnicity gap and the correlation is very weak. Chair Profumo noted that a correlation between the average off scale and number of women in a department was also very weak even though there is a general assumption that women have lower off scale salary as they are not as likely to seek outside offers and have retention actions. Chair Profumo also suggested that there is no correlation between salary growth and gender noting that the data suggested that everyone is being promoted at the same rate. However, Chair Profumo added that although trivial, the more retention actions in a given department, the greater the salary growth.

In terms of promotion rate by department and gender, Chair Profumo suggested that Arts Division and the Art Department is lagging behind on everything. A major take away from the analysis is that those in the arts are not being promoted at the regular schedule. This was calculated on time from degree and assuming 2 years for Step 1, etc. Members considered why Art might be lagging. Anecdotally, there have been concerns about chairs not being very supportive in promoting faculty. Also, what equals productivity is different in the arts than in other divisions and varies from person to person, which may be difficult to evaluate. A suggestion was made that a rubric to review art accomplishments may be needed.

When looking at salary growth by department and gender, the Art Department, Film and Digital Media, and Social Science Division appointees are low.

When looking at salary vs. promotion growth by division, Chair Profumo suggested that the Arts, with already low salaries, are not getting promoted as much as others and are not advancing as quickly as say the Social Science Division, which is promoting quickly with decent salaries. Members reviewed an associated slide and commented that the Merit Boost Program or Special Salary Practice was having a positive effect. A suggestion was made that much of this may again be due to culture in departments and Chair Profumo suggested that for that reason, divisional transparency with regards to hiring salary and start up is needed and added that chairs should know what other chairs are doing, particularly within the same division.

Overall, the goal of CFW's analysis was to see if there were equity issues. Chair Profumo suggested that there is nothing significant in terms of gender. CFW would like to share this information with divisional deans and the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD).

Strategic Academic Planning - Campus Landscape Analysis Review

CFW has been invited to comment on the Strategic Academic Plan Phase I Deliverable – Campus Landscape Analysis report. Although the report provided a good sense of the process and principles behind the process, members agreed that it provided too little representation of the data and its interpretation, and would have appreciated a more detailed executive summary report on the Phase I findings, as well as a complete written report to assess and evaluate the process.

Members noted that the Landscape report appears to illustrate that the campus largely agrees about its needs. However, members acknowledged that, in reality, the needs of the campus and its many cohorts are more nuanced than what was portrayed in the report. In addition, concerns were raised about workgroup attendance and how workshops were presented and reflected in the report. Members who attended workgroups noted that many more signed up for the group than attended. The report referenced the number of those who registered for the workshops, not the number of attendees who actually provided feedback, which is misleading. The committee was happy to see that the faculty need for transparency was highlighted in the report, but ironically, felt that the way that the report was presented did not at all provide transparency in how Phase I really played out.

For the evaluation of future phases of the Strategic Academic Plan, CFW will recommend that executive summaries with more detailed interpretation of the data be provided and that bullet point slide-like presentations like this report be avoided.