

Meeting Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of April 26, 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

Consideration of the draft minutes of February 15, 2018

The minutes were approved.

Upcoming CFW Consult with CP/EVC and VCBAS on May 10, 2018

Chair Profumo informed members that CFW will consult with CP/EVC Tromp and VCBAS Latham on May 10, 2018.

Report from the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) Consult with VCBAS on April 18, 2018

Chair Profumo was invited to attend the Committee on Planning and Budget's (CPB) consultation with the Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham for updates on the Student Housing West project and the building of the UCSC childcare facility. Chair Profumo asked the VCBAS why there was no Request for Proposal (RFP) for the third party childcare vendor. When pressed, the VCBAS informed attendees that the decision to go with Bright Horizons was made by then Interim CP/EVC Herbie Lee and Chancellor Blumenthal. Chair Profumo suggested that CFW should insist on an RFP when the committee consults with the CP/EVC and VCBAS on May 10th. Members considered that the CP/EVC and VCBAS might view an RFP at this stage as delaying the overall project. However, Chair Profumo claimed that an RFP should not affect the current facility design phase. CFW member questioned whether the Academic Senate and Senate leadership were behind the request for an RFP and a possible delay in the completion of the project and suggested that the committee ask Senate leadership what they thought.

During the CPB consultation, VCBAS Latham once again shared that Bright Horizons (BH) was used by the campus in 2015 to conduct analysis for the summer Childcare Services Model workgroup. BH also participated in a 2011 childcare taskforce Request for Information (RFI) that had two responding vendors. When asked why BH was chosen over the other vendor, VCBAS Latham said that BH appeared to be the better option. Chair Profumo emphasized that if the summer 2017 Childcare Working Group was informed that BH was already chosen as the vendor, it may have influenced their report and recommendations.

Chair Profumo informed the committee that VCBAS Latham also touched on concerns regarding possible view disruption with the planned childcare facility. The VCBAS suggested that the facility would not be noticeable from certain points on campus. The CFW childcare representative

added that in meetings, it was accepted that the building would change the view, but the intent was to choose architecture that would create a nicer transition and blend better with the rest of the environment. CFW members noted that there have been several concerns raised about the view, particularly from Hagar Court residents. However, some other resident recognize the housing crisis and need for childcare and, knowing that the administration has considered other sites, are willing to lose the view in exchange for critical housing and childcare services. A suggestion was made that many complaints about the project may stem from the lack of transparency as the general public is not aware of all the options that were explored. Chair Profumo added that he, the Senate Chair, the CPB Chair, were invited to consult with the VCBAS and Sue Matthews at a previous meeting regarding the new/current childcare location and were told that the location was already chosen. At that time, Sue Matthews had said that after the 5 year term, the vendor would be evaluated before a contract is renewed. Chair Profumo suggested that no real Senate consultation on the site occurred.

When CFW consults with the CP/EVC and VCBAS, Chair Profumo would like to educate them on the history of childcare on the campus and raise concerns about the campus's engagement with BH. Members would also like to inquire about the other sites that were explored and would like that information shared with the greater community, although members noted that in 2015, CFW expressed a preference for an on campus location.

Members discussed the third party vendor to manage the childcare program. Chair Profumo noted that campus management was explored, but determined to not be feasible due to liability concerns and a lack of an early education department and professionals in the childcare field. When a member questioned whether any not for profit providers were looked into, the Childcare Representative suggested that there are some small non-profits, but none that could manage the size of the proposed program. She added that the 2011 Child Care Task Force and the 2013 UCSC Child and Family Learning Network Steering Committee both suggested a "necklace" conceptual model of many childcare groups working together. Members also referenced the childcare program at Cabrillo College, which is now part-time due to state funds, and questioned whether a contract could be made with Cabrillo.

Update from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting of April 13, 2018

Chair Profumo reported that President Napolitano is expected to make a decision in the near future on whether or not to accept the faculty salary increase plan to decrease the gap in median salary with the "Comparison 8" campuses. In order to bridge the gap, the proposal is for a three year plan to increase on-scale salaries 3% every year, plus a 3%

increase in off-scale every year for three years. It is currently unclear as to where the funding will come from. The issue will be discussed at the Regent retreat next week.

Chair Profumo noted that when the topic was discussed during a recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting, some colleagues suggested that if the funding must come from Chancellors and the campus's, then the increase should not happen. Chair Profumo suggested that it all boils down to salaries as purchasing power and not just keeping up with inflation. However, he agreed that taking money from resources is not the way to increase salaries.

When asked if the situation would be helped by more state funding if the campus were to meet the transfer to student ratio goal, Chair Profumo noted that median salaries are not that much below, but when cost of living is included, there is a 10% lag. He added further that Santa Cruz cost of living is 30% more expensive than Merced. Chair Profumo noted that every campus must achieve the transfer ratio in order to get more funding, which is unlikely, and suggested that there should be a systemwide ration. However, even if the money comes, it may be earmarked for something other than salaries.

UCFW is waiting for a June report from the Benefits Working Group on potential changes to retiree health packages. For current employees, an official Request for Proposals (RFP) resulted in Health Net being selected as the administrator for the Blue and Gold plan once again. Mental health will be included in the new offering and pet insurance will be offered as an extra option.

Chair Profumo shared that UCFW received a report from the Task Force on Investments and Retirement. The Task Force shared that the Office of the President (UCOP) has an office that deals with investments, which is now moving the UC towards index funds to fund retirement. The funds mirror the Dow Jones, Nasdaq, etc. and have very low costs as compared with money managers. The Task Force also suggested that it is currently better to invest in stocks than in real estate in California. Members noted that Fidelity is available to assist faculty who have questions regarding stocks. Some members suggested that the company is not very helpful.

In terms of salary, UCFW discussed salary equity across the campuses in detail. Chair Profumo noted that every campus has come up with its own metrics and analysis and suggested that it would be good if there were a set of general best practices. There is a one day symposium on salary equity planned for October 31, 2018.

Senate Review – Strategic Academic Plan Internal Barriers

Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (AVPAA) Martin Berger has asked the Academic Senate to prioritize a list of internal structural barriers to teaching and research resulting from an earlier request for feedback.

Members highlighted and prioritized the following 11 proposed barriers due to their significant impact on faculty welfare, in unranked order:

- Pressure to increase graduate enrollment without adequate support
- Lack of incentives and support for faculty to generate resources
- Lack of funds for faculty travel/conference participation
- OSP grant procedures cumbersome and support inadequate
- Extreme risk-averse nature of IRB process
- Inequities in teaching loads across departments and divisions
- Lack of staff support/space for DRC accommodations
- Lack of job and training manuals for staff and administrator roles
- Risk-averse culture of institution
- Lack of coordination among deans
- Poor campus information sharing
- Lack of coordinating structure/support above divisional level (for intra-divisional efforts)

In addition to this list, CFW would add “lack of shared governance”. Members raised concerns that large amounts of solicited Senate feedback are seemingly not being taken into account with regards to administrative decisions.

Faculty Salaries – Subcommittee Update and Senate Report

The committee received an update from the CFW Faculty Salary Subcommittee and considered preparations for the May 4, 2018 Academic Senate meeting. Chair Profumo plans on beginning his presentation at the Senate meeting with a focus on salary equity, with a gender equity gap of more than 10% and a white vs. non-white gap close to 13%. The Faculty Salary Subcommittee looked at the trend of diversity by rank and reported that 50% of all Assistant Professors are non-white, and 40% are female. Further Less than 20% of Above Scale Professors are non-white, and 10% are female, meaning that 70% of all Above Scale faculty are white men. However, Chair Profumo suggested that the data shows that diversity is growing on campus, which is good. A member suggested that women and minorities may be more likely to get hired, but not promoted. Chair Profumo added that the data showed that salary growth is slower for non-white faculty, except at the higher ranks. For female vs. male faculty, there appears to be no big differential in

salary growth. A suggestion was made that CFW needs to continue to study this to ensure that gender neutrality continues in promotion and growth.

During the Senate presentation, Chair Profumo also plans on emphasizing the unfair mechanism of having to seek outside offers and retention actions in order to increase salary, and how the practice is more likely used by male faculty and is not homogeneous across divisions and ethnicities. The data suggests, for example, that Asian faculty may be penalized as they are not seeking retention actions. Chair Profumo will also provide feedback on the Academic Personnel Office Report of Salary Competitiveness and note that the 7-campus comparison used is misleading, as is leaving out Above Scale Salaries. The Chair will also emphasize that a report of “competitiveness” should address cost of living variables. He will also suggest that the APO report should compare year to year to see what happens with UCSC’s median as compared to the system-wide median over time.