

**Minutes**  
**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**Meeting of October 19, 2017**

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

**Chair Announcements**

*Update on Childcare and P3 from the 10/12/17 meeting with VCBAS Latham and the Committee on Planning and Budget*

Chair Profumo provided the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) with a report from an October 12, 2017 meeting he attended with Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Latham and CPB on Childcare and the Private Public Partnership (P3) building project. Chair Profumo reported that Capstone Building Corporation is the chosen builder for the project. At the 10/12/17 meeting, VCBAS Latham informed attendees that the Student Housing West project needs to be redesigned and the northern part of the project has shrunk significantly due to environmental restraints. The project will include undergraduate, graduate, and family housing, as well as a childcare facility. Different options being considered were presented. A variety of the models considered included the possibility of parking underground. The most feasible of these models includes moving Family Student Housing (FSH) and the childcare facility to the corner of Coolidge Road and Hagar across from employee housing. However, an environmental report will need to be conducted to determine feasibility of the project.

CFW members agreed that this would be an optimal site for the childcare center, but noted that there may be political push back from employee housing owners and other campus constituents with regards to noise, view blocking, traffic, etc. Chair Profumo suggested that the campus needs to focus on the end goal and benefits of having employee childcare on campus.

Chair Profumo reported that the project is estimated to be complete in 2020 and will provide 140 spots for childcare serving students, staff, and faculty. The Childcare Workgroup recommended that the Campus Childcare Advisory Committee be reinstated to provide recommendations on the center's pedagogy, etc. Members considered pushing for more spots, noting that the original recommendations of the Childcare Workgroup were based on the old blue print of the current student childcare center and were restricted by size. A suggestion was made to look at the current wait list and research what other campuses are doing, focusing on how many slots are available for faculty. Members noted that the number of graduate students on campus is increasing and there may be a greater need for childcare. Members further noted that afterschool care may be needed as many school programs are overbooked.

VCBAS Latham will consult with CFW during its meeting of November 2, 2017. In its preconsultation memo, CFW will inquire about the number of children the facility will serve and

the number of spots that will be reserved for students, staff, and faculty, the building timeline, and the possibility of including aftercare.

### **Faculty Recruitment Allowances**

Concerned about equity across the divisions, in March 2017, CFW wrote to then Interim CP/EVC Herbie Lee requesting more information on divisional distribution. Now as VPAA, Herbie Lee has provided the committee with data on the distribution of faculty recruitment allowances.

Members reviewed the data, which indicated that all divisions now offer at least \$50k in recruitment funds. Chair Profumo would like to reiterate to the new CP/EVC that CFW has looked into this data. Right now, there is equal distribution, which CFW commends, but CFW wants to ensure that this information is shared with department chairs so that the trend continues. A suggestion was made to request that the CP/EVC share the data every year of the past 3 years. Members note that UC policy sets a cap of \$150k on recruitment. Given the cost of housing in Santa Cruz, Chair Profumo suggested that \$50 is low as it is only 5-6% of the cost of a house. CFW would like to reiterate it's previous request to share starting salaries with department chairs along with this new data.

### **Systemwide Review – Negotiated Salary Trial Program**

In 2013, UCOP initiative a Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) on three campuses (UCI, UCLA, and UCSD). The trial was designed to run for five years with a “full review” during the fourth year. A taskforce was appointed to review the program. CFW was invited to review and comment on the Report from the Fourth Year Negotiated Salary Trial Program Taskforce.

Chair Profumo noted that in the past, CFW was critical of the position as many faculty at UCSC could not benefit from it, which could cause inequities. However, members noted that the taskforce report suggested that the pilot program is going well and did not impact the funding of graduate students and/or post docs and did not appear unfair to those not in the program. The UCSC response to the initial pilot proposal also raised concerns that once the program had begun, it would not be reversible. CFW members raised similar concerns after reviewing this taskforce report.

Members agreed that the committee's response will state that CFW noted that the Task Force convincingly addressed the most pressing questions and concerns CFW had voiced in the past, especially in regard to the impact on funding for graduate students and postdoctoral associates. Additionally, in view of the results of last year's UCSC faculty welfare questionnaire, which reported that salary levels were the foremost concern for UCSC faculty, and in view of the dire situation of faculty salary levels at UCSC when cost of living is included, CFW views positively a possible additional source of faculty compensation. Such source would also presumably help boosting UCSC extramural funding levels and bring additional resources to campus from overhead on such extramural funds.

Although CFW notes that the program would not offer equal opportunity across our campus' divisions, CFW views positively the possibility to continue and expand the pilot program to additional campuses and departments including UCSC. If instituted at UCSC, CFW would encourage the administration to address divisional inequities by earmarking some of the additional overhead generated by the program from extramural funding to address access inequity across divisions.

### **Advocacy for Partner Hire Resources**

In recent years, CFW has identified partner employment as an issue that could have a significant positive impact on household incomes, recruitment, and retention on the UCSC campus. However, there is currently little help on campus in this regard. To address this issue, in February 2015, CFW proposed the creation of a list of UCSC faculty and their partners who could provide general information regarding the local job market and varying fields of expertise to current and/or prospective faculty partners/spouses. The committee received no official reply from the administration to its proposal.

In 2016-2017, Interim CP/EVC Lee confirmed in meeting that partner hires was one of the main reasons why faculty choose to leave the campus, but informed CFW that the administration felt that the proposed resource was not sustainable. No alternative suggestion was provided.

Members reviewed the 2015 CFW proposal and considered strategies for seeking support from the new CP/EVC for a resource/tool to address the issue. The tool is currently a spreadsheet being utilized by PBSci and SOE and is being managed by a former CFW member. Members noted that administrative buy in is essential for sustainability of the resource. Chair Profumo suggested that the arrival of the new CP/EVC may be a new opportunity for CFW to once again make the point that this is a cheap and useful resource that could assist in the recruitment of quality faculty members.

Members noted that the tool could help to build community and could potentially help recruit faculty from underrepresented backgrounds. A suggestion was made that such a resource supported by the administration gives a good impression to new recruits given the high cost of living and the difficulty in finding spousal/partner employment.

CFW is interested in collaborating with the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) in encouraging the CP/EVC to support the project, after which, CFW will draft a letter to the CP/EVC.

### **New topic – Access to OPERS for faculty members**

Chair Profumo received an inquiry from a faculty member inquiring why OPERS access is not free for faculty. Chair Profumo noted that this is in the purview of faculty welfare and suggested

that CFW inquire with the administration as to whether waiving the fees for faculty would be feasibly. If not, Chair Profumo questioned whether similar to students, faculty could be taxed on their paychecks pre-tax, perhaps \$4/month, in order to cover the costs and provide OPERS access to faculty for free.

Members additionally noted that the facilities are impacted and congested and noted that there are no longer hours reserved for faculty/staff at the main facility.