

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of November 2, 2017

Present: Vilashini Cooppan, Hiroshi Fukurai, Grant McGuire, Nico Orlandi (via Skype), Stefano Profumo (Chair), Su-hua Wang, Yiman Wang, Barry Bowman (*ex officio*), Susanna Wrangel (ASO)

Absent Without Notice: Tesla Jeltema

Consultation – VCBAS

The committee consulted with Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham on the topic of childcare and receive an update on the progress of the building of a childcare facility and employee housing under the P3 project. Director of Colleges Housing & Educational Services (CHES) Dave Keller and Associate Vice Chancellor (AVC) of Colleges Housing and Educational Services Sue Matthews also attended.

VCBAS shared that the project has evolved due to site issues and shared slides of possible building options for the Student Housing West project, which includes undergraduate, graduate, and family student housing, as well as a childcare facility.

The original plan was to build the whole project where Family Student Housing (FSH) and the student childcare center are currently located along with some new land closer to Porter and Kresge. After discussion with Fish and Wildlife, the campus was informed that due to the habitat of the red-legged frog, the original building plan may be delayed for years, so the usable and buildable area of land was shrunk in order to expedite building. Capstone, the selected contractor, came up with four possible building options. VCBAS Latham shared the sketches of the 4 options by slide.

Three of the options included all housing and childcare on one site on the west side of campus. Many of the options contained multiple story buildings with sub-terrain parking, and closely-knit together buildings/facilities, with little room for outside play for the childcare center. The fourth option moves FSH and the childcare facility to a different site located at the corner of Hagar Drive and Coolidge Rd. In this scenario, FSH would offer 2 bedroom units for families and an approximate 15-16,000 square foot childcare center with a large outdoor play area.

When concerns regarding traffic were raised, Director Matthew stated that there may be traffic issues with the west side development as well and reported that they are currently evaluating road access. Chair Profumo noted that CFW likes this design option, but suggested that the campus

must have a plan for traffic. When a suggestion was made to create another entrance into UCSC, VCBAS Latham encouraged the member to bring the suggestion to the upcoming LRDP forum for faculty.

In terms of timeline, VCBAS Latham noted that FSH cannot lose access to student childcare. As such, the plan is to first complete the FSH and move beds and build the childcare center at the same time, with a one-time cost for temporary housing.

VCBAS Latham that there will be more outreach to community groups regarding the project. VCBAS Latham noted that faculty and staff who live on Hagar as well as the current FSH inhabitants were consulted with first prior to campus leaders with the hopes of gaining support for the project. The project will also be mentioned in the next Tuesday Newsday online campus newsletter. VCBAS Latham reported that the campus is still waiting for Environmental Impact Reports on the new proposed site, however meetings/forums have been held with various community groups, and most seem happy that the campus is creating more housing for students. VCBAS Latham added that some community members were not able to attend the meetings and suggested that in moving forward, the campus will be more mindful about making the meetings more inclusive in terms of location, time, etc.

When asked about the ratio breakdown of the number of students to staff to employees who would be serviced at the proposed employee childcare center, VCBAS Latham stated that there may be 72 for slots students and 56 slots for faculty, but emphasized that this ratio is not final and suggested that this will be one of the challenging conversations that need to happen when figuring out the details. In terms of the current student childcare center, VCBAS reported that there are currently 5 children on the waitlist: 3 toddlers, 2 preschool children, and 1 school age child. When a suggestion to include school age care into the new facility was made, Latham suggested that policy regulations and teacher to student ration constrict what the campus can offer in terms of other types of childcare needs.

When asked whether and when the building of Ranch View Terrace Phase II (RVTII) employee housing would be included under the P3 building umbrella, VCBAS Latham said that she thought it would. She added that JLL, the same vendor that the campus worked with before, is currently conducting a programic review and is working with staff. A Request for Proposals (RFP) will go out winter quarter after the RVT II project is finalized.

Finally, CFW inquired about the possibility of granting fee access to OPERS facilities for all faculty. VCBAS suggested that this would require a longer discussion. A financially viable model would need to be determined. It was further noted that the current facility only holds 8000 and the

campus is already having trouble accommodating students, staff, and faculty. A suggestion was made to integrate more faculty into the wellness center or build another facility.

Debrief

CFW debriefed from the consultation. Concerns were raised about traffic during the building of the project, as well as when the project is complete. Members noted that the Hagar/Coolidge intersection is already congested around 5pm.

Chair Announcements

Faculty emails

Chair Profumo reported that he received an email from a faculty on parking. The faculty member noted difficulty with finding parking after leaving to pick up her child from childcare and suggested that faculty should have priority for parking over undergraduates. When asked if they agree, CFW members noted that they agreed that there should be reserved spots for faculty only. A suggestion was made to convert the Core West Parking structure to faculty only parking. Chair Profumo suggested that a need for faculty parking may be advocated for during the ACCTP meetings.

CP/EVC Consult with SEC – List of CFW Issues

The CP/EVC has an upcoming consultation with the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). CFW would like the CFW Chair to inquire about the following items during that meeting:

- Partner hire resources
- Faculty housing
- Consideration of cost of living with faculty salaries
- Housing allowances
- Childcare

Intellectual Property Campus Policy Proposal

CFW has been asked to review and comment on a new intellectual property campus policy proposal. Members questioned whether the campus was looking to adopt such a policy merely because other universities are doing so. Members found the key motivations given for the policy in the review packet, i.e. (i) “to build a sustainable path for funding our operation” [OR-IATC] and (ii) this practice being “the norm at other major research universities”, though not at 7/8 of the other UC campuses, both unconvincing and insufficient. The committee determined that royalties should rather remain within the pertinent divisions and/or principal investigators’ laboratories, as done in all but one of the other UC campuses. Without further clarification of the reasons underpinning and justifying this policy, CFW will respond that it opposes the proposed policy.

Draft Policy Re: Conflict of Interest Related to Consensual Relationships

CFW has been asked to comment on a proposed campus policy from the Title IX Office regarding conflict of interest related to consensual relationships. The committee found the proposed policy extremely problematic and questioned how the policy would relate to the Faculty Code of Conduct, APM 15 and other similar policies. Further, the proposed policy appeared to be an initial rough draft with several grammatical errors. Members agreed that the issue is a delicate matter and should be carefully phrased and crafted before CFW can endorse it.

Faculty Salaries – Vetting of Senate Report

Last year's CFW completed an analysis of UCSC faculty salaries indicating a need for cost of living to be considered when comparing UCSC salaries to the campus median. Last year's committee was unable to present their report during the spring Senate meeting in 2017. Members reviewed the draft report and considered approval for presentation at the fall Senate meeting in December, 2017.

Chair Profumo noted that an important role of the report is to show that the Special Salary Practice or Merit Boost Program has allowed the UCSC campus to barely keep up with the UC all campus median. Chair Profumo emphasized that including all 9 campuses vs the 7 campuses that the administration used in its analysis is important due to the cost of living in Santa Cruz. Chair Profumo suggested that the higher salaries at UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles compensate for the higher cost of living in the Bay Area and Los Angeles. When cost of living is included in the salary analysis, UCSC lags behind the all campus median by 10-15% depending on rank. Concerns were raised about retention with a lack of housing allowances, new faculty housing, and non-competitive salaries. A member questioned whether the campus will be conducting another equity study this year. Chair Profumo noted that the study is usually mandated by UCOP, but added that CFW will do an independent study with metrics it feels are most critical and important.