

**Minutes**  
**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**Meeting of October 3, 2019**

**Present:** Vilashini Cooppan, Thorne Lay, Grant McGuire (Chair), Nico Orlandi (via Zoom), Su-hua Wang, Judith Aissen (*ex officio*), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

**Welcome & Introductions**

Chair McGuire Welcomed members to the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) and shared that before becoming chair, he was a member on CFW for three years and was intimately involved with salary and salary transparency discussions and analysis. Chair McGuire noted that there are many issues that pertain to faculty welfare and suggested that the committee will need to determine what topics to take on in the coming year in order to make a difference. Members were informed that the committee will likely collaborate with other Senate committees such as the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) on shared topics of interest. Chair McGuire encouraged members to share any faculty welfare issues and/or concerns from colleagues with the committee, particularly those of junior faculty, as there is no junior faculty representation on the committee.

Members introduced themselves and shared why they joined CFW. Reasons included a need for increased shared governance, special salary practice monitoring, and the pending establishment of the new campus childcare center. Member Su-hua Wang shared that she will represent CFW on the Childcare and Family Services Advisory Committee in 2019-20.

**Chair's Orientation to Committee Business**

Chair McGuire provided a brief overview of member responsibilities and procedures for conducting CFW business. The committee reviewed the Member Guidelines, and agreed to the committee confidentiality statement and consultation procedures.

**Issues and Goals for CFW in 2019-20**

Members reviewed the 2018-19 draft annual report and discussed issues that they would like CFW to address in 2019-20. Chair McGuire suggested that much of CFW's job is to monitor these issues.

*Childcare*

Members were informed that UCSC is the only UC campus with no childcare for employees. The Student West Housing Project includes a childcare facility. The project is currently being sued and is on hold. A judge is scheduled in October to rule on whether the lawsuits may move forward.

Last year, former CP/EVC Marlene Tromp created a campus Childcare and Family Services Advisory Committee, which will meet this year with CFW Member Wang present. David Keller, Executive Director of Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES) will serve as chair. The committee also includes staff and student representation, and faculty representatives including Catherine Cooper. Member Wang shared that a short-term goal of the committee is to create an access policy that is fair and equitable for faculty, staff, and students. A second goal is to create an evaluation process for the 3<sup>rd</sup> party childcare vendor (currently Bright Horizons) to ensure quality. Chair McGuire noted that there have been concerns with Bright Horizons being selected as the childcare vendor, particularly as there was no office Request for Proposals (RFP). The campus instead piggy backed on negotiations that were made between Bright Horizons and UC

Davis, and CFW raised concerns about the lack of transparency in the process. Member Wang shared that as there is no early education program on campus, there is no expertise to run the program in house as is done on other campuses. After the childcare program launches, and following an evaluation of the vendor, a third goal of the committee will be to decide if the campus should put out a RFP for a different provider.

Members were informed that last year, CFW worked on trying to establish an emergency care program for children and dependents. Chair McGuire noted that other UC campuses have this type of program, and he will be speaking with colleagues at the University of California Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) level about this. Returning CFW members noted that last year, UCFW confused emergency back up care with the UC SitterCity access, but noted that the service is not an immediate solution for last minute emergencies/issues.

### *Faculty Salaries*

Chair McGuire suggested that this year, CFW will push for a consistent set of faculty salary analysis metrics, an agreement that must be made between CFW (Senate) and the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and administration. Chair McGuire noted that APO is charged with doing the annual analysis and CFW is able to comment on it if needed. However, due to a disagreement in metrics, for several years, CFW has done its own analysis with a different set of metrics. Chair McGuire would like to change this paradigm and noted that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair have agreed to make salary metrics a priority this year.

CFW would like salary analysis to be focused on a 9 campus comparison (the APO report focuses mainly on a 7 campus comparison and does not include UCB or UCLA), Above Scale salaries, and include a cost of living variable. Chair McGuire noted that cost of living (COL) at both the systemwide and campus level appears to be a huge taboo, although it greatly hinders UCSC particularly with regards to cost of housing, and a lack of faculty housing. CFW has occasionally included COL in its analysis and has found that UCSC is 10% behind other campuses when this variable is included.

Returning CFW members shared that there were issues with getting necessary data from APO last year, to which APO blamed a lack of FTE. Chair McGuire noted that CFW has been able to get systemwide data and starting salaries, but agreed that getting extra metrics has been difficult, but was easier when the request was made in person to VPAA Lee and AVP McClintock. A suggestion was made that the Senate should push on this, and Chair McGuire stated that he would bring this up with Senate Leadership.

### *Healthcare*

Chair McGuire informed members that open enrollment is coming up and UC Care is expected to get more expensive, which is a serious issue. Last year, UC Care was said to be on a “death spiral” with healthier people dropping out due to the cost, which decreases the sustainability of the program. Further, there is no leverage to pull down costs at UC medical centers as if they provide

services for less money, they lose money and the medical centers are a major money generator for the UC. It is currently the most expensive health plan option for UC employees. Chair McGuire noted that the UCFW Healthcare Task Force (HCTF) has been active trying to solve this issue. A new UC medical center director will be on-boarded and the hope is that this will improve things for UC Care.

Chair McGuire emphasized that the issue for UC Santa Cruz is that the campus has limited healthcare access in town. The Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF)/UC Care and Physicians Medical Group (PMG)/Blue and Gold are both at capacity for taking on more patients. Although Kaiser Permanente's presence is growing, it is not yet at a level where it could absorb enrollees in PAMF. As such, UCSC depends on access to PAMF providers currently being offered only through UC Care. Chair McGuire noted that CFW must continue to keep telling the system that UCSC must have access to PAMF, however, he fears that it will get worse before it gets better.

Chair McGuire would like to make sure that the new Chancellor and Interim CP/EVC are aware of limited healthcare access and related UCSC healthcare concerns.

### *Housing*

The lack of affordable housing is serious crisis for the UCSC campus right now. Chair McGuire noted that the campus must build more housing and CFW will put pressure on the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) to get more employee housing units built at the Ranch View Terrace Phase II site as all the infrastructure is already there. Last year, CFW reviewed and provided feedback on an employee housing needs survey that is set to be launched during the fall quarter. Following results from the survey, the current plans for single family units on the proposed site will likely need to be rethought to include higher density. Chair McGuire added that whenever the campus's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) is discussed, north campus is dangled as a possible building option, however it is too expensive to build there due to a lack of infrastructure and not a realistic option. However, Chair McGuire suggested that this and other sites will need to be considered if the campus is serious about addressing the housing crisis.

CER Chair Aissen noted that the 2018-19 CFW Annual Report touched on the stresses of housing and the effect on retirees and survivors of retirees in campus housing. Members noted that campus housing was intended to act as a starter home to gain equity before entering the off campus market, however the high cost of living has made this impossible for most on campus home owners. In time, the majority of campus housing residents may be retirees. Members agree that this is a sensitive and difficult issue and questioned how to incentivize people to leave campus housing without setting a time limit like other university campuses.

Chair McGuire noted that CFW has tried to start a conversation with Director of Capital Planning and Employee Housing, Steve Houser about the possibility of making changes to the Resale Pricing Program and there appeared to be reluctance. Members questioned whether there might be more traction if the two parties got together to envision a new program for new housing projects

as the issues that the resale program originally aimed to solve are remote and not big issues right now. CFW would like to consult with Director Houser this year to continue to brainstorm ideas to optimize campus housing.

### *Parking and Transportation*

Returning member Nico Orlandi served as last year's CFW representative on the campus Advisory Committee on Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) and reported that last year a student referendum passed with the hope that it will secure current bus lines. Member Orlandi noted that there is a new Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) Director this year. Last year much of the ACCTP focus was on passing the referendum, this year, it is unclear what the focus will be. Member Orlandi shared that an ongoing major faculty concern is the inability to park close to classes and one's department and the inability to leave campus and come back and find parking. Last year, CFW questioned whether lots closer to buildings could be made exclusive to faculty and/or A parking permits as the lots currently also include B parking permits (graduate students). The committee also recommended the consideration of using some downtown parking lots with a shuttle service for faculty and/or graduate students. Member Orlandi suggested that these proposals were met with resistance and it is unclear if they will be pursued.

Chair McGuire noted that the overarching issue with TAPS is that it is consistently trying to cover debts and there appears to be a lack of a long-term vision to serve a growing campus. Chair McGuire hopes to gain SEC's assistance in putting pressure on TAPS to gain a better vision of how they will solve these issues.

### *Spousal/Partner Hire Resources*

Due to the high cost of living in Santa Cruz, CFW has noted the importance of dual careers and spousal/partner hire resources for faculty. Chair McGuire noted that a former CFW member has created a database of spousal contact info so that prospective faculty and their partners could have someone to contact regarding employment in fields other than academia in the Santa Cruz area. Although CFW has recommended that the administration take over the management of this database or create something like it, the administration was not interested. There is apparently a new company that the campus is working with now that has a representative that is willing to assist faculty with spousal hire information. A former CFW member who is returning in winter quarter did research on this resource last year and will update the committee when they return. Chair McGuire noted that Spousal/Partner Hire Waivers of Open Recruitment on campus tend to produce tension as receiving deans must give up an FTE allocation. Chair McGuire added that other campuses have central resources to soften the blow to departments who have to compromise and suggested that advocacy for such assistance may be needed.

### *Retirement*

Chair McGuire noted that there is a UCFW subcommittee that focuses on retirement. There have been issues raised about the new two-tier retirement system caused by recent retirement option changes for new employees. CFW *ex officio* and Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER) Chair

Aissen noted that there are also concerns about the upcoming changes in retirement health plans that should be monitored. Under UC Care, Medicare is primary and UC Care is secondary. In the new plan, the bills will first go to UC Care and it is unclear if they will approve the same services that Medicare has approved in the past.

Members noted that there is a new Path to Retirement program in the works. Both CFW and CFW will monitor developments. In addition, a former UCFW subcommittee for retiree healthcare has been merged with the general UCFW HCTF. Chair McGuire would like to monitor this change to ensure that it does not have a negative effect on retiree healthcare issues.

### **Committee Issue Assignments**

All CFW members are expected to monitor or work on a specific issue about which they will report back to the full committee throughout the year. In some cases, this will require additional attendance of a campus committee, and for others, the analytical review of reports or data, which are provided to CFW on a regular basis. Members discussed the responsibilities of these assignments and volunteered for assignments.

### **Faculty Salary Transparency**

In recent years, CFW has sent salary data to faculty at the beginning of the fall quarter when departments are conducting merit and promotion reviews. These data allow faculty to see the average UCSC salaries at each rank and step, and provide faculty with a better sense of what level of off-scale is typical on our campus. Due to difficulty with access to data, CFW's salary analysis was limited last year. Members considered whether there was a need to send an email to faculty this year with main takeaways from this limited analysis and determined that due to changes in the personnel review call timeline, it was already too late to get this information to faculty as files were already being submitted to the call. The committee will revisit this in winter/spring and may decide to send a more comprehensive salary summary including cost of living considerations once the committee completes its annual analysis.