

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of October 17, 2019

Present: Vilashini Cooppan, Thorne Lay, Gran McGuire (Chair), Jennifer Parker, Judith Aissen (*ex officio*), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: Nico Orlandi, Su-hua Wang

Chair Announcements

Chair McGuire provided members with a report from the October 11 meeting of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW). The UCFW received a long report from the Health Care Task Force (HCTF). There is new leadership for UC medical centers, which is expected to be positive. There is hope that there will be less focus on profit, and more focus on making sure things like UC Care work and/or are replaced by something that works better. UC healthcare plan premiums changes are expected to be much smaller this year, including premiums for UC Care. There will be changes to UC Care's formulary which determines which medications are covered and which are not. Current medications will be grandfathered in, as long as there is no change in dosage. This will be tracked by the HCTF and the hope is that this cost savings measure is not a major change for enrollees. CFW members noted that this change may have large impact on mental health prescriptions as dosages are constantly changing and generics are not the same as name brand prescriptions. The HCTF will also monitor changes in retirement healthcare with regards to the new Medicare Advantage program.

Chair McGuire reported that UC retirement (UCRP) is not looking good and assumptions are now being revised to consider longer term coverage due to the trend of people living longer and the need for UC to pay out longer. Liabilities to UCRP have gone up. They are planning on a 3% increase on employers over a course of six years (.5% annually). This will be a huge expense for individual campuses. Employee contributions are also expected to increase. The Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) is expected to push back on this and approach the Regents to suggest borrowing in order to reduce this burden. Chair McGuire additionally noted that TFIR informed UCFW that it is not longer the case that when compared to other institutions, even though UC salaries are lower, overall UC compensation is higher. The task force will be doing analysis this year to determine the UC's total remuneration.

UCFW consulted with Vice Provost of Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson and discussed salary. At the request of President Napolitano, a 4% increase on the ladder rank scale began last year in order to bring the UC in closer alignment with the median of the "Comparison 8" universities. UC had been lagging by 12%, but is now 6.2% behind. It is unknown whether the next UC President will continue with these salary increases. Chair McGuire brought up the need to include cost of living, and was once again told that UC does not consider it in the analysis. However, VP Carlson did state that if UCFW thought it was important, that it could advocate for it. Chair McGuire hopes that this will be discussed at the next UCFW meeting.

Chair McGuire noted that UCFW is still pushing or the rationalization of salary scales. The committee is leaning towards proposing that every rank/step should be at the median of Comparison 8 campuses. The belief is that off-scale is a less transparent process. Chair McGuire suggested that making the scale more realistic would reduce the need for off-scale so that it is only a minor part of salary and increase overall transparency and the ability to conduct salary

comparisons across the UC system. There is expected to be pushback on this proposal as off-scale is controlled by each campus chancellor and if off-scale goes away, it would in essence reduce chancellor power. However, Chair McGuire noted that he is glad to see that this will be pushed forward.

UCFW was also informed of a major change to policy related to travel reimbursement. With pre-approval, faculty may now be eligible for reimbursement for dependent care when traveling to conferences, etc. if the funding source allows it.

When UCFW discussed its pro-active agenda for the year, Chair McGuire suggested that the committee focus on childcare and housing. Chair McGuire will update CFW when the UCFW Chair sets the UC committee's priorities for the year.

Systemwide Review, Revised Presidential Policy – Copyright Ownership

CFW reviewed the proposed draft of the revised Presidential Policy on Copyright Ownership. Members echoed concerns expressed by the Committee on Information Technology (CIT) regarding online course design, and noted that the definition of “Significant University Resources” in section II of the proposed policy is overly broad, and does not at all clarify whether funding or central resources used to design such a course would fall under this definition. Members agreed that this could be a potential problem with the growing number of online courses, and will recommend that this term and its possible relationship to online course design be clarified in the policy.

Divisional Review – Review of Student Success

CFW discussed the Review of Student Success report of August 2019. Members appreciated the thorough review of Student Success and the efforts that it took to create recommendations for improvements moving forward. Although Student Success is not under the direct purview of the committee, many of the discussions and recommendations of the report are correlated with the faculty experience and faculty welfare, and members reviewed these carefully. As faculty, CFW members offered additional feedback on some of the recommendations according to firsthand experience.

Members noted that most of the recommendations for faculty on page 18 of the report have already been implemented and are actively taking place on campus. However, members observed that the report seemingly recommends placing much of the responsibility of educational equity on graduate/undergraduate directors' position. Although members agree that training people with the highest amount of contact with students is a good idea, members noted that many graduate and undergraduate directors do not have the power or the ability to implement change, and the wording in the report could be read as adding burdens onto these positions, such as providing Disability Resource Center accommodations. Therefore, CFW will argue that this responsibility might be more appropriately placed at the department chair and/or dean level.

As faculty working directly with students on the front line, members noted that they are intimately close to the effects of impoverishment of housing resources. As such, members were pleased to see that both the critical need for housing and the housing crisis in our area were mentioned several times in the report. However, members noted that the “Opportunities” section of the report suggests that new campus leadership could increase the capacity to focus on the housing issue, but does not at all indicate how this could be accomplished. Further, the recommendations provide no concrete recommendations to address this pressing issue. Members will recommend that detailed plans to work with the administration to address the lack of affordable housing should be a top priority for Student Success and the unit’s leadership.

Faculty Salary Analysis Metrics

CFW annually reviews faculty salary comparative, comparing UCSC with its 8 sister campuses. Members discussed goals and metrics for their 2019-20 analysis, which will shape CFW’s request for data from the Academic Personnel Office (APO). In addition, the committee considered the proposal of a Senate resolution for APO/campus annual salary analysis to include a 9-campus comparison, Above Scale salaries, and a cost of living variable.

Chair McGuire noted that in the past, the main salary concern for CFW has been the lag with fellow UC campuses. Chair McGuire suggested that in many ways this has been resolved and we have caught up with thanks to previous CFW committees. The current focus of CFW is to ensure that the campus analysis includes a 9-campus comparison, Above Scale salaries, and a cost of living variable. Chair McGuire reported that Senate Chair Lau is on the same page as CFW and Chair McGuire is hopeful that there will be some traction on the issue and that the next Academic Personnel Office (APO) Report of Salary Competitiveness will include these metrics.

CFW would like to include salary equity (internal to UCSC) and salary compression and inversion in its 2019-20 analysis. Members noted that APO and CFW have looked at race, ethnicity, and gender equity in the past recognized that it is difficult to assess. Gender disparity is there, but the cause is unknown and may be due to there being fewer women on the BEE scale, and/or other issues such as hiring and representation. As for diversity, Chair McGuire noted that there is a general lack of diversity in faculty and it is difficult to do analysis as there is not enough data, but reported that UCSC is considered to have one of the most diverse faculty in the UC system. In addition, Chair McGuire noted that compression and inversion are serious issues on our campus as new faculty are being brought in at higher salaries than those who were hired when faculty were not paid as well as at other universities. Members noted that the Career Equity Review process addresses rank/step discrepancies, but the ability to increase salary and is limited. CFW’s analysis could show that this is a problem and that there is a need for another process that addresses salary inequities. Chair McGuire suggested that CFW could collaborate with CAP to argue for a campus salary equity review process.