

Committee on Faculty Welfare Annual Report, 2018-19

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) met bi-weekly throughout the academic year; members also represented CFW on several other Senate and campus committees—the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), the Employee Housing Workgroup, the Child Care Workgroup, the new Child Care Family Services Advisory Committee, the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER), the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), and the systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW).

CFW's work in 2018-19 focused attention on developments both on campus and systemwide with regards to issues affecting faculty welfare and faculty quality of life. The key topics of this year's work were:

1. voicing the dire need for more campus employee housing to campus administration, the UC Academic Senate, and the UC Regents;
2. a close engagement with campus administration on the rapidly evolving development of a childcare facility on campus and the UCSC Child Care and Family Services Advisory Committee;
3. monitoring campus transportation and parking and collaborating with campus administration to brainstorm improvements and discuss the need for a long term vision for Transportation and parking Services (TAPS); and
4. advocating for access to affordable health care options for UCSC faculty and staff.

Other topics traditionally making up a substantial part of the committee's work, such as retirement, did not see as much activity since no major changes have occurred either on campus or systemwide.

Housing

There appears to be a campus-wide consensus that UC Santa Cruz is in dire need of more employee housing due to the pressing needs of recruitment and retention in conjunction with small inventory, low turnover rate, and the high cost of living and housing in Santa Cruz County.

Physical Planning, Development, and Operations is currently finalizing a campus-wide housing needs survey that will be circulated to campus employees in fall 2019 to assess employees' needs for housing in terms of size, location, lease or purchase, and desired price point. CFW has provided feedback to Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Planning, Development and Operations (AVC) Traci Ferdolage and Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham on the draft survey, and has recommended that the consideration of future employee needs be assessed by surveying divisional deans on their future hiring plans. The committee hopes that findings from this survey will be used to optimize the design of Ranch View Terrace Phase II (RVT2) and future employee housing projects on our campus.

Multiple locations on and around campus have been surveyed for potential new housing projects. The site reserved for RVT2 remains the most feasible location for the next employee housing project. The Employee Housing Workgroup met several times this year, with a CFW representative in attendance. There was no major movement this year. However, a few goals related to RVT2 development were set for summer and fall 2019, including: (1) receiving budgetary funding; (2) development of communications plans; (3) developing a request for proposal; and (4) modification of technical requirements for the employee housing project.

CFW applauds the administration for doing a thorough analysis of needs, and being willing to rethink and rework plans for RVT2 and possible additional campus sites accordingly. We would like to emphasize the issue of lack of turnover and, somewhat relatedly, the issue of retirees and spouses/partners of retirees. The campus needs to rethink the housing program and ways to speed up the turnover. These issues need to be considered with the development of new faculty and staff housing. CFW looks forward to future discussions with VCBAS Sarah Latham and Director of Employee Housing and Capital Planning Steve Houser.

Child Care

A major development in childcare this year was the Regents' approval of the proposed Early Education Center (EEC), as part of the Student Housing West project. Although this vote was not without controversy (due to the selected site) and two lawsuits were subsequently put forward to stall the construction, the campus reached the milestone of the closest point to having a childcare facility for faculty and staff in addition to students. Nonetheless, it is unknown how the new Chancellor will move forward.

CFW's childcare representative Su-hua Wang participated in every meeting with the design and development team this year, providing input on the research component and safeguarding the needs and accessibility of faculty to childcare services. The team has been very responsive to comments provided by CFW and by the Summer Childcare Work Group. This ongoing communication is crucial to ensure the quality of the facility and program, and the voice from CFW to weigh in on different aspects of EEC development.

CFW studied the issue and need of back-up/emergency care, which was pending from the previous year. Back-up/emergency care is a benefit that allows faculty members to fulfill their normal work obligations when their regular childcare and/or dependent care is unavailable. CFW collaborated with the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) to have the issue listed as a Senate Executive Committee (SEC) priority next year. CFW consulted with VCBAS Sarah Latham and Associate Vice Chancellor for Housing and Educational Services (AVC) Sue Matthews on this issue in spring 2019. They have already taken action to gather information from other UC campuses that provide some form of back-up care in order to gain a better sense of how the benefit could possibly be implemented on our campus.

The UCSC Child Care and Family Services Advisory Committee was established after initial delays due to campus leadership transition. This new committee expands the scope of the previous Child Care Advisory Committee, and is charged with providing vital information on the family issues confronting our faculty, staff, and graduate and undergraduate student populations. The

committee will provide advisement on important institutional policies related to the new center, including the EEC's access policy; the assessment process for the childcare provider; and, should it be deemed appropriate, on a Request for Proposal (RFP), which could be initiated in year three of the five-year operating agreement. CFW was happy to see this committee convene in summer 2019, as the design and decisions for the new campus Early Education Center are moving quickly.

The new Child Care and Family Services Advisory Committee is also charged with studying and reporting on the most important issues for family support faced by our campus community, including recommendations for addressing our community's most urgent concerns including back-up/emergency care. The committee is expected to look throughout the system and across higher education nationally to understand best practices around family support, and will provide an interim report on this topic by April 2020.

Transportation and Parking

A representative of CFW served on the Advisory Committee for Campus Transportation (ACCTP). CFW sincerely appreciates the ability to provide a faculty voice in dealing with the pressing needs of campus transportation and parking services via ACCTP.

This year, CFW was pleased to hear that the Interim Director of Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) has already brought new ideas and questions to the table. CFW is hopeful that a new vision for transportation and parking services will be brought forward to our campus that will not only address current needs and budgets, but will also include plans for the future. CFW was pleased by the results of the 2019 Campus Election student referendum. An increase in transportation fees for undergraduate and graduate students should alleviate some of the budgetary concerns. However, the lack of parking is a persistent problem.

The primary [objective of the ACCTP¹](#) in the committee charge is to recommend a sustainable funding model that a) ensures adequate support of programs, services and infrastructure to provide access to campus-owned facilities and b) aligns with campus goals related to sustainability and the limits imposed on campus by the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). In the past two academic years, ACCTP meetings have focused primarily on the TAPS budget crisis, with little room at the table for considering a broader vision of a model that serves current campus needs and makes preparations for the future. While CFW recognizes that the budget deficit is binding and should be addressed, the committee has recommended that it should not be the primary focus of consideration. Rather, CFW would like to see an overall comprehensive strategy to meet the growing transportation and parking needs of our campus.

There are many pressing parking and transportation issues for our faculty. Primarily, the inability of faculty to find parking has a direct effect not only on the welfare of faculty and staff, but also on the teaching and research of our institution. Further, this issue has a disproportionate effect on those with family obligations that require them to leave campus in the middle of the day and find parking upon return.

¹ <https://sab.ucsc.edu/outreach-committees/committees-campus.html>

A benefit of having a committee of members representing various cohorts on campus like the ACCTP, is that it provides a collaborative space where creative remedies to issues at hand may be found. However, the CFW representative proposed potential remedies to pressing issues that were persistently dismissed. One such suggestion was for TAPS to consider making some parking lots exclusive to faculty and staff with A permits. A second recommendation was to consider dedicated shuttles that would transport faculty and graduate students from various locations directly to campus, to encourage more commuters to reduce their car trips to campus. Although the current climate of cuts to transportation services may make these suggestions seemingly difficult to implement, CFW would like to encourage the ACCTP and TAPS to take on a proactive agenda in closing the gap between needs and services.

CFW recognizes that TAPS has already planned to make some changes to address parking issues. The committee was pleased to hear that the campus is moving forward with the implementation of a parking management project for real-time data that will tie together capital projects and academic expansion, thereby tying parking rates and rate structure. CFW understands that the campus will be creating a master plan for parking expansion and buses by 2030, along with relevant discussions in the context of Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). CFW suggested that faculty and graduate students may welcome a fee-based shuttle system from Caltrans. A suggestion was also made to request that Metro bus drivers pack the buses more efficiently.

CFW understands that TAPS also plans on reducing the number of C permits, reallocating A/B permits in North Remote, adding medical spaces in Science Hill, expanding East Remote from 190 to 250 spaces, and expanding Kresge College parking. However, the impact of these proposed changes is small on the grand scale of current needs. The imminent temporary closure of one third of East Remote for the solar project presents further reasons for concern. Since transportation services continue to be cut and the student population continues to increase, a much more robust vision for meeting transportation and parking needs on our campus is needed. CFW looks forward to seeing the ACCTP and TAPS work together to create a proactive vision.

Healthcare

CFW continued to monitor and advocate for access to sufficient health care options and the affordability of the UC health insurance plans for UCSC faculty and staff. Compared to most other UC campuses, Santa Cruz has limited health care options. We have only two major options here at Santa Cruz, Physicians Medical Group (PMG) accessed through the Health Net HMO (UC Blue and Gold), and the Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) through the UC Care PPO plan. CFW recognizes that PAMF offers many after hour and weekend appointments with expanded urgent care options for employees with small children, and PMG is unable to absorb the large number of current UCSC PAMF enrollees (37% of all UCSC enrollments). Kaiser Permanente's presence in Santa Cruz is growing, but it will be several more years before they could accommodate the large number of patients currently using PAMF. In addition, the closest Kaiser hospital is located in Watsonville, which makes the plan unfavorable for some employees. For these reasons, and because UCSC does not have a UC medical center in close proximity, CFW has always maintained that UC Santa Cruz must have access to PAMF through the healthcare plans that are offered. However, with continuous rising premium costs of the UC Care plan, this year CFW emphasized that this option must also be affordable.

In winter 2019, UC Care enrollees were notified that Anthem Blue Cross (the administrator for the UC Care PPO plan) had not yet come to an agreement with Sutter Health, of which the Palo Alto Medical Foundation is affiliated. Enrollees were informed that if no agreement was made, Sutter/PAMF coverage would end on a specific date. Luckily, an announcement was made in March 2019 that Anthem was able to come to an agreement for a multi-year contract through 2022. If an agreement had not been made, UCSC enrollees would have lost their access to PAMF providers. This is extremely troublesome as many UCSC UC Care enrollees choose this option during open enrollment specifically to access PAMF providers.

This is the second time that UCSC has been threatened with losing access to Sutter/PAMF providers in the last four years. In early January 2015, Blue Shield of California (the previous administrator of UC Care) sent letters to members informing them that the Blue Shield/Sutter Health contract was terminated, effective December 31, 2014. Later that month, Blue Shield and Sutter announced that they had reached an agreement for a new two-year contract that would allow enrollees to continue to use Sutter/PAMF doctors and hospitals. Both instances highlight the added fragility of access to PAMF for our campus as medical groups consistently secure their negotiations with administrators like Blue Shield and Blue Cross after UC Open Enrollment for the year has closed.

The future of UC Care is unknown and it is currently the only way for UCSC employees and family members to access PAMF. As PMG and Kaiser are not able to absorb current PAMF enrollees, if the UC Care plan is no longer offered in the future, CFW contends that the UC must make PAMF available and affordable to UCSC employees through another healthcare plan option. Next year's committee should collaborate with the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), the UC Health Care Task Force, and the UC Academic Senate to explore this option.

In 2018-19, CFW also discussed a proposed affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Health. UCSC CFW members endorsed the UCFW position on this matter that “no unit of the UC should affiliate with a health care system that prohibits care for anyone.”² UCSC CFW also agreed with the interim report of the UC Non-Discrimination in Healthcare Task Force³, which makes clear that those who would preclude the provision of care for non-scientific reasons do not reflect or embody UC's mission or values. It has been announced that this partnership/affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Health is no longer being explored, and CFW supports this outcome.

Faculty Salaries

CFW could not carry out its intended salary analysis this year, due to issues with access to data. The following summary is based on previous analyses that were further discussed this year and some initial analysis done this year.

Median salaries at UCSC continue to remain below the median for Full Professors, although they are near the systemwide median for Assistant and Associate Professors. In terms of gender, CFW observed that the main differences arise for higher earners: there are very few females among our

² UCFW to May, Re: Possible Affiliation Between UCSF and Dignity Health - DRAFT

³ Interim Report of the UC Academic Senate UC Non-Discrimination in Healthcare Task Force, April 2, 2019

highest-paid faculty. Other differences were also observed in promotion and salary growth rates across divisions and ranks, but the committee noted limitations with the current methodology that need to be addressed before definitive conclusions are drawn: The data provided annually by the Academic Personnel Office (APO) did not include the initial rank, step and salary of the faculty members in the dataset. Hence, the committees 2018-19 methodology used proxies (the year of highest degree a “standard” baseline salary) to compute growth metrics. These proxies might not work well for individuals with an “alternative” career path (e.g., those who have had a career outside academia before joining UCSC). Extended datasets were requested from APO, but they were not forthcoming. CFW was also interested in understanding how the rates at which different actions (salary increases, regular merits, greater-than-normal merits, accelerations) are awarded varies within departments, division, ranks, gender and ethnicity. To that end, longitudinal data on the career of faculty was requested from APO. Since this is an actionable item by faculty and departments, analyzing these data and sharing the results with the faculty at large would be a useful step towards addressing inequity issues. However, the committee was unable to secure these data from APO. We recommend that next year’s CFW vigorously pursue these data requests early in the academic year so that an analysis can be carried out as soon as possible.

One piece of data that was provided by APO referred to the impact of changes to the Special Salary Practice (SSP) on faculty salaries. The administration refers to these as “savings”, a perspective that CFW flatly rejects. The changes in policy reduced outlays to faculty by a total of \$178,800 when compared with the previous policy. The impact on individual faculty ranged between \$600 and \$5,800, with an overall median of \$1,300. As would be expected the impact was much larger for Full Professors (median \$3,000) than for Assistant Professors (median \$700). While these one-year reductions are small, the cumulative effect over the years will likely be dramatic and put faculty salaries at UCSC at risk of again falling behind those at our sister campuses.

Finally, an equity salary study by the administration is greatly needed to further assess the health of salaries provided to UCSC faculty across different ranks, divisions, and demographics.

Partner Hire Resources

The ability of partners of faculty members to find satisfactory employment is a necessity in attracting and retaining top faculty, particularly given the local housing market and high cost of living. One way campus can effectively increase household income is to help partners of faculty members find the best jobs they can. A survey of 9,000 full-time faculty at 13 leading U.S. research universities by the Clayman Institute found that 72% of faculty have employed partners, and 36% of faculty have academic partners, making partner employment critical to recruiting. Among the key findings, this report also highlights couple hiring as a potential method to increase faculty diversity.

This year CFW consulted with Jessica Wise, Director of HERC (Higher Education Recruitment Consortium) for northern California, and Leslie Marple, Senior Analyst and Academic Recruitment Manager in the Academic Personnel Office about the possibilities of leveraging HERC resources to aid partners in finding jobs during the recruitment process. Ms. Wise agreed to act as a contact person for the partners seeking jobs, to help with networking leveraging the NorCal HERC community, resume review, and coaching. In the last hiring cycle, information on

HERC resources and contact information for Ms. Wise was provided to hiring committees by Manager Marple. One successful partner hire was made through a staff position at UCSC. In spring 2019 a new director for NorCal HERC, Leslie Taylor, was appointed and she has agreed to continue the partner hire pilot program next year.

CFW is grateful to see the support of members of APO and HERC on this important issue for faculty. We look forward to building on these first initiatives and continuing discussions on dual faculty hiring with the administration in the future.

Acknowledgments

The committee would like to thank those who consulted with and/or provided information to the committee this year: Chancellor George Blumenthal, CP/EVC Marlene Tromp, VCBAS Sarah Latham, VPAA Herbie Lee, AVP Grace McClintock, AVC Jean Marie Scott, AVC Sue Matthews, AVC Traci Ferdolage, Employee Housing and Capital Planning Director Steve Houser, Employee Housing Manager Jennifer Talusan, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity Chair Elizabeth Abrams, and Committee on Academic Personnel Chair Lynn Westerkamp.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Tesla Jeltema

Longzhi Lin (F&W)

Nico Orlandi

Abel Rodriguez

Yiman Wang

Eve Zyzik

Barry Bowman, *ex officio*

Grant McGuire, Chair (F&W)

Su-hua Wang, Member (F&W), Chair (S)

August 15, 2019