

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Annual Report, 2006-07

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) worked during the academic year as well as during the summer on issues of concern to the faculty and the entire campus community. Craig Reinerman served as chair of CFW in the fall, and Paul Ortiz served as chair in the winter and spring quarters. The Committee was ably advised by Pamela Edwards who patiently guided CFW through transitions in chairs as well as Committee members.

This year's Committee benefited enormously from its close relationship with the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER) chaired by Professor Michael Warren. Professor Warren regularly attended CFW meetings and graciously volunteered to serve as CFW's representative to the Campus Welfare Committee. CER and CFW co-sponsored two successful Brown Bag Forums for retiring faculty and faculty contemplating retirement. These forums were well attended. It is very important that CFW and CER continue to maintain a close linkage because of the commonality of issues each committee deals with. In addition, CFW benefits from the "long view" that CER representatives possess regarding perennial quality of life issues that impact Senate members. For additional information relating to emeriti affairs, Senate members are referred to this year's annual CER report.

CFW acknowledges the openness and willingness of Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) David Kliger and then Acting Chancellor George Blumenthal to meet with us and discuss faculty quality of life challenges throughout the year. We also would like to acknowledge the hard work and efforts that Senate Chair Faye Crosby put into helping us grapple with these issues as well.

A Critical Moment for Faculty Quality Of Life

This is a critical moment for faculty quality of life at UC Santa Cruz. There is universal agreement within the University of California system that our salaries need to be bolstered significantly to make up for the salary stagnation of the previous years. In general, medical costs and insurance co-pays have been increasing for the past several years. On top of this, the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) is determined to reinstitute employee contributions to our retirement plans. On the positive side of the ledger, UCOP and the UC Regents now clearly understand that faculty salaries must be raised across the board in order to keep the UC system competitive with its peer institutions. This is an important step forward. However, it is possible that the reinstatement of employee contributions combined with rising medical costs—not to mention the high cost of living in the Central Coast—will wipe out future salary gains unless UCOP takes decisive action to repair our salary structure.

CFW urges the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate and the administration at UCSC to take faculty quality of life into consideration in all phases of future campus development including enrollment as well as campus growth in general.

In a related sense, faculty workloads have risen steadily while in many cases staff support positions have been cut in critical areas. The narrative of this work speedup is uneven across our academic divisions and departments. However, faculty from numerous departments report declining “steno pool” or faculty services support, increasingly thin informational technology assistance and unreasonably large discussion sections of 25+ students that negatively impact graduate student workloads and undergraduate learning.

In many cases, faculty are reporting unintended speedups. For example, as UCSC has moved towards emphasizing letter grades it has not adjusted its grading deadlines in line with best practices adopted by peer institutions. Consequently, final grades are often due only two or three work days after the end of final exams. This practice is apparently a holdover from the days when most grades were essentially “pass” or “fail.” In the spring, the quick turnaround in the time that grades are due after finals reduces the ability of many faculty to participate in commencement exercises. CFW suggests that the relevant Academic Senate committees including CEP, CPB, as well as SEC look into this problem during the 2007-08 academic year.

In addition, our entering cohorts of undergraduates need more academic support than ever including remediation in subjects including writing and mathematics. Faculty at UCSC cannot make bricks without straw. We are willing and excited to work with all of our undergraduates. However, UCSC clearly needs enhanced and expanded learning support services in order to take the pressure of increasing faculty as well as staff work loads in these areas. For these reasons, CFW joins the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid in calling for enhanced learning support services at UCSC.

The Academic Senate and the administration must more effectively factor in faculty workloads at every step of campus development processes as well as in academic personnel cases. There is a perception at UCSC—and outside of our campus as well—that junior faculty at Santa Cruz conduct a much higher level of academic service than their peers at competing academic institutions. For example, by the time a junior faculty member approaches a mid-career review on this campus he or she is far more likely to have served on a departmental search committee or performed other time-consuming committee work usually reserved for tenured faculty at our peer institutions.

Simultaneously, many of our junior colleagues report being given contradictory advice by their academic mentors. On the one hand, they are advised that they are essentially “competing” for tenure with faculty at elite peer universities and should understand that research productivity, publishing, grants, etc., etc., are the keys to getting tenure. On the other hand, many of our junior faculty feel pressured into levels of academic service that take away from their ability to complete their research. For all of the above reasons, CFW suggests that the Academic Senate hold a special series of forums on faculty quality of

life this year with workload issues being a key component of this discussion. The agenda of the forum should be controlled by the Academic Senate and the UCSC administration should also be invited to participate as well.

In recent years, we have been reminded on many levels that the academic and public stature of UCSC has risen dramatically. Our undergraduates routinely gain acceptance into the finest graduate and professional programs in the country, our graduate students are landing good jobs, and our faculty frequently outperform our colleagues at peer institutions—with less research support. The rise in our prestige is due in the main to the creativity and work of our faculty, staff, and administration. It is time that our salaries, benefits, and workloads catch up with our stature.

Child Care

CFW met with Chancellor Blumenthal and Senate Chair Crosby twice during the academic year about the issue of childcare. We believe that these were very productive discussions. Chancellor Blumenthal reiterated his commitment to expanding childcare provisioning on campus, and we look forward to this becoming one of George's signature accomplishments as incoming Chancellor.

During spring quarter, CFW held an extended consultation with Chancellor Blumenthal as well as other key members of the administration in order to help “jump start” progress on expanding the scale and scope of childcare at UCSC. In addition, members of the Child Care Task Force and Child Care Advisory Committee, Child Care Director attended this meeting. We discussed numerous issues including where a new child care facility might be built on campus or whether existing building space would be adequate to the task. In addition, we brainstormed on how to spend existing funds, 2.7 million dollars that are available for child care as well as ways to raise additional needed funds in the future.

CFW members and other faculty at this meeting reiterated the belief that an expanded child care facility should include a research component that would in turn generate research as well as grant opportunities for faculty and graduate students in particular. We discussed the possibility of pursuing funding opportunities via foundations as well as the private corporations that have expressed interest in supporting cutting-edge family-friendly policies.

We discussed the possibility of collaborating with successful child care programs at Cabrillo College as well as town/gown partnerships. At the end of the meeting CFW asked Chancellor Blumenthal to make a strong, positive statement regarding child care at the May 30 Academic Senate Meeting. In addition, the Committee asked the Chancellor to work with the Development Office to make raising funds for child care a development priority. The Chancellor agreed to both suggestions. CFW looks forward to working with the Development Office on raising funds for child care.

Additional Structural Suggestions Regarding Childcare

CFW urges the administration to examine the possibility of moving purview of child care from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs. Why? This might be especially viable if the forthcoming childcare facility has a research component and the additional faculty/staff slots provided in the new Child Care Access Policy.

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare's Proposed UC Policy, June 1999, on Child Care recommended that child care funds be set aside for each new building. This was a recommendation only and not funded. CFW has asked the administration to consider making this a policy in future building.

In 20 years there has been no increase in 19900 funds from the administration to fund child care. Obviously, the campus has grown significantly during the past twenty years. This needs to be addressed in the near future.

In a related sense, CFW strongly believes that whenever growth occurs—whether at divisional, college, or campus levels—childcare must be placed in the center of issues to be factored into growth. The failure to integrate childcare into campus growth plans in the 1990s and in the earlier part of this decade has placed UC Santa Cruz in the problematic position we are currently in. However, thanks to continued Academic Senate work as well as a new openness on the part of the administration, we are poised to make some breakthroughs in this area.

Housing

In the past year, CFW has continued to work towards creating a viable housing plan for the campus. The successes we have had are the following.

- Ranch View Terrace (RVT) construction has started and sales are progressing well. As of July 25, 2007, 53 offers have been made from the faculty wait-list, with 26 selecting sites (12 have deferred until Phase II). Of these 26 faculty that have selected sites at RVT, 12 are current home owners in the Cardiff/Hagar/Laureate community. These are significant numbers, especially the percentage of faculty interested in homes that are on the wait-list.
- The "Low-Interest Option" Supplemental Home Loan Program (LIO-SHLP) that was established by CP/EVC Kliger has been very successful, with 40 eligible faculty having applied since its inception in August, 2006. Of these 40, 13 loans have been funded at an average of \$44,000/loan. An additional 20 applicants have expressed an interest in purchasing Ranch View Terrace Homes (10 of these persons have already selected units to date).
- Based on the October 2005 Senate/Administration Employee Housing Report and input from the Senate, the CP/EVC has established various proposals to improve housing on campus. These proposals include determining if restructuring the Housing Administration to include a 501(c)3, modifying policies to encourage housing turnover (buying housing outright), modifying the LIO-SHLP procedures

to increase its benefits, developing a plan for the next employee housing project and re-pricing (re-indexing) the current housing stock to generate funds for the LIO-SHLP program and the next housing project.

The final issue was the most controversial by far for CFW. The struggle was to determine fair housing prices that would still be affordable for the faculty but also generate funds to help faculty on the whole to get housing (i.e. the LIO-SHLP and the next housing project).

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) directed CFW to negotiate with the administration to set total housing costs of the two-bedroom units to no more than 40 percent of the total gross income of an average assistant professor (\$64,000/year). We would like to note that one of the main assurances we had from the administration that helped soften this price increase was the fact that salaries will be increasing over the next three to four years. If this is not fully implemented, then we may want to reassess this re-pricing plan.

We would like to add that while CFW understands why this money was needed, we believe that there could be a better way to solve our housing needs. One proposal is to negotiate with UCOP a separate line of credit, besides a campus line of credit, that supports only employee housing, similar to the Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) loans. In this manner, the campus does not have to generate funds to start the next housing development and UCOP regains the loan amount after the units are sold. This may be politically difficult to achieve but well worth trying for the coming year. SEC will need to follow up this possibility with the relevant Senate committees as well as with the CP/EVC and Chancellor.

The challenges for the next year will focus primarily on developing the next housing project for UCSC, which does not have the cost over runs and delays that occurred with RVT. This will entail extensive discussions with the administration to determine which site and housing plan will best serve UCSC. In addition, CFW will help oversee the newly instigated LIO-SHLP and the re-pricing plans, if they need fine tuning.

Retirement Brown Bags

CFW co-sponsored the Faculty Pre-Retirement Workshops during spring quarter by the UCSC Benefits Office. This series of five workshops covered the topics (Medicare eligibility, Medical plan choices and options for those who plan to move out of area, options for those who plan to travel extensively, how the University plans work with Medicare and the rights of emeriti and re-employment/recall appointments) with experts in each area presenting and answering questions specific to the needs of UCSC faculty. While the topics and presentations were excellent, much better publicity is needed to make more faculty aware of the workshops and their location.

Also, it might be more appropriate to schedule the workshops earlier in the academic year so that those faculty retiring in the summer immediately after the current academic year

will have more time to absorb and utilize the information presented. The workshops could be usefully marketed to all faculty either over a certain age (e.g., 60), planning to retire in 5 years, or those who have worked more than a certain number of years for UC (e.g., 25 or 30). A parallel series of workshops with slightly different emphases (e.g. financial investment, UC beneficiary information and social security updates) could also be offered to faculty who have recently been tenured to assist them in their long-term planning.

Social Security and Medicare Coverage

CFW has worked with the systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare as well as UCOP to find a solution to the problem of colleagues who “opted out” of the Social Security system in the early 1970s and who now approach retirement lacking enough Social Security “credits” to qualify for Medicare. CFW was approached with this issue several years ago and progress on this front has been sorely lacking. However, thanks to recent initiatives on the part of UCOP, we are moving closer to a possible solution on this important issue but more work needs to be done. I am including below a redacted communication from a faculty colleague who describes the dilemma many of our senior faculty members face:

“I'm writing to ask that the Committee on Faculty Welfare address the issue of Medicare benefits for faculty such as myself who opted out of Social Security when we were hired in the early 70s. There was a period in the early 70s when Social Security was optional, and those of us who were hired at that time were advised, by the UCSC staff member concerned, to opt out of Social Security. Many of us took this advice, not realizing what the consequences would be. It then became impossible to opt back in. Many of those who opted out of Social Security at that time later became eligible for Medicare either through marrying someone eligible for Medicare, or by earning enough outside the University to qualify. One needs 40 units of Social Security to qualify for Medicare; if one earns approximately \$4,000 in any given year, and pays taxes on these earnings, one gains four quarters of Social Security. One cannot gain more than four quarters of Social Security per year, regardless of how much taxable income one earns.”

So for many faculty, the problem got solved, at least in regard to Medicare. Faculty in the natural sciences and in many cases in the social sciences routinely earn enough outside the University that many became qualified for Medicare without even trying to accomplish this. But for others this did not happen. In the humanities, stars tend to collect enough speaking fees outside the university to deal with this issue; non-stars do not. Those of us who have not earned much outside of our university salaries are now very likely to retire without Medicare. At this point, it is possible to become eligible for Medicare by paying some \$300 a month, after one retires. But since the early 70s, when we opted out of Social Security, the health care system in the US has changed: almost everyone is now eligible for Medicare. It seems to some of us who are not eligible that it is dangerous to remain in such a tiny category. Costs could rise dramatically; Medicare could become a precondition for other policies (as it now is for the only University policy

that provides national and international health care). Many of us feel that it is simply too dangerous to remain outside the Medicare system.

The university could solve this problem. The Federal Government offers a program designed to allow organizations to include employees who opted out of Social Security in the past, that is, to allow them to become eligible for Medicare (though not for Social Security). This involves setting up a system whereby these employees can pay a Medicare-only tax, out of their salaries. Many organizations ranging from fire stations to the entire school system of Illinois have taken advantage of this. It involves making a phone call. Someone from the University has to call the Social Security administration and arrange to set up a Medicare-only tax, available to those not enrolled in the Social Security system. Thus they can acquire quarters, and become eligible for Medicare. Individuals cannot do this on their own. Their employer has to set it up. The employer (UC) has to take this issue seriously enough to be willing to make a phone call. That phone call could save some of us enormous difficulty in the future.

There is of course another way of addressing this: those of us in this position could get second jobs. I believe that this is against university regulations. It would also make it very difficult for us to do our university jobs properly.”

As this colleague explains, there are viable solutions to this problem and CFW urges the administration to help us move towards solving this issue in 2007-08.

Transportation and Parking

Charge: The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) advises the Campus Welfare Committee (CWC) and the Co-Directors of Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) on issues pertaining to transportation, parking and circulation and the implementation of the Transportation Element of the campus' Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and other transportation-related campus documents, including those pertaining to transit services and the expenditure of Student Transit Fees. In so doing, the committee is expected to encourage campus and community input on the following issues:

- Transportation: Advises the Director of Transportation and Parking Services on policies and programs associated with development of the Travel Demand Management (TDM) plan and evaluation of its success. Reviews and recommends policies and programs for coordinated TDM, parking, transit and circulation planning, transit-related marketing and information services provided by TAPS staff, and financing.
- Parking: Reviews and recommends parking rates, utilization, policies, and plans.
- Circulation: Reviews and recommends pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation policies, plans, programs and implementation.

- Campus Transit: Provides advice on policies, programs, projects, and budget expenditures associated with Campus Transit operations—Day and Night Shuttles, Shopper Shuttles, and other premium transit services—and transit-related capital improvements. Also offers guidance on the scheduling, routing, and effectiveness of campus transit services.
- SCMTD Transit Services: Provides advice on the scheduling, routing, capacity, and effectiveness of transit services provided by the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD) and/or other transit service providers. Also offers recommendations for the annual appointment of a UCSC representative to the SCMTD Board of Directors.

Some of the main issues of the 2006-07 Transportation Advisory Committee were the following:

- TAPS rate proposal: There were two proposals for TAPS's budget for the 2007-08 academic year. The first (the TAPS proposal) recommended a five percent increase in parking fees, and similar increases in fees for other transit services (bus passes, vanpool fares, etc.). The other proposal came from TAC, an advisory committee to TAPS, and it eliminated the parking fee increase from the TAPS proposal. The pros and cons of the two budget proposals were discussed by the CWC. The CWC agreed on two issues—one, that TAPS is confronting serious difficulties in trying to create a self-supporting unit under current circumstances; and two, that the current method of funding TAPS is unsustainable. TAPS is currently working with the assumption of an annual five percent increase in parking permit costs. However this annual increase will soon make parking permits unaffordable except to the most highly-paid employees.

Since the bulk of TAPS's budget comes from sales of parking permits, and that the campus is very effectively promoting alternative transportation (thereby reducing private vehicle traffic to campus), it is clear that some long-term solution needs to be found. CFW urges the administration to work on finding this solution during the 2007-08 academic year. An additional problem is that TAPS is required to pay for new parking lots and structures. After the parking facility has been built the University has sometimes used the parking facility for new building construction without repaying TAPS. Thus TAPS ends losing millions of dollars.

The 2007-08 Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) parking permit and program rates were finalized. There were no increases for individual permits (A, B, C, R, meters, etc.); they will remain at 2006-07 rates. Rates for some unit-specific permits (Official Use, UC Vehicles, and Reserved spaces) will increase approximately 5 percent from their respective 2006-07 levels.

- New campus transit buses and shuttles:

The TAC approved TAPS acquisition of three 12-passenger vans for use in the 100 vanpool program at an estimated cost of \$70,000. They also approved TAPS operation of a third Bike Shuttle trailer van during spring 2007, for an estimated \$6,500.

- Advertising on buses: A proposal for advertising in or on campus shuttle buses at UCSC was made as a new mechanism to generate revenue for TAPS. The Monterey Salinas Transit presently generates net income of \$200,000 per year from this practice, and is seeking a partner in working with advertisers.
- In-vehicle parking meters: TAPS conducted a pilot program with nearly 100 staff and faculty to test the feasibility of using in-car parking meters for employees regularly parking on-campus only a few hours per day. TAPS staff discussed with the TAC possible program parameters concerning pricing and eligibility, and reported its intention of offering this parking option by fall 2007.
- Flex-Car/Carshare: TAPS will be administering a flex-car carshare program where rental cars are available on demand. The car will be parked in set locations and can be reserved for use as required.

Salaries Task Force

This academic year, CFW sent a regular representative to the Salaries Task Force meetings. This task force, which was led by CP/EVC Kliger examined various possible solutions to the crisis in faculty salaries at UCSC and networked with UCOP and the systemwide Academic Senate.

Equity Across Academic Divisions

CFW was contacted on several occasions by department chairs who voiced concerns that allocations of recruitment and retention funds are not being distributed in an equitable manner across the academic divisions. For example, we continue to receive reports that MOP loans and other forms of housing assistance are not consistently offered across the divisions in recruitment and retention cases. CFW worked with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on this issue and this will continue to be an important area of concern for the Senate and the administration to address as it has a major impact on morale as well as the relative earning power of faculty. CFW hopes to continue working with the central administration as well as the Council of Deans on this important issue.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Karen Bassi
Margo Hendricks
Ted Holman
Joel Kubby

Elizabeth Stephens
Nancy Stoller
Craig Reinerman, Chair (F)
Paul Ortiz, Chair (W, S)

Michael Warren, *ex officio*

August 30, 2007