



University of California  
**Administrative  
Management Professionals**

UC-Santa Cruz  
Administrative Management Professionals  
amp-executive-board-group@ucsc.edu  
amp.ucsc.edu

September 21, 2021

CYNTHIA LARIVE  
Chancellor

LORI KLETZER  
Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

DAVID BRUNDAGE  
Chair, Academic Senate

RE: 2021 AMP Annual Priorities

Dear Campus Leaders,

UC AMP (Administrative Management Professionals) is a systemwide institution of business officers from academic departments and research organizations, curriculum and academic program analysts, and operations managers. AMP's mission statement can be found on our website: <https://amp.ucsc.edu/>

This past year has been challenging for everyone at UC Santa Cruz, and we acknowledge the work done at all levels of our organization to operate in a near fully remote environment for over a year due to COVID-19. As we prepare to return to campus over the coming months a new set of challenges awaits us and many of the same problems that plagued us before the pandemic are just as poignant if not more so.

Each year, in preparation for this memo, we survey members and prepare a priorities list for your consideration and support. Our aim is to identify key areas that would benefit from wider campus attention. Issues identified by AMP in the past include the need for streamlining business practices, improving disaster preparedness, and greater support for undergraduate advising.

Our list of top priorities for 2021-22 is attached. You will see one of our priorities is establishing a culture of trust on campus. In that spirit, we invite you to join the AMP Executive Board during fall quarter to discuss our priorities, with a follow-up meeting during the spring quarter to discuss progress. We will reach out to schedule these meetings. We believe this will be a mutually

beneficial exercise to create an open dialogue around these issues. Thank you for your time in reviewing this memo, and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

*The AMP Executive Board*

Sarah Arantza Amador, Co-Chair

Chris Paradies, Co-Chair

Jessica Lawrence, Ex-Officio

Leah Kahn, UC AMP Systemwide Steering Committee Chair

Emily Gregg, Systemwide Representative

Amber Burke, Systemwide Representative

Lynn Crowder, Treasurer

Jimmy Gaffney, Committee Member

Verónica López-Durán, Committee Member

Sarah Thorne, Committee Member

Cc:

Anna Finn, Associate Chancellor and Chief of Staff

Linda Rhoads, Chief of Staff, Chancellor's Office/EVC

Isabel Dees, Associate Vice Chancellor of Equity and Equal Protection

Kimberly Register, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Planning

Peter Biehl, Vice Provost and Dean, Graduate Studies

Herbie Lee, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs

Andrea Cohen, Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Michael Tassio, Chief of Staff and Director of Online Education, Academic Affairs

Jody Greene, Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning

Richard Hughey, Vice Provost and Dean, Undergraduate Education

Stacey Sketo-Rosener, Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Advising

Jennifer Baszille, Interim Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs and Success

Byron Walker, Interim Vice Chancellor for Information Technology

Garret Naiman, Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean of Students

Grace McClintock, Assistant Vice Provost, Academic Personnel

Sarah Latham, Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services

Steven Stein, Associate Vice Chancellor & CHRO, Staff Human Resources

Jean Marie Scott, Associate Vice Chancellor, Risk & Safety Services

Jennifer Yeager, Associate Director of Risk Services

Tchad Sanger, University Registrar

Monica Parikh, Director of Summer Session

Matthew Mednick, Executive Director, Academic Senate

Divisional Deans

Divisional Assistant Deans



## **1. Untenable burden of workload placed on departments**

When problems arise, new initiatives are created to solve these problems. Committees are convened, processes are established, and more often than not the onus of work in those processes are placed on individual departments and frontline units to carry out. Quite often, however, these processes would be more efficiently implemented, in terms of time and resources, if a central unit on campus retained responsibility. Staff at UC Santa Cruz are so overworked that units are tasked with solving a problem which they do not have the resources to accomplish. They create a process that offloads that work onto others, often to academic departments that also do not have the resources. Current and past examples include distributing computer equipment; relaying communications to students, staff, and faculty; establishing health and safety protocols; and training staff on new systems. New responsibilities are added to job descriptions while retaining all other work. There is no increase in pay to reflect the additional scope, nor workload assessments to determine if hiring more staff is required. We are especially concerned about how this burden will affect staff upon our return to campus. There will be a natural decrease in productivity as staff begin to adapt to changes related to returning to campus and altered methods of service delivery. New challenges will come up to face the realities of in-person instruction amidst a pandemic and more responsibility will be placed on department staff.

Proposed Actions:

1. Any task force or committee that has influence over the workload of departmental staff should have a departmental staff representative.
2. New initiatives and responsibilities should come with staff resources in the appropriate areas to accomplish the task.
3. The university should either centralize computer deployment or create a campus-wide standard for computer replacement.
4. We should have strong top-down encouragement to create a campus standard of 20/50/80-minute meetings. This will have benefits on staff mental health by creating breaks between meetings and allow for travel time on campus.

## **2. Salary not commensurate with cost of living**

None of us are immune to the high cost of living in Santa Cruz County and the Bay Area in general. Displacement of families, the destruction of homes due to wildfires, and a pandemic

which has seen high-earning Silicon Valley engineers moving to Santa Cruz have only escalated the dire need for compensation philosophy reform. We have continued to hire new staff at the low point and have no practices in place that help staff make appreciable efforts to stay afloat in our high-cost community. A [March 2020 CPB report](#) stated “Overall, it is seen that 73% of UCSC staff are currently below the median for their job classification, suggesting significant erosion of salary levels as a consequence of recent compensation practice.” The CPB report also points out inequities between staff and faculty compensation philosophies, stating, “While faculty began to receive cost-of-living adjustments (in addition to merit increases) starting with academic year 2011-2012, no cost-of-living adjustments have been made to non-represented staff salaries since the advent of the Great Recession. Merit programs, amounting to increases in average compensation levels of 3% in a program year, have been afforded to non-represented staff in academic years 2011-2012, and each subsequent year since 2013-2014.” During the pandemic, staff were expected to take on additional responsibility, stretching our mental and physical capacities to their limits, for no increase in pay, while faculty continued to receive salary increases, and were sometimes excused from their research work because the pandemic made it impossible. Salary scales are such that it would take ten years for someone hired at the minimum to reach the midpoint at a 3% increase each year, and there is no guarantee we will receive that.

We support the proposed actions from the August 10th letter from CODA regarding compensation for advisors. Additionally, we were happy to receive news of a new 3-year compensation program to raise the salaries of those at the lowest end, and to hear that new hires will start at the 25% mark, however we have several concerns with this new program. We are worried that the increase of these lowest salaries will create a compression of salaries in the next quartile. We fully support the increase of these salaries but also want to know what will be done for those in the next quartile who are still underpaid. This program will likely bring salaries up to be on-par with those of professional staff such as managers, advisors, and analysts, which require a higher level of skill and are more difficult to replace. In order to maintain great talent, the university must compensate properly. We are also concerned that there seemed to be no staff representation on the 3-year compensation program’s committee until very late in the process.

Proposed Actions:

1. Implement cost-of-living increases, in addition to merit increases, for unrepresented staff.
2. Commit to being transparent regarding the new 3-year program. We would like to know more about the decision-making process for this program.
3. Create a program to move those in the 2nd quartile up to or past the midpoint in salary.
4. Provide staff with a one-time stipend to acknowledge the additional work and personal expense we accrued over the last year and a half.
5. Make the Compensation Philosophy Task Force Report public.

### **3. Improve campus communications**

We commend the recent formatting and design changes in campus leadership emails that have led to improved readability and make overlooking these important messages less likely. With the understanding that the chaotic nature of the past few years has led to a plethora of situations that are out of the control of our campus and have necessitated rapid response, the methods and protocols of our campus communication have made bad situations worse. Sudden policy changes, reversals on decisions, late dissemination of information, and dissemination of incorrect information all lead to an increase of workload for staff, and some of these over the past year have come at the detriment of our personal wellbeing and financial stability. Examples from the past year include reversing decisions on Fall 21 instruction capacity merely days before spring break and when schedules were due to the Registrar's Office, creating an onerous workload on academic departments and even more so on the staff in the Registrar's Office, and forcing staff to work days they otherwise may have had planned to take off. We received inconsistent communication from campus regarding COVID-19 vaccine eligibility, which was sometimes not congruent with news outlets or government messaging. Many of our staff learned of the UCOP vaccine requirement through local media outlets or through press releases from UC-Berkeley and UC-Davis days before we heard anything from our campus leadership. Employees learned of the dropping of Dignity Health five days after their contract had expired with Anthem Blue Cross. Our understanding is the UCSC campus was not made aware of this fact until the day after the contract expired; however, it still took campus administrators four days to notify employees. Thankfully this issue was resolved, but the delayed communication could have been incredibly costly to employees. Information about Slug Crossing was sent out only one month prior to the end of the spring quarter, creating yet another last-minute burden on departments, then policies surrounding audiences at the event changed, creating more confusion. There have been inconsistencies between messaging from campus leadership and Academic Senate committees, specifically regarding Fall 21 instruction preferences from faculty.

#### Proposed Actions:

1. Many communications seem to set a high bar with regards to who receives the notice, and there is an expectation that those individuals will pass on the information. This creates a situation where dissemination of information is reliant upon one individual fully reading a message and forwarding in a timely manner. Those forwarding on the message have the ability to add or notate the message, which can lead to conflicting messages. A campus standard must be set that messaging is distributed widely to the individuals for whom it is intended. We must get away from a culture of "please forward this to all relevant faculty/staff."
2. In relation to the previous point, we ask that all academic senate and campus leadership communications that are sent to Department Chairs and Directors have a cc to Department and Program Managers. In instances where communications are in the purview of Divisional Analysts, such as scheduling, external review, workload policies, etc, Divisional Analysts should be appropriately copied on those communications as well.

#### **4. Invest in hybrid and remote work**

Since March 2020 nearly all campus employees have been working remotely. Despite the sudden shift a year and a half ago, we have adapted, learned new skills, and realized that the in-office work experience is not necessary for all positions. There were snags along the way, but it has, for the most part, been an impressive shift for such a large enterprise. Last year, the campus released guidance and resources for staff and managers to use in the implementation of hybrid and remote work upon the resumption of in-person activities. This has been helpful, and there are multiple AMP members who have already used these for their own working situations, or with those for whom they supervise. The future of hybrid and remote work presents several opportunities for the campus. In the way we have learned that visiting a doctor remotely can often be just as effective as in-person consultation, many of our advisors and students have found that remote advising appointments are preferable to in-person. We are able to go in and out of meetings with ease. We no longer have to commute, lowering our carbon footprint and creating less of a need for abundant parking on campus. This remote work also has its drawbacks, including a lack of personal connection, no breaks between meetings, and feeling the need to work through what would normally be a commute or a lunch hour. We hope the campus will continue what has been a promising start to hybrid and remote work.

#### Proposed Actions

1. Allocate funds so that each department and division has at least one teleconferencing meeting room. This will allow faculty and staff to avoid coming to campus for “just one meeting.”
2. Implement university-wide, bi-weekly “no meeting days.” This creates a day that staff can comfortably anticipate being able to catch up on work or to plan a day off without being needed.
3. Some staff may only need to come to campus once or twice a week, and may no longer need a permanent desk or office. The campus should create solutions such as shared docking spaces so offices can be given back to the department or division for those who need them.
4. There are times when working remotely is not possible due to an internet or power outage. We ask that campus provide guidance on how to handle these situations for our remote employees.
5. Allow staff to return unused scratcher permits they purchased during the pandemic when onsite work was sporadic.
6. Expand the 4-hour parking option currently available for campus guests to be available to employees.

#### **5. Establish a culture of transparency and trust**

In preparing this memo, the AMP membership dedicates one of its monthly meetings to prepare a list of the most pressing issues facing staff on this campus. Year after year, we have looked at this list and come to the conclusion that many of the issues touch on a lack of transparency by the administration. New employees are exposed to it immediately, and veteran employees have been hardened to the reality that there is a pervasive feeling of mistrust at UC Santa Cruz. Staff are left off of important communications, reports that we are told will be made public are not,

and decisions that greatly affect staff have no input from the very people that they affect most. In our preparation for this memo, numerous examples of faculty bullying were brought up. In each instance it was the staff member who was told to change their behavior and adapt to the faculty member's needs and "idiosyncrasies." During the wildcat strike, which we fear could resume at any time, department staff were tasked with enforcing the administration's dismissals of our graduate students, despite the personal and supportive relationships we have with our students. For the 2020-21 winter curtailment, we were initially told to take six days of vacation, rather than the usual three, in what felt like a forced reduction of our vacation accrual. Some of these examples may be inadvertent misunderstandings, or simply ideas that didn't come across as intended; however, the fact that staff misconstrued what may have been good faith efforts to be ill-intentioned speaks to an unhealthy climate.

Proposed Action:

1. Bullying of employees should never be tolerated and there should be real consequences for it. Currently one person handles all issues on campus for staff, faculty, and students. The campus must reestablish an ombuds office to handle these issues.
2. To address transparency: all committees and task forces should have a relevant staff member as well as an easily accessible website that is regularly updated with meeting notes, new developments, future actions, and all outcome materials.