

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of April 14, 2016

Present: Karen Bassi, Shelly Grabe, Ted Holman, Andrew Mathews, Grant McGuire, Nina Treadwell, James Zachos (Chair), Shelly Errington (*ex officio*), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: Ricardo Sanfelice

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

Update from the UCFW Meeting of April 8, 2016

Chair Zachos reported that the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) consulted with the Health Care Task Force (HCTF). The HCTF noted that UC participants were recently surveyed regarding Optim behavioral health care. Apparently not many providers accept this type of insurance, which has been problematic for patients. There appears to be a move to integrate mental healthcare with primary care.

UCFW also discussed a proposal from UC Riverside for tuition remission benefits for faculty and possibly staff. Chair Zachos reported that UCFW had a vigorous discussion on the merits of such a benefit, how valuable the benefit is and at what cost. Some members worried that given the recent criticism of UC, the political capital for a benefit that impacts a small percentage of the faculty would be too high, particularly when tuition for in state students is increasing. It was pointed out that existing UC tuition assistance programs for California residents based on income might be sufficient to help those staff and faculty with lower salaries.

UCFW also discussed childcare and adoption benefits. Systemwide adoption benefits are being considered, and childcare availability varies from campus to campus. There is emergency childcare on many campuses, which does not exist at UC Santa Cruz. Many campuses are contracted through Bright Horizons. UC Los Angeles (UCLA) is opening a second childcare center with Bright Horizons. Apparently, UCLA's CFW is not involved with childcare, and the purview rests higher up in the campus administration.

UCFW was informed that a recent case at UC Davis has brought regarding the survivor benefit for domestic partners and survivors to the fore. Apparently, UC domestic opposite sex partners and survivors are not recognized as they would be at the state level until the age of 62. This issue is being raised with HR.

Members discussed the 3% faculty salary allocation. UC Santa Cruz applied the 1.5% discretionary increase to the total salary of all faculty and was an outlier as it was the only campus to provide every faculty member with a raise. UCFW also considered the UC auditor report on out of state enrollments. UC has noted that the auditor report had some flaws with regards to admissions data, and out of state student test scores are higher than in state test scores. This is laid out in the President's response to the report.

UCFW consulted with the Office of the President (OP) regarding the UC retirement fund. OP recognizes that with changing markets the 7.25% assumed return rate needs to be adjusted, and is

considering a lower rate of return to reposition the assets and look at the future with more accurate probability. Given this Chair Zachos suggested that state/employee contributions might need to increase in the near future to return UCRP to 100% funding.

OP is considering funding menus for the new defined contribution (DC) third tier retirement plan. UCFW recommends improved documentation for new employees about retirement options including financial impacts of choices under various scenarios. CFW members agreed that new employees will need rigorous training and financial planning advising. CFW members reported that current retirement advising in the form of webinars and websites are not very effective.

With regards to housing, UCFW was informed that there is now \$500k available for the Low Interest Option Supplemental Home Loan Program (LIO-SHLP) on each campus.

Update from the SEC Meetings of March 29, and April 12, 2016

Due to a time restraint, the report from the Senate Executive Meetings of March 29 and April 12 were tabled for a future CFW meeting. Chair Zachos did report, however, that on April 12th, SEC discussed the 3% faculty salary increase and UC Santa Cruz's application of the 1.5% discretionary increase. SEC agreed that UCSC's approach was based on merit (as required by the President) as it was applied to total faculty salary, which includes off-scale salary given for merit.

Quick Update from the ACCTP Meeting of April 5, 2016

The CFW representative provided the committee with a brief update from the last Advisory Committee for Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP). The ACCTP discussed the announcement that the Santa Cruz Metro Bus will be reducing its service and routes due to budget cuts. The ACCTP was informed that 50% of all ridership in Santa Cruz is comprised of UC Santa Cruz students and affiliates. Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) Director Larry Pageler weighed in with concern on the services that are being cut.

In addition, the ACCTP was informed that TAPS recently completed a survey of bike shuttle users. The results showed that users of the service are passionate about it. Several respondents noted that the bike shuttle is the reason why they are at UCSC. The ACCTP also discussed some recent complaints about TAPS quality of service are handled. There is some concern that the TAPS is lacking an adequate process to handle and resolve such complaints and reports.

The CFW ACCTP representative also reported that TAPS is piloting a "SafeRide" app, where users may request a chaperone to walk them from an office or classroom to a bus stop or parking lot.

CFW members briefly revisited the recent TAPS fee increase proposal. Chair Zachos reported that the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) had a very negative response due to what it perceived to be a lack of thorough analysis on the part of TAPS or a clear basis for the increases. CFW has already voiced its concerns in the committee's response.

Consideration of the Meeting Minutes from February 4 and February 18, 2016

The consideration of minutes was postponed until the next CFW meeting.

UC Retirement and Faculty Salary Allocation

Due to the consultation, CFW tabled this discussion until the next CFW meeting.

Consultation – CP/EVC Alison Galloway

CFW consulted with Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CPEVC) Alison Galloway on the topic of childcare. The committee was eager have a frank discussion with the outgoing administrator and seek her advice, as a colleague, on how to move forward. The committee also sought to secure a committeemen to continue to reserve and safeguard the \$730k in funds set aside for employee childcare, for its intended purpose only.

CP/EVC Galloway informed CFW that there is still hope for employee childcare. However, she noted that the campus is not prepared to sustain with a lot of administration and lacks the funding to make it function on campus. Childcare would be an expensive endeavor, and the CP/EVC commented that childcare is not the campus's area of expertise. The CP/EVC noted that there were issues with the previous proposal to have childcare located at the Granary, and there was a recent incident and legal issues associated with the current student childcare center.

Chair Zachos questioned whether a third party vendor would be affected by the same road blocks, to which CP/EVC Galloway noted that a third party with experience would help with liability concerns as less responsibility will be placed on the campus. She later noted that if the campus could get a handle on childcare, a third party vendor may not be needed. However, the CP/EVC added that another roadblock is the cost and the way that the campus would go about building a facility. She shared that the typical approach used has a limited campus debt capacity of \$400 million, and \$300 million of that is used for housing. The campus has had to look at each project as a single project with one bid, complete the project, and make repairs before moving onto the next project. The consequence of this system is that the campus has been limited in what it could build. The CP/EVC shared that the mandate to accept additional students in fall 2016-17 (along with the lack of traditional bond funding of new buildings) has forced President Napolitano to consider alternative funding models for building expansion on UC campuses. The CP/EVC reported that the Office of the President (UCOP) is now allowing campuses to go out to bid for several projects at a time in order to encourage larger companies (vetted by the President) to bid for more years of continuous building, which would result in cost savings and allow the campus to move forward with several projects at a time. The new funding model, which the CP/EVC reported other campuses are already implementing, would enable the campus to quickly expand student housing, while also providing an opportunity to enlarge the existing student child care center to include employee child care.

CP/EVC Galloway emphasized the critical need for affordable housing in the city for students and for the greater community. She reported that the campus is currently speaking with the city to see what can be done. The CP/EVC questioned whether something could be done to serve the childcare needs of the campus and the broader community as well, although any negotiations for specific requirements for UCSC patrons would require additional paperwork and vetting.

When asked if an interim voucher program would help to mitigate the situation or hinder a longer term project, CP/EVC Galloway stated that there is even more liability with a voucher program as the campus would in essence be endorsing individual centers used by employees. However, she expressed that she believes that employee childcare is not too far away and may be secured in the next five years. A CFW member noted that when the current student child care center was created, it was opened up to faculty and staff, but then returned to student services only, due to a cap of students. The member asked the CP/EVC if it would now be possible to increase the building's size to accommodate more students. CP/EVC Galloway replied that when the student center is replaced/remodeled, it is imperative that it be expanded to accommodate faculty and staff. She emphasized that things are changing with new directives from UCOP and noted that VCBAS Sarah Latham is aware that employee childcare is a huge issue for the campus. The CP/EVC recommended that CFW stay on VCBAS Latham's radar so that the issue is not forgotten.

The parties discussed childcare at other UC campuses. UC Los Angeles is opening up its second third party center, and UC San Francisco has three childcare centers. When a concern was raised about affordability with a third party provider, CP/EVC suggested that the intention for UCSC would be to partially subsidize the cost for employees with priority enrollment given to faculty and staff. Members noted that fundraising and donations could cover some of the cost of the facility (for example a play yard or viewing room), but would not cover operational costs of a center. CP/EVC Galloway commented that the \$1.2 million in matching funds available from UCOP for a childcare facility would not come close to what the campus would need to build a center, even with the \$730k that is set aside. CP/EVC Galloway suggested that CFW repeatedly bring the next CP/EVC in to talk with the committee in order to try to fit childcare into the budget and the campuses list of priorities.

Members questioned, given the cost for a new building, if it would make more sense to change the blue print of a current building, rather than build from scratch. CP/EVC Galloway agreed that given the new building model, this would be easier, and added that the renovation of family student housing (where the current center is located) has a five year renovation plan. The CP/EVC added that unlike housing, a childcare building would not bring in revenue, so there is no return for the campus and no revenue to pay down any debt incurred in the building of a center. CP/EVC Galloway reported that the State is no longer funding buildings and noted that the last State funded building will be the Coastal Science building. In the future, half of the money to build will need to be externally and/or personally financed, this is why a different building and funding model is important for the UCSC campus.

Members questioned whether the building of Ranch View Terrace Phase II (RVT2) could be included in a large scale project bid, to which CP/EVC indicated that if the campus is looking at a swath of building, RVT2 should be included. CP/EVC added that the new model will enable the campus to redesign the plans for RVT2 if needed. The parties considered whether childcare could be enveloped into a redesign for the project.

CP/EVC suggested that the new building funding model is a huge game changer for UCSC and will change the culture of the way building happens including Physical Planning and Construction's (PPC) role in the process. CFW members emphasized that the committee feels strongly that a childcare center on campus would be optimal for faculty, although the CP/EVC commented that what is optimal is not always achievable.

The CP/EVC added that as she will be leaving her post, VCBAS Sarah Latham will be the continuity on the topic. CFW members emphasized the need for continuity of Senate faculty on topics such as childcare and suggested that the Campus Welfare Committee (CWC), once reinstated, could serve this need for institutional memory. CP/EVC noted that the administration is trying move the CWC away from talking about childcare and have the committee focus on other campus climate issues such as employee morale and other issues that affect all employees. The CP/EVC suggested that childcare needs to stay with CFW.

Chair Zachos noted that CFW would like to keep a clear paper trail on childcare and the committee would like to have a commitment in writing that the \$730k currently set aside for employee childcare will be reserved for that purpose only. CP/EVC recommended that CFW write up a post consultation memo and copy VCBAS Latham.

Following the consultation, CFW members debriefed from the meeting and considered content for the post consultation memo.