

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of April 2, 2015

Present: Noriko Aso, Adrian Brasoveanu, David Cuthbert, Andrew Mathews, Benjamin Read, Nina Treadwell, Manfred Warmuth, James Zachos (Chair), Roger Anderson, Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

Absent with Notice: Ted Holman

Consultation with CP/EVC

CFW invited Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) Alison Galloway to consult with the committee on the topic of child care.

Chair Zachos noted that at the beginning of the academic year, with the UCSC Project Report: Planning Faculty-Staff Child Care at the Granary and Family Resources Centers at UCSC (1/13/14), it appeared that the campus was moving forward in securing child care for UCSC employees. However, the committee has since been informed that the Granary has been determined an unsuitable location for a child care facility and the proposal, which included a comprehensive business plan, has been put aside. CFW made it clear that the committee wants to help the CP/EVC move forward with securing child care for UCSC employees and would like to gain a sense of how the committee may contribute.

CP/EVC Galloway confirmed that the Granary is unsuitable and noted that employee child care has been complicated by a recent issue at the student child care facility, which resulted in two campus child care leads leaving their positions in early July, 2014. This year, the administration is trying to figure out if the campus can mount a child care center for employees that is high quality where students and employees would feel comfortable leaving their children. Galloway commented that this is not an easy task given the changing environment in terms of employer obligations and requirements associated with providing child care, and noted that it may not be financially feasible.

UCSC's student child care is relatively low in cost compared to some other UC campuses. The current center serves 62 students and they are close to capacity. Galloway shared that the facility will need to be closed and relocated when the campus begins planned renovations on the west side of campus. Galloway noted that they are trying to simultaneously plan for the relocation and the possibility of including employee child care at that time. They are shooting for a center that will serve 120 children. It is not yet known where the child care center will be relocated. The administration is trying to figure out if the campus would be building something itself, or working with a third party. Chair Zachos commented that there does not appear to be an appropriate site on campus, so the process of identifying a location off campus should start now.

When asked about the timetable for the project, Galloway said that advisory groups lead by Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services, Sarah Latham, and Associate Vice Chancellor of Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services, Sue Matthews, are already meeting to discuss design. They are also working on planning the staging for the project. The current plan is to begin building on the northern edge of family student housing first, and then move on to a second phase of housing, which will include the current student child care center. The campus plans on starting the project in the next couple of years. The work will be done in phases, and it is not yet known how long the first phase will take, although Galloway guessed that it might take a year, after which, families would need to be moved back to the phase I units and families in phase II would need to be moved out of housing before work on the second phase is begun. It is not yet known what the impact of construction will be on the childcare center as phase I is being worked on.

CP/EVC Galloway reported that she has set aside \$750K for childcare, \$730K of which still remains. There is a \$1.5 million matching offer from the Office of the President for child care facilities, which Galloway believes is still available. Galloway stated that her intention is to put the \$730 in the pool for matching funds. If the campus secures the matching funds, the money would not cover operational costs. Galloway stated that the campus needs to put up roughly \$2 million in order to receive matching funds, which is why Galloway stated, the campus is putting money away.

Galloway expressed that she feels that there is a need for a campus discussion about what UCSC's priorities are as we cannot afford all of them at this point. There will be no budget cuts in the next year as shortfalls in the budget will be covered centrally. In 2016-17 and beyond, there is an expected \$3 million per year shortfall and there will need to be budget cuts. If the proposed tuition increases do not go through, there will be an addition \$3-4 million shortfall.

A comment was made that child care may not be something that people think about when they are being recruited as they may just assume that child care exists, however it is important for diversity and retention issues. Galloway agreed and noted that the campus is having issues retaining high quality staff in middle management and is competing with employers in Silicon Valley over the hill. Many are taking offers from Google or Apple and are commuting in company shuttles over the hill.

When asked what her ideal employee child care situation would be, CP/EVC Galloway said that she would like to see a child care center run either internally, or through a third party, possibly not on campus, but perhaps on the west side in the Delaware area with an easy commute to campus, and with provided transportation to take students to campus in the morning. The location would be newly renovated, meet necessary requirements for a child care center, and incorporate study facilities for Psychology, etc. that are in place at the current center. The center would serve roughly 120 students from infant through pre-k and would

have to address needs for after care. Her vision is that such a center would serve students, and possibly faculty, staff, and major employers in the area, and would be up and running within 2-3 years, but she does not know if that is possible. Galloway needs to see the financial model of what it would take for the campus to do it alone vs. going with a third party vendor. She estimates that child care for employees will be a \$250k/year investment for the campus.

Galloway commented that there is not much available in terms of high quality affordable childcare in the county and believes that an alliance with the city and/or county government may provide enough children to support a larger center. Once the campus has an idea of what the students need, they can contact the city, county, and large employers in the area to see if a collaboration may be made.

A question was raised as to whether care for sick children was being considered for employees as many are unable to take their children to standard day care providers if they are ill with a fever, etc. Galloway commented that every option that is provided makes the cost go up and that at the moment, they are providing minimal services. Galloway recognized that sick care as well as after care and care during the academic breaks would be extremely helpful to employees and students, but would make the cost of child care go up significantly. Further, providing care to sick children could expose child care staff and other students to potential illness.

A question was raised as to what funding would like look in a childcare facility serving students, employees, and city/county employees as when employee childcare was combined with student childcare in the past, there were issues with blended funding streams. Galloway responded that funding would be different for different cohorts of students, supplemental for the children of students, and perhaps with some other subsidies for children of UCSC employees and/or city and county employees.

When asked whether the state voucher program mentioned in the UCSC Project Report: Planning Faculty-Staff Child Care at the Granary and Family Resources Centers at UCSC (1/13/14) was being considered, CP/EVC Galloway reported that it is being explored and that there are many ways that support may be given, some with tax implications and others without.

In CFW's 1/16/15 post consultation memo to Galloway, the committee recommended that while an off campus facility was being explored, that a campus child care voucher system be put in place for faculty and staff. Members noted that there could be a wait list with priority given to Assistant Professors, much like the campus housing wait list, and suggested that the funding for such a program could come from the \$730k reserved for child care. CFW would like to see such a system in place starting fall 2015. Galloway noted that such a voucher system could be taxed as it is seen as a benefit that is part of a stipend and/or income. She further commented that if the campus were to give employees vouchers, it is a liability for

the University if it is used to pay for care with someone whom is not an appropriate provider. Galloway insinuated that the campus could be seen as being on the hook for supporting an unwise decision. She also commented that accessing need for participation in such a system would be tricky due to gauging income levels, families with double incomes, etc.

Galloway noted that there may be other options such as an assistance plan with voluntary payroll reduction by request of the employee. This could also be seen as a benefit by the IRS and would not be considered “free money” and users would need to be informed that they will need to pay the IRS. A voucher program contracting with specific and preauthorized child care centers contracted with the campus may also be an option. A reimbursement program may also be an option and would provide parents with more choice, but puts UC at a higher liability. All options would need to be run by Campus Council. When asked about the campus Child Care Reimbursement Program for Graduate Student Employees as a model, Galloway stated that she did not know how the program was run, but that students were probably limited to using approved centers. Galloway promised to speak with Latham and Campus Council and get back to CFW regarding possible options.

A suggestion was made that a reconstituted Child Care Advisory Committee (CCAC) could assist in the process of determining possible options. CP/EVC Galloway stated that they are not quite at that point and estimates that the CCAC should be back up and running by fall quarter 2015. Historically CCAC worked on the child care wait list and addressed admission questions. The CP/EVC suggested that the committee perhaps was not as productive in the past as it could have been but that it would be good to have a collaborative group of faculty and staff working together, some who need childcare for their children, and other who do not in order to have a balance of perspective. It was mentioned that the former Campus Welfare Committee (CWC) had two different people chairing the committee, which may have affected the committee’s productivity. Galloway would like to bring CCAC and the CWC back in place and bring more voices to the table in fall 2015 with the CCAC reporting to the CWC, and noted that the platform is needed to foreground some issues that cut across faculty, staff, graduate student, and undergraduate communities before they become critical. Galloway will run the proposed CWC charge by CFW for comment.

When asked why the former CWC and CCAC dissolved, Galloway suggested that there may have been difficult issues presented to the committees that were not pleasant to take on, and the committee died out.

Galloway noted that Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services, Sarah Latham, is the new point person for child care on campus and the person whom CFW should communicate with on the topic. Sue Matthews, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Housing and Educational Services (CHES) would also be someone whom the committee should keep direct contact with. Galloway is expecting a report on childcare from Latham in in the next two weeks. Galloway mentioned that although the report is strictly confidential due to detailed information regarding an issue at the student child care center, Latham is looking

into what to do in the future to serve a broader audience, and both Latham and Matthews are working on the remodeling of the current student child care center. Although CFW cannot see the report, Galloway insisted that she and Latham could come back to the committee to speak with them regarding the basic findings and future direction of campus child care.

A suggestion was made that an improved CCAC could act as a place from which up to date child care information can be shared with the campus, and Sarah Latham could either be a member, or provide the committee with frequent updates on the topic. A further suggestion was made that having two representatives from CFW on the committee would be beneficial, and that both the CCAC and CWC could be responsible for collecting information on child care needs, assessing models, and helping to determine what the highest level of care is that the campus can afford to provide. Galloway suggested that Latham is being pulled in many different directions and a representative from her office may need to stand in for her at such meetings.

Health Care

Galloway moved the conversation focus to the topic of health care. She mentioned that there have been many rumors going around campus regarding proposed changes to employee health care including a faculty petition, but she did not have any information of the topic and could not respond. Apparently the UC Office of the President (UCOP) Human Resources staff and Executive Vice President John Stobo met with the Council of University of California Staff Assemblies (CUCSA), and a Senate and union representative, regarding possible changes, and never spoke with the campuses. On April 1st, Galloway was provided with an overview of where UC intends to go with UC Care and next year's health care options.

Galloway reported that there is no intention of eliminating any of the existing healthcare plans, however, they are looking at expanding UC Care and putting a cap on employer and employee contributions. The intent is to move more people to UC Care in order to make it a more sustainable program. If they can accomplish that goal, then they are willing to guarantee a cap for four years on increases. The Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, and Merced campuses are concerned about health care due to limited care options in those areas. Galloway reported that at the moment, UC Santa Cruz appears to be okay and that we are back on the radar in terms of our unique needs.

Housing

During the fall quarter 2014, CFW consulted with the CP/EVC and discussed the possibility of moving forward with building Ranch View Terrace, Phase II, in order to create more housing inventory on campus. Galloway mentioned that she would like to see an update on the market value comparison as with the current increase in the market, as the cost of a Ranch View II home may not be above market, as was originally assessed. When asked if there has been any movement in looking into possibilities of building off campus, Galloway reported that the property that they were considering is already under development by another group.

CFW has been interested in the bonuses given to new faculty for housing and how the funds are distributed by divisions. CFW recognizes that these funds make it possible for some new faculty to put a down payment on a house but note that some divisions consistently provide these funds, whereas other do not. Galloway said that providing these funds is pretty much standard in all divisions except the Humanities and offered to get CFW more detail on the restrictions of such funds and how they are being used. She noted that FTE requests come in and are reviewed by the Senate, but cannot remember if housing budgets are included. She will check with the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB).

With regards to Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) loans, Galloway feels that the campus has been lenient on extensions and MOP loans to assist faculty to move off campus. A suggestion was made that the campus could be more aggressive with advertising MOP loans.

CP/EVC Consultation Debrief

Members debriefed the consultation and noted that although it appears that the campus is trying to move forward there are many issues to consider and there is a high level of concern regarding liability issues. With the securing of an off campus child care site seemingly in the distant future, the committee originally believed that a voucher program would be a quick and simple solution, but it is not. Members questioned how the graduate student child care reimbursement program functions and wondered if it is done under financial aid and not compensation.

The committee expressed frustration with the many hurdles preventing the campus from moving forward and the lack of inertia with securing child care for employees. Members noted that other campuses have child care options and question how they were able to create these programs and assume liability whereas the UCSC campus is reluctant to do so. Members are also skeptical of the claim that a voucher program would open up the campus to liability issues. Members consider whether it may have been easier to start such programs in the past, but is harder to do now as the legal landscape has changed so drastically. Liability often appears to be the main impediment to moving forward.

Members agree that they are happy to have a specific individual to contact regarding child care issues (Sarah Latham) and made plans to request a consultation with her as soon as possible and hear more about her research on child care options for employees and the report that she is in the process of creating for the CP/EVC.

CFW would like to know if the foundation is raising money for child care. In the past, it clearly was not on the campus fundraising list. However, members believe that a child care center could be an attractive option for potential donors. Members further considered whether child care could be considered a diversity issue as the campus and President Napolitano both have a commitment to diversity.

A suggestion was made that the campus needs to find a creative solution and CFW considered some options ranging from forest kindergartens to parent coop care arrangements, the later of which was previously proposed when staff children were removed from the current child care center and was immediately shut down by the campus due to liability concerns. Members questioned why the liability for the UCSC summer camp such “Sammy Slug” where students are outside all day would be any different than the liability associated with running an all day care center.

CFW noted that a few years ago, there was an academic vision plan for child care. A suggestion was made that with the current timetable for the renovation of the student child care center, now may be the time to move forward with something basic and that Cabrillo and the UCSC Education and Psychology departments may be good resources. The committee considered compiling a list of potential child care locations on campus for the EVC in the case that the campus missed something.

CFW would like to see CCAC reinstated in the fall and looks forward to consulting with Sarah Latham in the near future.

CFW concluded with a discussion of the CP/EVC post consultation memo.

CFW Housing Subcommittee Update

The CFW Housing Subcommittee met on March 11, 2015 to discuss the 2015-16 Employee Housing Program Resale Pricing Proposal, and consider strategies for expanding campus housing inventory. Members received a brief summary of the subcommittee meeting discussion.

The subcommittee decided that more information was needed than was provided in the proposal packet. During the next CFW meeting, members will be discussing the proposal in detail in which Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES) proposes a 1.58% increase. This may not appear to be a large increase, but members would like to know the history of the program and the model/equation that is being used to justify the proposed increase.