

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of October 22, 2015

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

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

Update from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting of October 9, 2015

Chair Zachos reported that the UCFW meeting began with the disheartening news that State support of UC is at an all-time low.

The Healthcare Task Force reported that open enrollment for 2016 health plans will offer the same plans with minor changes and improvements. There will be a 5% increase in Health Net Blue and Gold premiums and UC Care premiums will increase as much as 25% for some employees. An increase was expected but the amounts were previously unknown. UC Care has been running into the red as the initial premiums for the program were too low for a PPO plan.

Negotiations with new network providers for 2017 will happen in the near future. There is talk of including an HMO plan in UC Care but some worry about equity and access for all campuses. At UCSC, employees have Dignity Health with Health Net Blue and Gold, and the Palo Alto Medical Foundation with UC Care. There is also word that Kaiser will be moving to Santa Cruz County, but it may be a long time before they are established in the area.

There has been a proposal to bring in more medical center representatives to the Healthcare Advisory Board. UCFW has sent a letter stating their objections and recommending that the board have better representation.

The Task Force on Investment and Retirement reported that Tier 3 of the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) is a done deal and will have a cap at \$17k. The option of a supplemental defined contribution plan is being investigated by an advisory task force that was put together by President Napolitano, and is charged with coming up with guiding principles for retirement. Possible guiding principles might include that the program must be competitive in the context of total remuneration, and that it must be a financially stable retirement program. The goal with the new tier is for the UC to save roughly \$75/year. What this savings will be spent on is still unknown.

CFW members expressed concern that such a defined contribution (dc) plan will only be made available to those with higher salaries, and commented that if the savings is used to support the dc plan, it is not fair to those with lower salaries. Members further noted that due to changes in retirement and several different tiers, senior faculty have better packages than junior faculty. As such, salaries for new hires will need to be higher in order to compete and some salary compression will be expected due to these changes in compensation.

Consultation Procedures – Members will review and agree to the CFW procedures

CFW members reviewed and agreed to follow the consultation procedures.

Childcare Update

In 2014-15, CFW consulted with CP/EVC Galloway two times on the topic of childcare. CFW proposed a temporary voucher system and that an off campus facility for childcare (since an on-campus location was off the table) be secured in the near future. The CP/EVC agreed to look into it and evaluate the options.

During the summer, CP/EVC Galloway created a Faculty and Staff Child Care Services Model Analysis Team to consider some options. Unfortunately, the committee did not include faculty representation and CFW members raised concerns about shared governance. The team met and drafted a report evaluating the options.

The report is in, and CFW has been asked to review and comment. The team evaluated two options (a reimbursement model, and a contract for services model). A few potential locations were considered and with financial data, and the team determined that a contract for services model was the preferred approach, but would still be a significant capital investment. Members noted that there will also be revenue that comes back to the campus, and questioned whether this report may influence the administration to determine that it is too expensive to move forward with securing employee childcare.

CFW considered the benefits of having a center on campus due to convenience and allowing faculty to spend more time in classrooms and labs, and questioned why the possibility of expanding the student child care center located at family student housing, which is set for renovation, wasn't considered in the report. The committee may consider asking employee childcare point person, VCBAS Sarah Latham, to provide a report to the Senate on the topic.

Members noted that the reinstated Campus Welfare Committee and the **CCA (spell out)** subcommittee will want to determine guidelines for employee childcare and will hopefully help to move employee childcare forward.

Last year, in a post consultation memo **(DATE)**, CFW recommended that the CP/EVC put aside \$250/year for child care in order to receive matching available funds from UCOP. The committee is concerned that \$730k in funds already set aside could be appropriated if not used for childcare in the near future. CFW is determined to keep the paper trail of these reserves alive so that they are not forgotten or used for other priorities.

Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking

1

The CP/EVC office is in the process of establishing an Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking, which is intended to replace the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). The new committee would continue to have one representative from CFW, a representative from the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and one faculty member at large. The CP/EVC has requested that CFW and CPB review and comment on the draft committee charge.

Members were in support of the clearly articulated vision and set goals for each meeting, and strongly supported the recommendation that a representative from the soon to be reinstated Campus Welfare Committee (CWC) be included in the membership as suggested in the draft ACCTP charge. However, the committee raised concerns about the frequency of the meetings and the potential workload impact that the frequency may have for the members on the committee.

Members noted that the new committee will meet twice per month as compared to once a month, as was the previous TAC schedule. Although CFW agrees that more frequent meetings would benefit the ACCTP in accomplishing the set list of goals in a timely manner, the time commitment is equal to that of a Senate committee that meets bi-weekly. CFW will recommend that Senate committee representative membership on ACCTP for both CFW and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) be open to a shared or split membership, split between two designated members who alternate months. CFW recognizes that the proposed work of the ACCTP is essential to the campus as a whole and with the proposed members, will promote shared governance on our campus, and looks forward to working with the ACCTP in the coming year.