

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of November 19, 2015

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

Absent with Notice: Andrew Matthews

Chair Announcements

Update from the UCFW Meeting of November 13, 2015

Chair Zachos reported that much of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting discussion was focused on the Retirement Option Task Force Report which is due on December 14, 2015. The third tier of the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP) has already been decided. Whether the plan will be supplemented and whether there will be an option of a full defined contribution plan needs to be decided. The task force is working on a recommendation for a supplemental benefit or full defined contribution plan and on January 15th, President Napolitano will make her final decision. There will be no opportunity for feedback from the Senate due to the winter break and the quick turn-around. UCFW is generating a request for more time to evaluate the findings. Chair Zachos will also see if the UCSC CFW can generate a request for the opportunity to provide feedback.

UCFW heard from the Health Care Task Force. The task force reported that UC Care is running a slight surplus this year. The overall increase in health care plans for UC during the 2017 enrollment is 3.5%, in large part due to Health Net not requesting large increases. Chair Zachos speculated that this might be to entice UC to continue to contract with the plan.

Concerns regarding the potential replacement of Regents on the UCOP Health Care Advisory Committee were heard. The Regents will not be replaced with chancellors from medical center campuses. Chair Zachos noted that this is a good thing and will keep the faculty voice at the table. The Health Care Task Force further reported that the UC Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory employees are suing UC stating that the UC was not holding up to its retiree benefit obligations. If the group is successful, it could have potential for us in the future if retirement benefits are changed.

UCFW consulted with UCPO personnel and were told that UCOP is designing an online faculty exit survey to find out why faculty leave UC. Some campuses have their own surveys, but this survey will be more comprehensive and will accompany information collected by the UC Campus Climate Surveys.

UCFW members provided updates from their respective campuses. Chair Zachos reported that half of the chairs spoke about childcare. Most raised concerns about access and long waiting lists. Childcare costs are reportedly running \$2k/month in the centers that are managed by Bright Horizons. Campuses are also reportedly doing different things with the 1.5% provided by UCOP to increase faculty salaries. Some are holding the amount for future unknown uses. Apparently

UCLA has equity issues that will need to be addressed. The UCLA campus also received a \$100 million gift to build a high school for the children of UCLA faculty and staff.

Consultation – VCBAS Sarah Latham

CFW consulted with Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) and campus child care point person Sarah Latham on employee child care and the Faculty and Staff Child Care Services Model Analysis Team Report, and consider steps for moving forward.

Dennis Roberts, Director of Business and Financial Analysis for Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES), and Dave Keller of Housing Services also attended.

VC Latham was clear that her and the Child Care Services Model Analysis Team's charge was focused solely on the financial, legal, and technical concerns and not what the program will look like or what would work for faculty and staff. Those considerations will be included in the next steps.

Chair Zachos noted that CFW had some concerns about the Analysis Team Report, but the committee would like to focus on the campus moving forward to secure a child care option. Members feel that an on campus location would be most optimal and convenient for faculty in the long term, will be more cost effective for the campus.

When asked why building on campus costs so much more than building off campus, VC Latham noted that there are UC requirements that are placed on construction on campus that increase the cost of building such as construction wage requirements, storm water requirements, etc. There are additional costs for building on campus, and additional costs for UC related projects off of campus due to public contracting codes, etc. As well, the closer the campus builds to campus, the higher the UC debt capacity and a new building on campus would need to be assessed in terms of building priorities, which already includes a sizeable list of projects. This list is located on the Planning and Budget website,

Dave Keller added that the Bright Horizon consultant who did the financial projections for the report estimated that construction should be roughly \$400-\$500 per square foot. However, on campus, construction runs \$650 - \$750 and up. Further, if there is an on campus location and vacant spots may not be filled by community members, the operator assumes more risk. VC Latham added that in the end, a couple million dollars between building on and off campus should not make a difference.

CFW members noted that building off campus places more of the cost on individual faculty who will use gas and time that could have been spent in their labs and classrooms to drop off and pick up their kids at an off-campus location. A suggestion was made that this should be included in the cost benefit analysis.

Chair Zachos informed the VC that last year, CP/EVC Galloway mentioned that the student childcare center located in family student housing would be renovated and that potentially employee childcare could be included in the renovations. VC Latham noted that a building assessment for family student housing is currently being conducted and that no change in the layout of the childcare center or expansion is being considered. CFW members noted their surprise at this new news and when asked if this blueprint was set in stone, VC Latham responded that it already going through Committee on Planning and Sustainability (CPS) review and Chancellor approval.

Dennis Roberts noted that he was included on the team that evaluated the Granary for a potential child care location. The team spoke with experts and found that the seismic renovation costs alone were a huge costs. The team was looking for a site that could be “plug and play” like the off campus sites that were reviewed by the Faculty and Staff Child Care Model Analysis Team. However, both of these locations had other interested parties and it is likely that these sites are no longer available. However, they were included as examples of possible sites that the campus might pursue.

When asked whether part of the Delaware building could be renovated to incorporate a child care center, Lathan suggested that incorporating child care into a building with multiple uses and offices could increase infrastructure costs. Outside play space, and licensing all need to be considered in shared spaces.

Chair Zachos questioned whether there would be an open bid for contracting child care providers. Dennis Roberts noted that there is a finite pool of providers who specialize in employer childcare and would anticipate only two bids, one from Bright Horizons, and one from Kinder Care.

In its pre-consultation memo to VC Latham, CFW requested an update on the child care matching funds program from UCOP that was originally announced in 2001 and how UCSC could benefit from the program. VC Latham stated that Planning and Budget is working with UC Planning and Budget to get an update and that she will provide the information to CFW as soon as they have an answer.

Chair Zachos noted that faculty should be involved in steps moving forward. VC Latham agreed and said that she would advocate to the CP/EVC for faculty input and representation to be included in the implementation team and in the next step as the campus moves forward in figuring out the details associated with securing employee childcare and what such a program should look like.

VC Latham suggested that CFW respond to the CP/EVC’s call to comment on the Analysis Team Report and consider a face to face consultation with the CP/EVC, of which, Latham is happy to attend. VC Latham further suggested that Planning and Budget should be involved and noted that although there is value to recruitment, retention, and productivity, at the end of the day, the dollars and cents will be the driving force.

Post Consultation and Child Care Services Model Response

CFW debriefed from its consultation and considered the content of a post consultation memo.

Members also considered the content of CFW's response to the report of the Faculty and Staff Child Care Services Model Analysis Team.

The committee's response to the report will note that although the committee favors an on campus center, CFW wants the campus to move forward with securing any option and that faculty should be included in all future employee child care considerations.

CFW will collaborate with the committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) and Planning and Budget (CPB).