

## **COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**

### **Annual Report 2022-23**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) met bi-weekly throughout the academic year; members also represented CFW on several other Senate and campus committees—the Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP), Employee Housing Advisory Workgroup (EHAWG), the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER), the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), and the systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW).

CFW's work in 2022-23 focused on developments both on campus and systemwide with regard to issues affecting faculty welfare and faculty quality of life detailed below.

#### **I. Salary Analysis**

With the written 2022-23 CFW Faculty Salary Report pending, Chair Sher provided an oral report on the following salary analysis findings at the spring Academic Senate Meeting on May 24, 2023.

##### **A. Background:**

Over the last year CFW continued its faculty salary analysis. As in previous years, the focus of the analysis remained on understanding the dynamics of University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) faculty salaries in relation to those of other campuses. A significant lag of UCSC salaries in 2007/2008 engendered the Special Salary Program (SSP). The program's purpose was to bring the UCSC faculty salaries up to the median of other UC campuses (all campuses except for UC San Francisco). The program was successful at reducing, but not eliminating the gap and was curtailed in 2017. Following repeated argument by CFW, the Academic Senate resolved in 2019-20 that the annual Faculty Salary Competitiveness Reports created by the Academic Personnel Office (APO), must include a cost of living component. Unfortunately, APO has not followed this resolution and is yet to include cost of living analysis in any of its reports. CFW will continue to monitor the situation with regards to faculty salaries and hopes to see movement on inclusion of cost of living adjustment in these administrative reports.

##### **B. Key Findings:**

This year CFW analyzed a UC-wide salary dataset from 2021 (the latest available data). The dataset included both Regular (REG) and Business/Economics/Engineering (BEE) Faculty Ladder Rank series. No medical, business, or law school faculty were included. Our analysis showed that for both REG (Assistant and Full Professor rank) and BEE (Full Professor rank) faculty, the goal set when SSP was created has not been met. Furthermore, the analysis shows that the gap between UCSC and other campuses for some of these categories increased since the curtailment of SSP in 2017-18, and that the annual rate with which we were gaining on other campuses during the period of 2012-2017 fell down almost to zero, or we started falling behind since the SSP curtailment. Adjusting for the cost of living in the areas where UC campuses are located led to UCSC faculty salary being behind every other UC campus for all three professor ranks in both REG and BEE series. CFW

members believe that reinstatement of the more progressive SSP is a straightforward and easy to implement solution that will address the inequitable compensation of UCSC faculty relative to other UC campuses. CFW expects to work with CAP next year on a joint recommendation for SSP reinstatement.

## **II. Salary Equity Review Program**

CFW opined on the first and second iterations of the newly proposed Salary Equity Review (SER) Program.<sup>1</sup> The program goal is to address historical inequities in salaries of UCSC faculty. Members were supportive of the program's goal and were encouraged to see that the second proposal explicitly stated that being considered for SER action will not require additional work from faculty beyond the standard preparation of documents for a personnel action. Members agreed that it is extremely important to make SER available at every action, including merit increases. Members concluded that the choice of a comparator group and the exact criteria for the SER are crucial for the success of the program, and should be carefully considered. CFW is looking forward to working with the administration and the Academic Senate on these important issues next year.

## **III. Academic Salary Program**

CFW advocated in the past for the increases within the Academic Salary Program to be applied to the full salary of UCSC faculty, not just the on-scale portion. This is an important component of not falling further behind other campuses. It was encouraging to see the increase applied to the full salary in 2022, and to hear that the upcoming October 2023 increase will be applied to the full salary as well. CFW will continue to monitor the situation.

## **IV. Other Faculty Salary Issues**

CFW opined on the proposed modifications to the Career Equity Review (CER) Program (inclusion of Teaching Professors and other changes) and to the Special Salary Program (changes to the acceleration at promotion step).<sup>2</sup> Members were supportive of both proposals, while raising a number of issues. CFW believes that CER should be available at all promotions and at tenure review. It also should be available at the first promotion for those who transferred from other UC campuses. In regards to the changes of SSP, members were concerned how a distinction will be made between acceleration at promotion step and the proposed one step on- scale plus one step off-scale.

## **V. Housing**

Housing was a central item on CFW's agenda throughout the year. Members had a consultation with Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) Lori Kletzer in January 2023, and with CP/EVC Kletzer and Vice Chancellor for Finance Operation Administration Ed Reiskin in

---

<sup>1</sup> CFW Chair Sher to Senate Chair Gallagher, 1/13/23, Re: Development of a Faculty Salary Equity Review Policy  
CFW Chair Sher to Senate Chair Gallagher, 5/22/23, Re: Divisional Review - Proposed Equity-Based Modifications for Faculty Review Process

<sup>2</sup> CFW Chair Sher to Senate Chair Gallagher, 5/22/23, Re: Divisional Review - Proposed Equity-Based Modifications

April 2023. Our focus at these meetings was to seek clarity on how the campus administration was conceiving of short, mid, and long term plans to address the paucity of affordable houses for faculty and staff. The administration had noted at the end of the 2021-22 academic year that a three-pronged approach that considered short, mid and long term plans for housing faculty and staff would be pursued. This year, CFW was eager to receive updates on the development of these three-pronged plans through consultation.

*Short Term Solutions:*

The only short term plan that was defined by the administration during these consultations was the 0% interest (ZIP) loan. Members agreed that this was a good resource, but only available to new faculty and retention cases. We learned that a ZIP loan is better than an FRA for housing purchases, because it is forgivable in 10 years, has zero interest and the taxation rates are better. The ZIP loan enables home buyers to have a greater purchasing power than the FRA of the same amount. Members felt that given the severe housing crisis, which affects current faculty as well as new recruits, it seemed critical to make this option available to all faculty, or at least to those who have not used their FRA yet. CP/EVC Kletzer informed us however, that at present there were no plans to make the ZIP loan available to the faculty more generally.

At the January meeting, we also discussed the current unavailability of the Landed shared equity program. CFW was told that the administration could possibly explore a way for UC Santa Cruz to provide shared equity in off-campus housing, but we have not been informed of any specific movement by the administration in this direction.

We spoke of plans for new downtown construction, and the opportunity for campus/developer partnerships. The housing crisis affects all who live in Santa Cruz and surrounding areas as much as it does UCSC employees and students. Members agreed that we need to avoid a perception that the campus is acquiring housing and making it unavailable for non-UCSC employees. However, given that numerous students and UCSC employees already rent in the city, moving them to the campus-owned housing would merely shift, but not decrease off-campus housing inventory. We hope that this perspective will be taken on as an important talking point as the campus continues to explore and secure off-campus housing.

*Mid-term Solutions:*

CP/EVC Kletzer offered RVT2 (building the long delayed second phase of Ranch View Terrace) as a mid-term plan for faculty housing. A new RVT2 Implementation Committee was established this academic year and a representative of CFW served on the committee. The administration has insisted that RVT2, initially focused on a 39 unit footprint, would be able to break ground in a couple of years. CFW is uncertain that this is viable. The Implementation Committee (RVT2IC) has only met three times since it was constituted in January, 2023 and has not included a representative from the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), despite many budgetary concerns being raised about the plans for RVT2. As such, CFW requested the administration include a CPB representative on the committee and provide CFW with an updated copy of the final RVT2IC charge.<sup>3</sup> We have yet to receive a final charge, and the Implementation Committee has not met since we made the request to include a CPB representative.

---

<sup>3</sup> CFW Chair Sher to CP/EVC Kletzer, 3/09/23, Re: RVT2 Implementation Committee

In our meeting with Vice Chancellor of Finance, Operations, and Administration (VCFOA) Ed Reiskin, the VCFOA confirmed our representative's report from the last Implementation Committee meeting that the campus aims to lease the land marked for RVT2 to a developer - following a model used by UC Santa Barbara - to build homes that would then be sold to faculty because the university does not have the capital to undertake the construction of this project itself. The Implementation Committee has noted that a request for proposal (RFP) would have to be developed before proposals from developers can be solicited and discussed. While the administration has continued to insist that RVT2 is viable as a midterm solution, we remain concerned that there is need for a lot more planning and that therefore, this is, in fact, a long term plan.

We have also noted that given the urgency of the housing crisis, that the RVT2IC must be provided with all of the staff support, resources, historical context, and information needed to effectively fulfill its critical mission. CFW should continue to press for alternative mid-term housing solutions in 2023-24.

An additional note: During our January consultation with the CP/EVC, we discussed the \$10 million debt that was incurred during the building of RVT1. While CP/EVC Kletzer has mentioned a few times in separate consultations that the administration will cover this debt so that it is not placed on future homebuyers, we do not have a copy of this commitment in writing. The CP/EVC reiterated that the administration will absorb this debt during our April consultation and maintained that a written memo to this effect was not necessary.

#### *Long Term Solutions:*

During the January meeting, CP/EVC Kletzer recommended looking at the other on-campus housing building sites identified in the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). She mentioned one site in particular, at the intersection of Western and Empire Grade, a big piece of property that could possibly hold a small neighborhood of 30-75 units. While she noted that she would have staff look at the LRDP and provide CFW with information about this site, and that she would like to consult and brainstorm about how to approach this site moving forward, there was no movement on this possible plan.

CFW would like to hear more about the administration's plans for additional substantive short, mid, and long-term solutions next year as we continue to have quarterly meetings with the administration and receive updates on housing.

## **VI. Employee Housing Repricing Program**

CFW reviewed proposed revisions to the Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendation (for 2023-24) in April and opined against the proposal to increase pricing by 5.01%. The increase in pricing by 5.01% will result in an increase to \$398 per square foot. This will mean that entry level units (2BD Cardiff, etc.) will be priced at 38.6% of 2022 Santa Cruz market sales. We have been informed that the administration has approved the 5.01% increase, but that they are interested in having a conversation with CFW to determine how the program can be re-envisioned moving forward.

CFW is looking forward to the conversation with administration about reconceptualization of the program. The committee outlined a detailed critique of the current Re-Pricing Program that we hope will be useful for such a discussion.<sup>4</sup> We noted that underpinning the model that the program uses to calculate affordable housing prices is an assumption that housing costs should be less than or equal to 48% of an individual's income. According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) definition however, housing burden is defined as spending more than 30% of your income on rent/mortgage and associated housing costs. This is a large discrepancy and has created an impasse. CFW would like to see HUD's definition of housing burden (30%) used in the Re-pricing Program's calculations.

A second impasse centers on the program's stated goal to price campus housing within 60%-75% of market prices in Santa Cruz county's most expensive zip code (the upper West Side, 95060). CFW has repeatedly argued that this goal is flawed if the aim of the program is to provide affordable housing for faculty. An argument for why housing prices in the most expensive zip code of the county are used in the program's calculations needs to be made. These are not minor issues as they get at the heart of how the campus chooses to conceive of affordability and housing equity. CFW has noted that a newly hired Assistant Professor with an annual salary of \$87,000 (median salary of most recently hired Assistant Professors, excluding those hired in Economics and Engineering) will continue to face a housing burden (paying an excess of 30% of their salaries towards housing costs) and this burden is only exacerbated if we add on childcare and dependent care expenses, not to mention previous student loan debt. This is a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) issue as faculty of color and first-generation PhDs are disproportionately financially burdened. CFW believes that the Re-Pricing proposal does not address the difficulty of attracting new and diverse faculty hires to the campus.

This program was designed in 2007 to achieve certain commendable goals, including renovating aging units, generating revenue and seed capital for new housing, equalizing pricing, and increasing unit turnover. Unfortunately, we have found no evidence that the program is, in fact, meeting all of these goals. Considering the present state of the housing market in Santa Cruz county, keeping faculty and staff housing at affordable rates and equalizing prices (the most significant goal of the program, as we see it) is incommensurable with raising revenue and seed capital for new housing (another goal of the program). In other words, if the program is aiming to generate revenue and seed capital through a price increase, it cannot and will not keep units affordable for faculty and staff, and a 5.01% price increase will not raise sufficient seed capital to build new housing units. In sum, the program cannot meet two of its most significant goals, at present. Moreover, it is not clear to CFW how this program incentivizes turnover of current housing stock.

While the price increase has been approved despite our objection, CFW is glad to hear that there is interest in reconceptualizing the program. We hope that the critique that we have outlined will be used towards this effort.

## **VII. Healthcare**

---

<sup>4</sup> CFW Chair Sher to Senate Chair Gallagher, 4/27/23, Re: Divisional Review - Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendation (for 2023-24)

CFW has continued to monitor healthcare and dental care at UC Santa Cruz and we continue to identify access and affordability of care as two serious issues.

Starting in 2023, for all UC non-Medicare plans, infertility coverage will be enhanced. Vitro fertilization (IVF), zygote intrafallopian transfer (ZIFT) and gamete intrafallopian transfer (GIFT), are covered with 50% coinsurance, up to a combined lifetime limit of two treatment cycles per eligible member. This is an improvement from the previous coverage: only for the diagnosis of the cause of infertility (covered at 20% coinsurance for in-network and UC Select).

SB 245 prohibits a health plan or an individual or group policy, that is issued, amended, renewed, or delivered on or after January 1, 2023, from imposing a deductible, coinsurance, copayment, or any other cost-sharing requirement on coverage for all abortion and abortion-related services. Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) plans are compliant to SB 245. The Preferred Provider Organization (PPO) plans will follow SB 245 where the plans are able to. Deductible still applies to the UC Health Savings Plan (HSP) and CORE. Abortion is fully covered by UC Blue & Gold HMO and Kaiser HMO.

In 2023, for UC Health Savings Plan with Health Savings Account (HSA), the HSA contribution limit was increased from \$3,650 to \$3,850 for self-only coverage and from \$7,300 to \$7,750 for family coverage. The in-network deductible has increased from \$1,400 to \$1,500 for self-only coverage and from \$2,800 to \$3,000 for family coverage.

CFW has been informed that Kaiser Permanente opened a new downtown Santa Cruz office at 110 Cooper St. in June 2022.

CFW additionally learned of a UC San Francisco Benioff Children's Physicians plan to open a clinic in Santa Cruz. CFW has been informed that its office space has been remodeled and the recruitment is underway.

Watsonville Community Hospital remains open and is now under public ownership by Pajaro Valley Health Care District.

CFW closely followed the negotiations on a continuing contract between Anthem Blue Cross and Stanford Health, which failed to result in an agreement in 2022. Stanford Health has been terminated from Anthem Blue Cross's network effective September 1, 2022. CFW advocated through UCFW and the UC Health Care Task Force to have Stanford services continue to be covered at in-network rates until at least the end of the enrollment period. As a result, through December 31, 2022, covered services received from Stanford Health providers were paid at the in-network level of benefits. Member's copayment or coinsurance out-of-pocket costs stayed the same as if Stanford Health is an in-network provider for Anthem's non-Medicare network. Later in 2022, Stanford Health and Anthem Blue Cross reached an agreement that preserved the access to Stanford Health for UCSC employees.

CFW continues to be concerned about the potential inequities between in-state and out-of-state retiree health care options as discussed in the Joint Benefits Reports issued by the Council of

University of California Retirees Association (CUCRA) and the Council of University of California Emeriti Associations (CUCEA), and endorsed by UCFW and Academic Council.

CFW continues to receive alarming reports that more and more local dentists are dropping Delta Dental insurance and/or are not accepting new Delta patients. Since Delta Dental is the only plan available to UC faculty and staff, CFW urges UC to offer an alternative to Delta.

Availability of health providers in the Santa Cruz area is of large concern. This affects both major providers in the Santa Cruz area: Sutter Health (Palo Alto Medical Foundation) and Dignity Health/Physician Medical Group of Santa Cruz. For example, regular appointments within Sutter Health take months and the network relies more and more on patients seeking help through urgent care. As a result, the urgent care centers are overwhelmed and patients are further redirected to emergency rooms. This process degrades quality of medical care because it is extremely inconvenient, it breaks the established connection between a patient and their Primary Care Provider (PCP), and it raises the cost of care significantly (emergency room copay is close to \$300 compared to \$20 copay for a regular doctor's visit).

In summary, CFW identifies two critical health care issues unique to Santa Cruz: the lack of adequate providers (not enough physicians in the area and no UC medical School or hospital on campus), and affordability (prices continue to grow, with 2023 Open Enrollment expected to bring up the cost of medical plans even more). During the next year, CFW expects to continue monitoring the situation. It is not clear what can be done to increase access, but a separate (from UC Care) plan that includes the Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) and Sutter Health might bring down the costs. An establishment of a UC Santa Cruz Task Force might help to work through the unique health care problems faced by our campus. We will also continue working on setting up a framework that will protect enrollees from sudden benefit changes due to middle of the year negotiations between insurers and providers.

## VIII. Childcare

CFW continues to monitor childcare on our campus as childcare needs continue to be acute, especially for caretakers of children 5 years old and younger. CFW had productive meetings with CP/EVC Lori Kletzer in January 2023 and with CP/EVC Kletzer and Vice Chancellor for Finance Operation Administration Reiskin in April 2023, which focused on short-term solutions to the lack of availability and affordability of childcare provision. The decision to focus the conversation on short-term solutions responds to the urgency of the topic, and the fact that it particularly affects new hires, Assistant Professors, and women-identified faculty.

There were two short-term solutions proposed by CP/EVC Kletzer that seemed very promising and that echoed some of the recommendations made by previous campus task forces:<sup>5</sup>

- 1. Subsidies for childcare costs.** CP/EVC Kletzer mentioned in our meeting of January 12, 2023 that she and Chancellor Larive had discussed financial support possibilities such as

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, UCSC Child Care Task Force, Supplemental: Interim Solutions, February 28, 2011. The 2011 Child Care Task Force (CCTF) submitted a supplemental report with more than 10 interim solutions, which included a Fund Dependent Care Assistance Program (Solution #5, which a 2015 staff committee also researched as part of their charge), Vouchers/Reimbursements (Solution #6), and Resource and Referral Services (Solution #7).

reimbursements for childcare like those recently provided to graduate students and researchers. We were excited to hear that this could be done right away, as this would show a commitment to both current employees and new recruits, especially women-identified candidates. The CP/EVC mentioned having brought this idea to labor relations and legal counsel in the past, and that the time was right to further explore this remedy. We understand that since this would be a change in terms of conditions of employment, there is a need to consult with the Santa Cruz Faculty Association (SCFA). We look forward to hearing about the plans to move forward on this front and hopefully implement reimbursements for childcare in Fall 2023. In our April follow-up meeting, CP/EVC Kletzer mentioned the possibility that these reimbursements may need to be reevaluated after childcare on campus is inaugurated.

- 2. Reserving spaces in local child care centers for UCSC employees.** We were encouraged and excited by our discussion on January 12, 2023 of possible campus collaborations with local childcare providers to reserve open spots for UCSC employees. This was something that CFW had suggested in the past,<sup>6</sup> and we are happy to see that the idea may become a reality in the near future. Together with the reimbursements mentioned above, this appears to be another tangible action plan that may be put into place immediately. CFW worked with the UCSC Resource Group for Academic Mothers to compile a list of local providers, which we provided to the CP/EVC. We note that the centers on the list have not all been vetted by faculty or staff and that some of these services may only be available to enrolled students at specific schools, etc. However, CFW has reviewed the list, and believes it to be a fairly comprehensive list of local providers to which an invitation to submit a Request for Proposal (RFP) could be sent. CP/EVC Kletzer mentioned that she would work with her staff and Campus Counsel to design the RFP and send it out to some or all of these providers, but a project timeline was not provided. For the medium term, CFW was pleased to hear about the Regents' actions to advance Student Housing West, which would include a campus-run childcare facility for up to 140 children.<sup>7</sup> We were particularly heartened by the news that construction will begin in 2024.<sup>8</sup> While both announcements are good news, CFW members raised questions about the affordability of childcare when it is established on campus. It seems that the campus childcare is set to be at market rate for employees, which is not affordable for some. CFW would like to be involved in the childcare center implementation process, including discussions on issues such as cost –and potential subsidies—and the way that wait lists will be managed.

As mentioned in the 2021-2022 CFW Report, CFW is pleased that due to the work of countless stakeholders and campus workgroups, the program, curriculum, and access policy for the center are ready to go. Prior work by the 2017 Child Care Work Group -- which serves as the guiding principle for the campus child care program -- was carried out independently from any third-party vendor. CFW members hope that this new development will help to expedite the delivery of campus childcare.

---

<sup>6</sup> CFW Chair Orlandi to CP/EVC Kletzer, 3/31/22, Re: UCSC Back-up Care Program

<sup>7</sup> [https://shr.ucsc.edu/news-events/news/memo\\_23\\_03\\_16.html](https://shr.ucsc.edu/news-events/news/memo_23_03_16.html)

<sup>8</sup> Chancellor Larive to UCSC Campus Community, 3/16/23, Re: Regent Action Advances Student Housing West



CFW sees the construction of on-campus childcare as a positive development. However, childcare needs have intensified since the COVID-19 pandemic and caretakers need immediate solutions. We urge the administration to implement the two short-term solutions described above, which can provide immediate –and much needed—relief to faculty.

## IX. Back-up Care

The child/elderly Back-Up Care program through Bright Horizons is an important initiative from UCSC's Administration that has supported families in moments when regular care fails. The Back-Up Care program was expanded in winter 2022 to include out-of-network services beyond Bright Horizons, and increase the number of hours provided to faculty. In response to CFW's recommendation in 2021-2022, the Back-Up Care website was updated with step-by-step instructions. Following a suggestion from CFW,<sup>9</sup> the Institutional Research, Assessment, and Policy Studies unit (IRAPS) conducted a survey in fall 2022 to poll employees on their dependent care needs and their experience with the Back-Up Care program to gauge the usage, understand the barriers that kept people from using the program despite a need, and seek general feedback on the program.

After reviewing the results and IRAPS's report of the Back-Up Family Care Experience Survey, CFW identified five main areas for improvement: lack of availability, unfamiliar providers, poor affordability, complexity of the process, and lack of information. Qualitative and quantitative responses showed that many caretakers experienced a lack of sufficient providers in Santa Cruz. Responses also highlighted how challenging it is to rely on providers they (and their dependents) do not know. These two concerns make the out-of-network provider option especially attractive. Unfortunately, respondents called attention to the process required to receive reimbursement for out-of-network providers. Having to wait too long for a response from Bright Horizons was identified as one of the main barriers since out-of-network providers can only be reimbursed if in-network providers are not available. This made using the program less feasible, which leads to another major concern: the cost of care when not covered by the program. Finally, many respondents did not know how to use the benefit, including how to get reimbursement, and this deterred their use in the first place.

CFW proposed one specific change to address some of the most pressing issues raised in the survey:<sup>10</sup>

- 1. Bright Horizons should remove the requirement that out-of-network providers can only be contracted after the in-network option is unavailable.** This would mean that care takers are able to directly reach out to their trusted providers when they need back-up care. This will solve the issue of having to leave dependents with unfamiliar care providers, it will streamline the process and make it faster, and it will help with the availability by increasing the amount of providers, and affordability (through reimbursements) of back-up care. This one action could greatly improve the overall process and program.

---

<sup>9</sup> CFW Chair Sher to CHES Director Keller, 11/15/22, Re: Request for Feedback - 2022 UCSC Backup Care Survey Project

<sup>10</sup> CFW Chair Sher to CP/EVC Lori Kletzer, 6/01/23, Re: Back-Up Family Care Experience Survey - Survey Results by IRAPS, April 2023

In June 2023, CP/EVC Kletzer responded that this suggestion “will be considered within an overall analysis of the program and its costs.” CFW will follow-up on this topic next year.<sup>11</sup>

We would like to note that, from the qualitative responses in the survey, one can infer that those most affected by the failings of the program are junior faculty/staff and new hires with lower salaries, those without family members in town, and families whose dependents have special needs. We believe that childcare and child and elderly back up care programs are crucial for hiring and retaining faculty and staff. CFW may want to explore the need for expanding elderly care in 2023-24.

CFW notes that the idea that childcare is an individual’s problem and thereby solutions around an individual’s available resources are sufficient, is long standing and inaccurate. CFW strongly urges the administration to address childcare issues and solutions (including the Back-Up Care program) with an institution-based, not an individual-based, approach. CFW acknowledges that not all faculty and staff with childcare needs have family members or friends nearby who have the time or flexibility in work schedule to provide childcare support. CFW continues to urge the campus administration to include reimbursements for childcare costs, and support the formation of a coalition with local care providers to strengthen the support system UCSC can provide to its employees.

## **X. Transportation and Parking**

The Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) met 8 times in 2022-23. Representatives from CFW, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), and a faculty member at large, were included in the committee membership.

The ACCTP received reports that the Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) projected operational balance is well sustained. Long term planning included continued research on zero emissions transportation systems and associated costs.

This year, the ACCTP was informed that the campus was successfully able to negotiate an agreement with eBikes to roll out a bike share program starting June, 2023.<sup>12</sup>

There was no discussion of increasing parking rates this year, but this is something that was brought up in the past. CFW should monitor this situation.

***Parking Bail Increase Proposal*** - UCSC parking citation bail amounts have not increased in 13 years. Taps reported that current bail amounts are no longer in alignment with their counterparts at other UC campuses and the City of Santa Cruz. To that end, their effectiveness as deterrents to illegal parking has decreased substantially over the years. This year, there has been a significant increase in reported scofflaw behavior. As such, parking violation fees will be increased starting

---

<sup>11</sup> CP/EVC Kletzer to CFW Chair Sher and Committee, 6/05/23, Re: Back-Up Family Care Experience Survey - Survey Results by IRAPS, April 2023

<sup>12</sup> UCSC is part of a regional partnership bringing bike share to Santa Cruz County:  
<https://news.ucsc.edu/2023/05/campus-bikeshare.html>

in September 2023.

***CMS Board Deployment / Use Fee*** - One of ACCTP's roles is to act as the designated review body for proposed TAPS fees related to parking operations, which include parking permit rates, event parking signage, and the deployment and use of Changeable Message Sign (CMS) boards. The CMS boards were purchased and provided to TAPS to use for campus events, instead of renting (as was being done for commencement, move in, etc.). The CMS boards allow for essential messaging to be conveyed along campus roadways and at entrances. The proposed fee of \$200 is intended to cover the costs for two employees with a truck deploying, setting up & breaking down the CMS boards for campus events and other notifications, and the \$75 per day cost is intended to cover depreciation / wear and tear. Additionally, the proposed fee represents a significant savings compared to renting from an outside vendor; for example, a CMS rental in 2019 was approximately \$400 / day, or \$700 / week or \$1800 / month, in addition to \$300 in pickup and delivery costs. For a three-day event, the TAPS CMS board would be \$425, and a rental would be at least \$1000 (and likely more, as prices may have increased since 2019). TAPS will now own and maintain its own CMS boards instead of renting/leasing them, which should result in overall saving.

***Bus and Transit Shelter Reimagining / Interior Ad Space*** - each UCSC transit stop includes a bulletin board, which is open to the public for posting events, advertising, and other public service announcements. The boards are usually completely filled with unmoderated content, and regrettably has been a popular landing spot for hate-based postings. Each week, TAPS staff remove outdated and non-UCSC affiliated content on the bulletin boards, and the costs for their labor, benefits, vehicles, and fuel is paid by TAPS out of the transit budget (which is funded primarily through the student transit fee). TAPS also cleans up the posters/fliers that have blown away, causing litter. The boards are often tagged with graffiti that requires additional maintenance time for clean up. Additionally, UCSC transit buses have dedicated space for advertising inside the bus, which is a fee-based service that is managed by City on a Hill Press (CHP). The relationship is codified through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between TAPS and City on a Hill Press that expires on June 30, 2023. City on a Hill acts as an intermediary between those who wish to do bus advertising and TAPS, however the process is less than efficient, and could better be used to help fund Campus Transit operations. TAPS has requested an approved miscellaneous fee for advertising in a framed, defined area on the sides of buses (i.e., limited area, no bus wraps), which is under review. The MOU with City on a Hill will expire this summer and TAPS is anticipating to begin offering advertising on the exterior of the buses. To that end, it is an appropriate opportunity to reimagine and optimize the advertising process. Based on the above, the ACCTP decided to remove the aging bulletin boards and replace them with new boards that have a plexiglass cover.

In summary, during the last year, a number of measures were taken to decrease TAPS operational expenses, broaden transportation choices (new e-bike program), and increase deterrent for unpermitted parking. CFW hopes that these measures will result in better parking availability and affordability on campus. The committee expects to continue monitoring the situation.

## **XI. Retirement**

CFW is encouraged by improved processing times for “normal” retirement cases, improved call center performance, and the development of a dedicated call center for survivor benefit intake.

However, CFW was contacted this year by several new emeriti faculty who were dropped from their health and dental coverage without notice, even though they are eligible for continued coverage. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this lapse in health coverage is also a problem for survivors. We support the findings of the CUCRA/CUCEA Joint Benefit Committee (JBC) Report<sup>13</sup> that there is still an unacceptable backlog for processing survivor benefits and unreasonable delays in processing retirements for more complicated cases. The promised re-establishment of retirement counselors has yet to be implemented. We agree with the JBC assessment that the Retirement Administration Service Center (RASC) appears to be unnecessarily risk averse and unwilling to institute “band aid” solutions, similar to the successful “No Lapse in Pay Program,” to improve service issues while more permanent solutions to these problems are developed. CFW should continue to work with the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER) to monitor RASC performance and to exert pressure for continuing improvement through UCFW and Academic Council.

## **XII. Additional Issues**

A number of individual faculty issues were brought before CFW. Each was considered from a policy point of view. CFW believes that the two issues discussed below require possible policy review.

### ***Abusive behavior towards faculty***

Abusive behavior by students in class towards faculty is currently covered by the Code of Student Conduct. CFW believes that a reporting procedure of such behavior should be made more clear to the faculty. It also might be worth considering the creation of clear guidelines for how such reporting and behavior should be addressed. There are clear campus guidelines for reporting and addressing student academic misconduct. Similarly, there should be clear guidelines and procedures for reporting and addressing abusive behavior by students towards instructors. Specifically, the committee was concerned about abusive behavior that was not covered by the Title IX Office.

### ***Clarity of Housing Access policy for married couples and domestic partners***

The UCSC Faculty and Staff Housing Access policy regulates access to the campus for-sale housing. At the moment, it does not explain or even mention how the access works for married couples or domestic partners. This creates ambiguity and potential for unfair treatment, for example in cases when both partners are eligible to participate in the program and separate while they are waiting in queue for the housing or after they acquired it. The committee communicated its thoughts to the CP/EVC Kletzer<sup>14</sup> and expects to engage with the administration on this topic next year.

## **XIII. Acknowledgments**

The committee would like to thank those who consulted with and/or provided information to the

---

<sup>13</sup> Joint Benefits Committee Report, CUCRA/CUCEA Virtual Joint Meeting at UC Santa Barbara, April 26-17, 2023: <https://www.cucea.org/uploads/1/3/9/6/139695957/joint-benefits-committee-report-spring-2023.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> CFW Chair Sher to CP/EVC Kletzer, 6/15/23, Re: Housing Access Policy Application to Married Couples and Domestic Partners

committee this year: CP/EVC Lori Kletzer, VPAA Herbert Lee, VCFOA Ed Reiskin, UCSC Health Care Facilitator Marianne McIvor, and Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES) Executive Director David Keller.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Madhavi Murty

Sara Niedzwiecki

Chen Qian

Gustavo Vazquez

Xi Zhang

Judith Habicht Mauche *ex officio*

Alexander Sher, *Chair*

August 31, 2023