

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE Annual Report, 2021-22

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 2021-22 focused on developments both on campus and systemwide with regards to issues affecting faculty welfare and faculty quality of life detailed below.

I. Salary Analysis

The following is a brief summary of the committee's findings. For a more detailed discussion of this year's salary analysis and cost of living, please see the 2021-22 Faculty Salary Analysis Report, which may be found on the CFW Senate webpage ([link](#)).

Background:

For over a decade, CFW has monitored UCSC faculty salaries with particular attention to the effects on salaries of both the 2008-09 implementation and the 2018 modification of the Special Salary Practice (SSP). CFW has also repeatedly argued that, in order to properly evaluate salary competitiveness, an analysis of cost of living should be included. In 2019-20, the Academic Senate agreed with this opinion, and produced a resolution stating that future campus analyses of salaries, and annual Faculty Salary Competitiveness Reports created by the Academic Personnel Office (APO), must include a cost of living component.¹ Unfortunately, APO's reports have yet to include a cost of living analysis as requested. CFW will continue to monitor the situation in 2022-23, and awaits developments on this front.

Key Findings:

This year's analysis, like the 20-21 analysis, reveals that: 1) The original Special Salary Practice (SSP) implemented in 2008 was reduced too soon. 2) Once cost of living is included as a variable, UCSC's salaries lag significantly behind salaries at virtually every other UC campus.

The SSP, which enabled our campus to make progress in terms of equity with other UC campuses, was reduced in 2017-2018 before UCSC could catch up with the 9-campus median. Median salaries of UCSC faculty continue to lag behind other UC campuses. This is true independently of whether we add considerations of cost of living. Once we add cost of living, UCSC's salaries lag significantly behind salaries at the other UC campuses, as also noted in CFW's cost of living analysis from 2017-18 and 2020-2021.²

¹ UCSC Academic Senate Resolution on the Commitment to Ensure Salary Equity and Competitiveness within the UC System, November 2019

² Committee on Faculty Welfare, Faculty Salary Analysis, April 2018

In spring 2021 and fall 2022, CFW collaborated with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The two committees formed a working group that assessed salary competitiveness and the effect of the modification of the SSP in 2018. In January of 2022, the committees communicated to the Chancellor and CP/EVC the findings that the salary gap is present and is likely increasing, and proposed that the SSP be improved to address the issue.³ The transmittal also recommended that the 3% increase implemented in the 2021-22 Academic Salary Program be retroactively applied to total faculty salaries (including off-scale salaries) and that future across the board increases be applied to total salaries as well. CP/EVC Kletzer acknowledged the seriousness of the salary issues, but communicated to the Senate that the money saved from applying the 3% increase only to on-scale portions of salaries would be used to supplement a salary equity program to be implemented in 2021-2022. CP/EVC Kletzer also committed to applying future increases, including the 2022-2023 4% Academic Salary Program increase to full salaries (including off-scales). This is a crucial measure since other UC campuses apply increases to total salaries. CFW needs to continue to monitor this situation.

II. Housing

The Employee Housing Advisory Workgroup (EHAWG), on which CFW had a representative, met inconsistently during the fall 2021 and winter 2022 quarters. Discussed more below, the EHAWG was abruptly disbanded at the start of the spring 2022 term after financial analysis completed by two companies contracted with UCSC identified an “extremely large gap” between new employee campus housing development costs and projected revenue, and determined that current employee housing plans were unfeasible.

The inconsistency with scheduling meetings during the fall and winter quarters stemmed partly from Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham’s departure from UCSC in December 2021. When meetings of the EHAWG were convened, discussions centered on housing affordability, and more generally on continued planning for the proposed second phase of the Ranch View Terrace employee housing project: Ranch View Terrace Phase II (RVT2).⁴

With the understanding that planning would continue for building additional housing on campus and being aware of VCBAS Latham’s impending departure from UCSC, CFW hosted a consultation with VCBAS Latham on October 21, 2021.⁵ During the consultation, VCBAS Latham provided updates on the status of campus housing, childcare, and backup care. VCBAS Latham clearly understood the importance of building additional housing and, with the green light from the 2021 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), indicated that the EHAWG would be tasked with reviewing housing plans as soon as winter 2022. The VCBAS also fielded a question relating

³ CFW Chair Orlandi to Chancellor Larive and CP/EVC Kletzer, 1/21/22, Re: Addressing Salary Equity and Competitiveness at UC Santa Cruz.

⁴ For the previous fiscal year (2020-21), VCBAS Latham set a goal to select three RVT2 housing scenarios/models. The three models were based, first and foremost, on financial considerations. Additionally, each of the three models was based on an analysis of the data collected from two sources: a Faculty and Staff Housing Market Analysis conducted through 2019-20, and Employee Housing Goal Sessions that were held in spring of 2021. Such sessions included representatives from the Staff Advisory Board (SAB), CFW, and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB).

⁵ Orlandi to Latham, 11/12/21, Re: Post Consultation – October 21, 2021.

to the idea of providing rental subsidies for employees in need; VCBAS Latham indicated that the University is in a secure financial situation and may now be in a position to explore this kind of nuanced approach to mitigating the housing crisis. CFW noted that the Campus Welfare Committee, the principal group formed out of the 2003 Housing Access Policy (HAP) that formulated guiding principles, eligibility requirements, and other employee housing policies, was disbanded and temporarily brought back together with a different charge and focus. VCBAS Latham reported that she recently brought up the need with CP/EVC Kletzer to assign a new group with Senate representation to review housing policies and update or revise the housing models by the end of 2022-23. Latham additionally suggested that every three years, an ad hoc group be charged to re-examine the housing policies and determine if updates are needed. As one way to continue pressing University administrators to meaningfully respond to a worsening housing crisis, next year's CFW should consider requesting an update from the CP/EVC on the establishment of these housing committees.

Another conversation organized before VCBAS Latham's departure took place at a EHWAG meeting on November 15, 2021. VCBAS Latham invited representatives from Landed (a financial services company) to present their shared equity down payment support program for public school employees. Landed specifically aims to lower barriers to accessing housing by providing financial assistance to reach a 20% down payment on a home without income restrictions (Landed provides up to 15%, or up to \$120,000, of a deposit amount; the home buyer provides at least 5%). With home buying success stories from employees at other colleges and universities in California, Landed offers one more tool for UCSC employees to access housing and UCSC announced a partnership with the company soon after the presentation. It is too early to tell whether or not the program is successful in assisting some UCSC employees attempting to break into the housing market. To this end, in a few years CFW may want to collaborate with the administration to conduct a small study to learn more about the program's successes and shortcomings for UCSC. CFW contends that, as the Landed representatives readily admitted during their presentation, this shared-equity program is a limited service that might help less than 10% of our employees. In a recent communication as of July 7 2022, Landed announced that "due to higher than average market uncertainty," Landed's equity share is increasing from 2.5% to 3.3% for every 1% that they contribute. This development might further limit the scope of the program. CFW holds that the housing crisis will need to be addressed by several diverse and robust solutions, including the expansion of employee housing. Outsourcing to a third party company alone will not solve the problem.

In this context, CFW found it surprising that the EHWG was disbanded in April 2022. According to the Employee Housing Advisory Workgroup 2018-2022 Report,⁶ financial analyses by two companies contracted with UCSC (JLL, a global commercial real estate services company, and TEF Design) revealed an insurmountable and "extremely large gap" between development costs and potential revenue from the sale of the new houses.⁷ It was therefore concluded that the current employee housing plans for RVT2, which the EHWG had been working on since 2018, were unfeasible. No alternative plan for home construction was proposed. However, recommendations

⁶ Employee Housing Advisory Workgroup to Kletzer, 5/12/22, Employee Housing Advisory Workgroup 2018–2022 Report.

⁷ Employee Housing Advisory Workgroup to Kletzer, 5/12/22, Employee Housing Advisory Workgroup 2018–2022 Report.

for next steps in the EHWG report include: engaging UCOP to identify home financing opportunities; retaining a local real estate company to assist employees with locating rental properties; exploring development opportunities off campus; establishing a 501(c)(3) to purchase units in the community for direct lease to UCSC employees; exploring housing payment vouchers; generating seed capital for housing projects by reevaluating calculations in the Housing Resale Pricing program; developing a new charge for exploring a financially feasible development project that might be accomplished in smaller incremental phases; explore state funding to subsidize housing construction; and updating the HAP to reevaluate waitlist priorities and increase access to existing housing stock.⁸

To draw greater attention to the dire housing needs of current employees, this year CFW sent a memo to Chancellor Larive and CP/EVC Kletzer requesting “Immediate Remediations for Essential Needs” for childcare and housing.⁵ The memo, which did not receive a response, proposed four housing solutions meant to spark discussion:

1. Create a housing subsidy for employees seeking additional financial assistance for a down payment on a home when a MOP loan and any accrued savings are increasingly not enough for the highly competitive housing market and cost of living on the Central Coast;
2. Provide rental and mortgage assistance for employees who may be directing more than 30% of their take-home pay for housing;
3. Begin planning for additional on and off-campus housing needs beyond—and parallel to—current RVT2 efforts, including fast-tracking home design, bidding, and construction at UCSC’s Westside Research Park and other locations; and,
4. Identify medium-term emergency housing solutions for employees who, as the 2020 CZU wildfire demonstrated, might not be able to return home. The regental authorization leading to the purchase of the Laureate Court apartments in the late-1990s could be seen as precedent for similar purchases of units for employees in dire need.

In order to identify and establish affordable housing as a top campus priority, CFW proposed a resolution at the May 20, 2022 Senate meeting on mitigating UCSC’s housing crisis⁹ with short, mid, and long term solutions, which was later voted on and approved by the Senate.¹⁰ CP/EVC Kletzer’s opening remarks at that Senate meeting spoke to the resolution, and gestured toward engaging in an active discussion regarding housing in 2022-2023. The CP/EVC expressed specific interest in a “modified for-rent model” for bolstering housing availability, and set a goal for developing a “staged plan” or program in which at any given time one employee housing project is being planned, one is under construction, and one is ready for move in. CFW looks forward to these proactive steps. However, as of the drafting of this report, there are no concrete plans for building additional employee housing on campus, no plans for acquiring additional existing properties to house current and future UCSC staff and faculty, no models for the creation of emergency short-term housing for unhoused employees in direst need,¹¹ and there are no short-

⁸ Employee Housing Advisory Workgroup to Kletzer, 5/12/22, Employee Housing Advisory Workgroup 2018–2022 Report, pgs. 16-17.

⁹ [Resolution to Mitigate UCSC’s Housing Crisis, May 2022](#)

¹⁰ Orlandi to Kletzer and Larive, 1/13/22, Re: Immediate Remediations for Essential Needs –Childcare and Housing.

¹¹ [Committee on Faculty Welfare, Annual Report 2020-21](#)

term solutions nor a long-term vision for addressing the festering housing crisis affecting UCSC. The Santa Cruz (city and county) housing market continues to skyrocket, and equitable access to affordable housing continues to be out of reach for many current UCSC employees, as well as many future employees who are actively being recruited to campus through the Faculty 100 initiative.¹²

Looking forward, CFW will need to remain actively and doggedly involved in discussions about housing, particularly (1) to hasten the development and implementation of concrete plans for building more homes for current and future employees, and (2) to advise University administrators on other practical solutions for mitigating UCSC’s housing crisis.

Employee Housing Repricing Program

Each year, the CP/EVC sends a request for Senate feedback on the UCSC Re-Pricing Program Recommendation for the following year. The proposal is prepared by Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES), and CFW and CPB provide feedback. The 2022-23 proposal included a proposed 2.43% pricing increase from the 2020-21 approved Campus Affordability Value, and a proposal to include Economics and Engineering new hire salaries in the “campus affordability value” calculation for the 2023-24 Employee Housing Resale Pricing Program and beyond. CFW supported neither the proposed 2.34% increase for 2022-23 nor the inclusion of the BEE scales in future resale pricing proposals.¹³

CFW’s response noted that annual increases, particularly those in recent years, have not resulted in increasing unit turnover, nor in securing seed capital for future employee housing/capital building projects. Further, CFW has repeatedly argued that UCSC employee housing prices are not “affordable,” since they are out of reach for the majority of junior faculty in a single income household, and even more so for our valued UCSC staff. The 2022-23 Recommendation for Campus Affordability Value notes that the proposed increase would price units at approximately 43.33% of 2021 actual market sales. However, with the Santa Cruz real estate market being one of the most expensive in the country, this is not “affordable” for many UCSC employees in desperate need of affordable housing. The committee raised concerns that including the BEE scale in the “affordability” calculation would only make employee housing even less affordable to a large number of campus employees. The committee has since been informed that the proposed 2.34% increase for 2022-23 was approved by the CP/EVC.¹⁴

For several years, the Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program has failed to reach two of its four intended goals: to sell affordable homes and generate revenue for expansion of program services and seed capital for additional units, and to increase unit turnover. The Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program is outdated, and is clearly not serving our campus amidst a severe and unrelenting housing crisis. As such, CFW strongly recommends that our campus take immediate action to

¹² “UC Santa Cruz announces ambitious investment to hire 100 additional faculty over decade, part of broader effort to advance student success and research excellence”, February 8, 2022, *UCSC Newscenter*, <https://news.ucsc.edu/2022/02/faculty-expansion.html>.

¹³ CFW Chair Orlandi to Senate Chair Brundage, 6/08/22, Re: UCSC Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendation (2022-23)

¹⁴ CP/EVC Kletzer to Interim Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services Kamaleswaran, 6/15/22, Re: 2022/23 Employee Housing Resale Pricing Program

rethink how employee housing is done on our campus and consider the creation of a new campus employee housing program that will best serve our campus community in both the short and long term.

III. Healthcare

CFW has continued to monitor healthcare and dental care at UCSC and we continue to identify access and affordability of care as two serious issues. This year we were also made aware of issues with retirees' healthcare coverage, particularly problems with the Medicare supplement coverage for out of State retirees.

Retirees who live out of state cannot participate in the United Health Care Medicare Advantage Plan. They are given a supplement of \$3,000 to purchase Medicare supplemental insurance from a broker who is specified by the UC. This supplement is insufficient and well-below what UC is contributing to support Medicare plans for in-state retirees. CFW holds that the supplement should be increased or that retirees who live out of state should be allowed to use United Health Care Medicare Advantage Plan, which is a national plan. Retirees should not be penalized for choosing to live out of state.

As for the rest of our faculty, there are three primary healthcare options for UCSC employees: UC Blue and Gold HealthNet HMO, accessed through Physicians Medical Group (PMG); Kaiser Permanente HMO, accessed through Kaiser doctors; and the UC Care PPO, accessed through the Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF). Kaiser Permanente has been increasing its footprint in Santa Cruz County since 2017, primarily taking patients away from HealthNet. However, the Kaiser facilities remain somewhat limited in Santa Cruz, as one must go to the Kaiser Hospital in Watsonville or Scotts Valley to access the full range of services. Currently, Watsonville Community Hospital is at risk of closing after years of financial struggle.¹⁵ As such, we risk losing one of only two hospitals in Santa Cruz County. This is extremely concerning as access to healthcare for Santa Cruz faculty and staff is already severely limited. CFW will continue to monitor the situation.

While PAMF has served the campus community well, there has been a consistent threat of losing our access to it, with two protracted negotiations in the last four years. The loss of PAMF access would be catastrophic as PMG and Kaiser could not possibly absorb the number of UCSC enrollees and the campus would lose its only PPO option, a healthcare model that is preferred by faculty and staff who need access to specialists. Many enrollees additionally choose PAMF for extended urgent care and weekend appointment options.

Access is also an issue when it comes to dental care. This year CFW has received several complaints that in many areas, dentists no longer accept Delta Dental. Since Delta Dental is the only plan available to UC faculty and staff (with either an HMO or a PPO option), CFW urges UC to offer an alternative to Delta. During a consultation with UCFW in April of 2022, Vice President of Systemwide Human Resources Cheryl Lloyd was made aware of this problem. CFW should continue to monitor it.

¹⁵ <https://www.santacruzsentinel.com/2022/06/30/watsonville-hospital-still-needs-12-million-after-state-funding-secured/>

The access issue is complicated by the affordability issue. Although UC Care was designed to be one of the more affordable UC health plan options, the PPO has become more expensive than the HealthNet and Kaiser HMOs, and has seen major rate increases since its inception. This forces many faculty who desire a PPO (or who simply desire to keep their current doctors) to pay extremely high premiums, and those who shift to HealthNet and Kaiser have difficulty finding doctors due to oversaturation. Living in Santa Cruz is already an expensive proposition and higher premiums compound that problem.

CFW continues to hold that a more affordable plan with PAMF is necessary. In the past, CFW has raised the possibility of dissociating PAMF from UC Care and either creating an independent plan that includes PAMF (as was done in the past), or moving PAMF into another plan. As UC Care increasingly seems unable to provide low costs, we strongly recommend that the administration independently explore other healthcare plan options in order to maintain our campus's access to PAMF. A separate plan could be created to provide access to PAMF/Sutter, much like that which was created in the past with the recently retired Western Health Advantage Plan, which aimed to increase healthcare access for UC Davis enrollees. During a UCFW meeting in July 2022, it emerged that some progress is possibly being made on this front. We await further information and a more formal announcement.

Anthem-Dignity Contract Termination and UC PPO Plans

In summer 2021, the campus was informed that Anthem Blue Cross, the insurance carrier of UC's PPO plans (non-Medicare), and Dignity Health, which includes Dominican Hospital in Santa Cruz, were not able to reach a contract agreement.¹⁶ As such, the contract ended effective July 15, 2021, and affected enrollees in the UC PPO plans: UC Care, Health Savings Plan, and CORE. All services for members of these plans received from Dignity Health and Dominican Hospital after July 15 were to be considered out-of-network and out-of-network deductibles and coinsurance rates would apply. However, on August 2, 2021, UC announced that a temporary solution would be provided as negotiations continued and regardless of whether an agreement was reached. Claims retroactive to July 15 would be processed after September 1, and members would be responsible for in-network cost-sharing.¹⁷ On August 14, 2021, Anthem Blue Cross and Dignity Health announced that they had reached an agreement on a continuing contract, and the terms of the agreement are retroactive to July 15, 2021, returning Dignity Health facilities to Anthem health plans

Consultation with UCSC Healthcare Facilitator

CFW consulted with UCSC Healthcare Facilitator Marianne McIvor in fall 2022. Compensation and Benefits Manager Madlyn Norman-Terrance and AVC and Chief Human Resources Officer Steven Stein were also in attendance. During the meeting, we discussed the challenges of finding primary care doctors that are accepting new patients, and issues with securing timely appointments with established primary care doctors in Santa Cruz. CFW was informed that at the time of the consultation there were no PAMF/UC Care primary physicians that were currently accepting new

¹⁶ Kletzer and Latham to UC Santa Cruz Community, 7/20/21, UC PPO plans impacted by Anthem Blue Cross-Dignity Health Contract Termination

¹⁷ UCSC Staff Human Resources Benefits Office to Members Who Opted in to Continue Anthem-Dignity Communications, 8/05/21, Re: UC Provides Temporary Solution to Anthem-Dignity Contract Termination as Negotiations Continue

patients, and that there was a similar issue with Blue and Gold/Physician's Medical Group providers with patients having to wait months to see a primary care physician. CFW considers this to be a crisis situation. Although we were additionally informed that our campus is working to bring UCSF primary care doctors closer to campus to increase access, it appears that our campus's access to care continues to erode.

We briefly discussed the high premium costs and instability of the UC Care PPO plan, which is the only PPO plan offered to UC employees, and noted that the plan is currently also the only way for our employees to access PAMF/Sutter providers. PAMF access must be affordable in order to be accessible. The need for a PPO plan that provides coverage out of state was also discussed. CFW will consider how it might advocate on both of these fronts in 2022-23.

IV. Childcare

CFW continues to monitor childcare on our campus as childcare needs have become particularly acute since the pandemic. Due to pending litigation, the building of a campus childcare facility is on hold. There was some progress on improving the back-up care program; however, more needs to be done.

In fall 2021, CFW consulted with former VCBAS Latham on the following childcare issues.

1. Members asked for an update on the building of childcare facilities on campus as part of the Student Housing West project, and were informed that it was still on hold due to legal action.
2. On the back-up care program, CFW expressed concerns on several aspects of the program, including the very limited services offered by Bright Horizons and available to UCSC,¹⁸ the lack of clarity in the information provided to faculty about the total cost and tax implications of using the service,¹⁹ and the lack of information about the usage of the program so far. Accordingly, CFW followed up with correspondence to CP/EVC Kletzer²⁰ to request an expansion beyond Bright Horizons affiliated services, to recommend some specific changes to the back-up care webpage for better transparency concerning costs, and to request quarterly reports on the number of uses of this program and on any reported issues.
3. 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 asked for consideration of providing subsidies for faculty, like those for students. Specifically, CFW requested that a workgroup, such as the one previously charged with determining access to the program, be charged to consider what a sliding scale or partially subsidized program might look like for UCSC employees, and provide recommendations for how such a model could be financially supported.
4. CFW requested routine updates on the status of childcare development on campus.

¹⁸ CFW to VCBAS Latham, 11/12/21, Re: Post Consultation - October 21, 2021

¹⁹ CFW to VCBAS Latham, 10/05/21, Re: Back-up Care and Information re: Total Cost to Users

²⁰ CFW to CP/EVC Kletzer, 3/31/22, Re: UCSC Back-up Care Program

CFW to CP/EVC Kletzer, 6/08/22, Re: Your 5/18/22 Correspondence on the UCSC Back-Up Care Program

Following the consultation, CFW was surprised to learn that Chancellor Larive had made the decision to have UCSC continue to provide in-house childcare services once the new center is built, thereby removing Bright Horizons from the childcare program.²¹ CFW regards this as a positive development, and was pleased to hear 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 childcare 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 and not cause further delay.

In winter 2022, CFW made a request to the Chancellor and the CP/EVC to provide immediate remediations for childcare needs.²² The committee suggested that the campus should consider and build on the wealth of ideas and recommendations made by various campus task forces for potential interim solutions for childcare that may be put in place before the long-term facility and program are built. For example, the 2011 Child Care Task Force (CCTF) submitted a supplemental report²³ 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). The supplemental report weighs the advantages and potential issues of each solution and is worth looking into with the current perspective and in greater depth than the 2011 CCTF was charged with.

CFW recognizes that childcare needs have intensified since the COVID-19 pandemic began. The advantages of the solutions in the report may now outweigh the issues of concern that were brought up ten years ago. Thus, CFW urges the administration to consider these potential solutions and other additional possibilities to provide faculty the much needed relief in the near term.

V. Back-up Care

The back-up care program was expanded to some extent in winter 2022 to include out-of-network services beyond Bright Horizons and increase the number of hours provided to faculty. However, faculty were desperately in need of more support, especially those with young children. In the effort to further improve the effectiveness of the program, CFW provided a list of recommendations to CP/EVC in March, 2022,²⁴ including:

1. Adding “How-To” instructions on [the campus website](#)²⁵ for using and getting reimbursed for the out-of-network options of the back-up care program.
2. Conducting a survey at the end of the first year to poll employees on their dependent care needs and their experience with the back-up care program to gauge the usage, understand

²¹ Chancellor Larive to CFW Chair Orlandi, et al., 10/21/21, Re: Preview: UCSC to continue in-house childcare services

²² CFW to Chancellor Larive and CP/EVC Kletzer, 1/13/22, Re: Immediate Remediations for Essential Needs - Childcare and Housing

²³ UCSC Child Care Task Force, Supplemental: Interim Solutions, February 28, 2011

²⁴ CFW to CP/EVC Kletzer, 3/31/22, Re: UCSC Back-Up Care Program

²⁵ <https://ches.ucsc.edu/back-up-care/>

the barriers that kept people from using the program despite a need, and seek general feedback on the program.

3. Consideration of a multi-pronged approach for further strengthening back-up care support. In addition to the program operated by Bright Horizons, CFW recommended a coalition with local care providers as a separate program that jointly contributes to the support system. Rather than relying solely on employees themselves finding an out-of-network provider in the time of need, the campus could provide a stronger infrastructure by seeking agreements from licensed care centers and licensed individual providers to be listed and contacted.

The CP/EVC responded to CFW's recommendations²⁶ and noted that as suggested, the website had been updated with step-by-step instructions, and mentioned plans for a survey in October 2022. However, with regards to CFW's third suggestion for seeking a coalition with local care providers, a suggestion was made that this was not necessary since many employees turn to friends and family for assistance when needed. CFW notes that UCSC has long perpetuated the idea that childcare is an individual's problem and thereby solutions around an individual's available resources are sufficient. 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 support the formation of a coalition with local care providers as a separate component to strengthen the support system UCSC can provide to employees. Further, CFW recommends that the campus serve as a liaison to encourage and increase provider participation in the Bright Horizons Back-Up Care network.

VI. Transportation and Parking

The Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) met 8 times in 2021-22. Representatives from CFW, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), and a faculty member at large were included in the committee membership. This year, the ACCTP considered short term planning and making adjustments to bus service based on usage. The ACCTP received reports that the 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. The installation of decks is slated for summer 2022. TAPS is looking into possible subsidies in order to incentivize users. UCSC participation in the program has functioned as a catalyst for other municipalities to participate, including, the City of Santa Cruz, the County of Santa Cruz, Capitola, and Cabrillo College.

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.

VII. Retirement

UC Retirement Administration Service Center (RASC)

²⁶ CP/EVC Kletzer to CFW Chair Orlandi, 5/18/22, Re: UCSC Back-Up Care Program

In addition to reports from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), of which Chair Orlandi is a member, the Chair of the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER) sits as an *ex officio* member on CFW, and brings matters of concern to retired faculty to the attention of the committee. CFW continues to be concerned about the generally poor service provided to UCSC emeriti faculty, retired staff, and their survivors by the UC Retirement Administrative Services Center (RASC). On February 17, 2022, CFW discussed and endorsed CER's *UCSC Faculty Retiree Experience with RASC, 2021 Report Update* (November 5, 2021), which summarized the experiences of UCSC emeriti faculty who retired between January 1 and July 1, 2021. Despite major changes in the management team and organizational structure at RASC, little appears to have improved in terms of the frontline service provided to retirees. The 2021 cohort of retirees continued to experience unreasonably long wait times for information from the RASC call center and secure messaging system, and often received inaccurate answers to their inquiries. They also reported significant delays in retirement processing, with most of those responding that they had yet to receive a pension check several months after their retirement date. Another recurring problem was that retirees were often dropped from their health and dental coverage, with no warning or notice, due to software glitches in the RASC system. CER's update on 2021 UCSC faculty retiree experiences was forwarded to UCFW, which considered the report at its March meeting, but declined to endorse it. However, the report was forwarded to the UCSC Senate Executive Committee, which did endorse it, and sent it forward to the Academic Council, who also endorsed it, and forwarded it to President Drake for administrative action. Anecdotal information suggests that retirement processing times may be improving, but that response times through the call center and secure messaging system are getting worse (with response times of up to a week). Next year's CFW should continue to work with CER to monitor faculty retiree and survivor experiences with RASC moving forward.

VIII. International Faculty Welfare

This year CFW received repeated complaints from several international faculty of severe problems obtaining and retaining visa status to continue working at UCSC. Some faculty members risked being deported because of delays in the processing of their green card. Other faculty members risked losing their health insurance coverage during the pandemic due to issues with the renewal of their visas.

In response to these problems CFW wrote a letter to CPEVC Kletzer,²⁷ and consulted with VPDUE Hughey and AVP/Senior International Officer Becky George on May 12, 2022. The consultation included a general orientation on standard visa issuance processes, and a discussion of current bottle-necks, staff turnover, and recent and planned improvements in the International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS) unit.

The COVID pandemic seems to have created a perfect storm of visa issuance problems. Many embassies and consulates closed and/or processed fewer requests. The US Citizenship and Immigrations Services (USCIS) Department was backlogged, increasing the typical approval time from 6 months to 9 months. In addition, we learned that USCIS removed customer service from its mission, which led to more difficulty in getting answers to standard inquiries.

²⁷ CFW Chair Orlandi to CP/EVC Kletzer, 4/12/22, Re: International Faculty Welfare

AVP George shared that premium processing is available for a fee of \$2,500 to expedite H1B petitions, and a recommendation has been made to our campus departments to pay this fee so that these petitions may be processed in 2 weeks, rather than 9 months. CFW was also informed that the premium process will soon be expanded to J visa petitions. Although either the department or individual scholar pays for premium processing, CFW contends that no individual should have to pay these fees, and strongly recommends a campus standard be created to include these fees in all approvals of international faculty hires (e.g., divisions should set aside \$2,500 to cover premium fees in the case that international faculty are hired.)

Members were concerned to hear about the recent staff turnover in International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS). Staff and business continuity in a unit like ISSS is absolutely essential. As such, CFW was happy to hear that the 2 newly hired Scholar Advisors appear to be interested in staying long term. We were additionally pleased to hear that there will be cross training so that both advisors will be able to assist with H1B, scholar, and student issues.

We understand that a new and improved database was purchased in 2019, which has been customized and will enable scholars to upload documents directly into the database and enable ISSS to communicate directly with scholars through the system, thereby improving workload.

At the time of consultation, CFW was informed that there was no mechanism in place to track and assess problems and get feedback on petitions and ISSS issues that arise. However, during our discussion, it was noted that the new system can timestamp and track timing from filing to approval, and the ISSS team can now look at timelines to ensure that all is going well. AVP George additionally suggested that a survey might also be a good idea and noted that she would speak with her team about the possibility of developing a survey for H petitions. CFW strongly supports both of these proposed methods of evaluation.

With regards to permanent residency petitions, we were informed that UC contracts one of three with outside attorneys approved by the UC. In terms of assessment/evaluation, CFW recommended a tracking system be put in place to assure attorney accountability and follow through. In addition, a feedback system, such as a survey, should be offered to scholars that interact with the attorney.

In sum, there are several faculty concerns in this area and some reasons for optimism. CFW should continue monitoring the situation in 2022-2023.

Acknowledgments

The committee would like to thank those who consulted with, collaborated with, and/or provided information to the committee this year: CP/EVC Lori Kletzer, VCBAS Sarah Latham, AVP Grace McClintock and APO Staff, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) Chair Stefano Profumo, Professor Steve McKay, Healthcare Facilitator Marianne McIvor, Compensation and Benefits Manager Madlyn Norman-Terrance, AVC and Chief Human Resource Officer Steven Stein, VPDUE Richard Hughey and AVP/Senior International Officer Becky George, Committee Analyst Jaden Silva-Espinoza, Academic Senate Director Matthew Mednick, and Academic Senate Chair David Brundage and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC).

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Yihsu Chen

Christopher Connery (*F, W*)

Tsim Schneider (*F, S*)

Gustavo Vasquez

Su-hua Wang

Judith Habicht Mauche, *ex officio*

Nico Orlandi, Chair

August 15, 2022