

Committee on Faculty Welfare

2000-2001 Annual Report

The past academic year was a period of very active engagement on the part of the Committee on Faculty Welfare with respect to a host of problematic issues. Housing and child care were at the forefront of the Committee's concerns, but the areas of health care, parking, the retirement system, and spousal employment also claimed its attention. This report can highlight only the most significant issues the Committee addressed during 2000-2001, but senators who have questions about other specific CFW activities should not hesitate to make contact with any of its members.

Child Care

UCSC began planning for the construction of a major child-care facility nearly twenty years ago. Though the projected facility is intended to serve a wide variety of campus constituencies, the hope is that it will very substantially increase what at present is an almost negligible number of placements allocated specifically for the use of faculty. The past year has seen dramatic swings in the prospects for realizing this objective, but the Committee on Faculty Welfare feels that, on balance, the campus plan has materially advanced, justifying an attitude of guarded optimism.

This was not the Committee's view at the start of 2000-01, when it reluctantly came to the conclusion that campus plans had stalled. The Program Planning Guide, completed in 1996, had yet to be converted into a practical building plan, and no concrete funding strategy had yet been devised. The Committee on Faculty Welfare therefore spent much of this past year working with a variety of partners among the faculty and in the Administration, trying to move the planning process forward. One form this took was the Committee's participation in a consultative group convened by the Advancement Office, which met through the fall quarter. It was instrumental in getting the campus to engage a consulting architect, develop a site-specific design concept, obtain community input, and begin to pin down projected costs and potential outside donors.

Funding prospects brightened when the Regents proposed that \$40 million be written into the University budget for capital projects and operating expenses in the area of child care. This was encouraging news indeed, but initial hopes were temporarily dashed when that item was subsequently deleted from the Governor's budget. In the end, thanks in no small part to a crucial intervention by Chancellor Greenwood in hearings before State Senator Jackie Speiers, the Office of the President decided that the need was so urgent that \$20 million in matching funds would be set aside for child-care projects proposed by the individual campuses.

To capture systemwide funds at the highest possible level will require a local contribution well in excess of the campus reserve that was earmarked for this purpose as early as the 1980s. Provost Simpson has made a commitment of \$500,000 in UCSC resources, agreeing to act as funder of last resort. Chancellor Greenwood has informed the Office of the President of our campus's intention to secure at least \$1 million in systemwide funds by coming up with not less than \$1.5 million in resources generated at the campus level.

UCSC's efforts to obtain outside funding have likewise had their ups and down this past summer. The Committee on Faculty Welfare was greatly heartened to learn that the Packard Foundation had responded in a very encouraging way to the campus's announced intention to apply for \$3 million. It initially indicated, in an informal communication, that it would welcome an application for a \$1 million grant toward construction costs, with the balance to be supplied by loans. There was even thought to be some possibility of increasing the amount covered by an outright Packard grant on the basis of a direct appeal from the Chancellor to Foundation trustees. The Committee on Faculty Welfare is convinced that the distinctive academic component of the facility that UCSC has planned, when persuasively presented by knowledgeable faculty members who work in related areas, have the potential to make such an appeal successful. Unfortunately, the campus has since been informed that stock market fluctuations have affected the underlying endowment of the Foundation, raising the question of whether the originally envisioned grant may have to be cut back or spread over time. The campus is still in the process of assessing what impact, if any, this news is likely to have.

Over the coming year, the Committee on Faculty Welfare expects to continue its advocacy on behalf of a Child Care Center and to press for the refinement and specification of the campus strategy. It also sees the need to address the problem of assuring ongoing institutional oversight of the campus's existing programs and the stability of their operational funding. But this is also a time to take heart at the genuine progress that has recently been achieved and to thank the many groups and key individuals with whom CFW has worked on this issue. There are many people who deserve recognition, but the Committee would like to single out Director of Child Care Services Lise Bixler, Professor Catherine Cooper, Associate Vice Chancellor Jean Marie Scott, Vice Chancellor Francisco Hernandez, Vice Chancellor Ron Suduiko, as well as Provost Simpson and Chancellor Greenwood for bringing us to what the Committee fervently hopes is the verge of success in this important enterprise. UCSC now has the elements of an actual building plan, and nearly half the cost of the proposed facility has been accounted for through campus and systemwide resources. These developments have created a sense of momentum that will, the CFW sincerely hopes, carry the project to a successful conclusion.

Health Care

One of the most gratifying bits of news the Committee has to report is the creation of a new position in the campus Benefits Office titled the "Health-Care Facilitator". The University Committee on Faculty Welfare played a crucial role in the creation of this innovative program and our local Committee on Faculty Welfare argued strenuously and successfully that our campus should be among the first to have such a position funded by UCOP because of the special challenges of the local health-care situation. Benefits Manager Julie Putnam has personally overseen the recruitment and training of Frank Trueba, who has spent much of the summer learning the intricacies of the UC benefits system. Beginning this fall, UCSC employees will be able to take health-care-related problems such as indecipherable bills, denials of medical referrals, or disputes over coverage to the Health Care Facilitator, who will serve as interpreter, liaison, and advocate vis à vis HMOs and health care providers.

There are, however, some dark clouds on the horizon. UC is by no means immune from the rapidly increasing costs that are affecting the health-care sector at large. Contracts are being re-negotiated at this time. Though no details are yet available, the possibility of higher premiums and/or reduced coverage looms.

In addition, the issue of out-of-area benefits has become increasingly prominent. Some of the problems result from differences in the contracting practices of Aetna Health, which took over the administration of the UC Care program from Prudential last year. The result is that members of this plan who seek out-of-area services must either choose from the limited number of "National Advantage" providers (who have agreed to offer to individuals the same discounted rate they offer to Aetna) or be prepared to pay the difference between the discounted rate and the "usual and customary" fees out of pocket. A second problem arises when UC employees affiliated with HMOs move out of the service area (Santa Cruz County.) They then face a choice of affiliating with PacifiCare and continuing to use providers located within the county; or of switching to UC Care out-of-area coverage. To some degree, this dilemma is a product of rising housing costs that are forcing people to consider relocating to outlying areas. At present, this situation affects only a limited number of UCSC faculty (a total of nine, some of whom are not just out of county, but out of state, perhaps on leave), but CFW has begun to monitor the issue of out-of-area benefits closely.

Housing

The transformation of the local housing market has drastically affected the welfare of recent cohorts of faculty hires. Until two years ago, no junior faculty member who applied for on-campus housing had ever failed to be offered the chance to purchase a unit within the first two years of employment. During the past year, on the contrary, just one of eleven names on this list actually received an offer of the opportunity to buy. This represents a sharp and sudden deterioration in the prospects for new faculty, who often find that they are both unable to enter the local real estate market and unable to gain access to less expensive on-campus housing.

More than a year ago, the Committee on Faculty Welfare joined with the administration in an effort to document and analyze the nature and extent of the problem. Working with then-Associate Vice Provost Faye Crosby, and subsequently with Assistant Director Of Institutional Research Julian Fernald and the personnel analysts in each of the academic divisions, data was collected on faculty attitudes concerning housing issues as well as on the actual impact the housing crisis was having on faculty hiring. This took the form of a two-fold initiative: first, a survey of a sample of current faculty (stratified by rank and division); second, a database which compiled the specific reasons for the success or failure of every recruitment undertaken over the most recent three-year period. The resulting report, "Faculty Recruitment and Retention at UCSC", established the wide-ranging influence of housing, among several other issues.¹

¹ The report can be accessed from the Committee on Faculty Welfare's web page, at "<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cfw/index.html>".

One of the changes the Committee on Faculty Welfare has supported is the recommendation that Mortgage Origination Program funds be over-allocated and that any resulting risk of over-commitment be pooled at the campus level. The Administration has successfully implemented such a scheme, in addition to which the campus received a fresh allocation of MOP funds from the Office of the President. Both of these steps have gone some way toward meeting increased demand for these loans in the near term.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare has been outspoken in its support for the projected on-campus housing development in Inclusion Area D, which it considers the most important means at the University's disposal of remedying the housing crisis in the medium term. This project made significant progress during the past year. A Master Plan and Building Committee (on which CFW was represented) worked with design consultants to come up with a plan for land use. This involved complex interactions with campus units (the Farm and Garden Project, the Arboretum), community organizations (an adjacent Neighborhood Association), and State-wide agencies (charged with oversight of the campus Historic District or the protection of potentially endangered species, for example). Accommodations have been arrived at in some cases, though a number of issues have yet to be finally resolved. Nevertheless, the campus does now have a Master Plan, approved by the campus Advisory Committee for Facilities, that would result in the construction of ninety-five units, most of which would be sold upon the project's completion, now slated for late 2003.² The Committee on Faculty Welfare also participated actively in public meetings aimed at providing information to the broader community and receiving feedback on the University's plans for the development of on-campus housing. This included the use of data collected in the previously mentioned recruitment and retention survey as a basis for a presentation on the need for affordable faculty housing.

A meeting between the chair of the Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Senate Special Committee on Housing took place over the past summer. It offered an opportunity to inform members of the new Committee of the various initiatives in the area of housing that are currently underway both on campus and at the systemwide level. The Committee on Faculty Welfare anticipates that once the Special Committee has had an opportunity to define its specific goals, these discussions will resume, and that the Special Committee will ultimately report its findings to the Committee on Faculty Welfare.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare also responded to a request from Provost Simpson at the very end of the year to review the policies regarding the allocation of for-sale, on-campus housing. Because he indicated his desire to bring any changes before the Campus Welfare Committee, CFW requested clarification concerning the ground rules that would apply in the allocation of units in Inclusion Area D. The Committee was informed that the priority that has previously been assigned to faculty hires would continue to apply to that project, though not

² This projected completion date is obviously subject to factors beyond the University's control, the most pressing of which at present is the review of environmental impacts.

necessarily thereafter. The Committee on Faculty Welfare solicited the views of the Senate Special Committee on Housing and sought information from the staff of the Campus Housing

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ
Committee on Faculty Welfare

AS/SCP/1327-5

Office before conducting its own internal deliberations. In the end, the Committee recommended changes to the allocation system that would result within a two-year span (i.e., before the completion of Inclusion Area D) in the elimination of the distinction between faculty hired "more than" and "less than" two years previous, eliminating an anomaly created by the tightening of the housing market over the past few years. As of this writing, the Committee has not learned the final disposition of the recommendations it made.

This year, for the first time, the Committee on Faculty Welfare reviewed the three waiting lists of faculty members who wish to buy on-campus housing units. The Administration had requested that the Committee undertake this task as a way of assuring applicants that the lists, which are confidentially maintained by the Housing Office staff, are being fairly and accurately administered. In brief, the Committee on Faculty Welfare found that the rules were being faithfully observed and that the system, though complex, has not been subject to tampering or inappropriate manipulation. Copies of the CFW report are available through the Faculty Housing Office.

It also seems worthwhile inserting a word suggestive of the efforts under way at the systemwide level. Because of the nature and magnitude of the sums required to address the housing crisis, and because this is a problem which affects virtually all UC campuses, most solutions will require University-wide action. The Committee on Faculty Welfare continues to work in cooperation with its systemwide equivalent, the University Committee on Faculty Welfare, on promising approaches to this crucial problem. One of the initiatives with greatest potential to improve the situation of many faculty is a proposal, developed by UCFW and now under review by a committee chaired by Vice President Mullinex, to use a small portion of the UCRP funds already committed to fixed income investments as a basis for an equity-sharing program that would benefit University employees. Although the need to protect the integrity of the retirement system and the special strictures imposed by the Internal Revenue Service will require careful analysis of the long-term implications of such a program, UCFW anticipates an initial response from the Office of the President this fall.

Parking and Transportation

The Committee was consulted concerning the elimination of Jitney service to UC Berkeley. Though initially concerned about the implications of this change, it received satisfactory reassurances from the Administration that Inter-Library Loan and Slug Express services would continue unimpeded. After inspecting data which demonstrated a very low level of ridership, the Committee on Faculty Welfare concentrated on identifying alternatives (for example, the campus rental carpool) for faculty who might need occasional alternatives for travel to UC Berkeley.

During 1999-00, the Committee on Faculty Welfare was pleased to receive from the Administration a revised set of campus policies concerning parking. The principal changes included a commitment that short-term interest payments generated by parking fees would

remain within the parking budget rather than being diverted to other campus needs, however laudable. The administration also provided its assurance that non-State-funded projects would in the future be required to cover the replacement cost of any parking spaces destroyed by new

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ
Committee on Faculty Welfare

AS/SCP/1327-6

construction. During this past year, the Committee on Faculty Welfare wrote to the administration to say that, while it was gratified at these changes, it wished to make the case that the policy on replacement spaces should apply equally to State-funded projects when these destroy parking spaces that have already been paid for by user fees. The Committee has as yet received no response to its representations.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare has worked productively with various campus administrators (in particular, Director Wes Scott, Associate Vice Chancellor Meredith Michaels, and Vice Chancellor Tom Vani) to develop a common frame of reference for managing parking policy. In general terms, the Committee's objectives include stabilizing (but not necessarily freezing) parking fees so that the campus might over time accumulate a reasonable parking reserve, helping to ensure that any increases in parking fees would be moderate and predictable. To this end, the Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Administration have been studying the approaches adopted by other campuses in the UC system and other California institutions of higher education. The Committee looks forward to continuing that dialogue this fall.

Retirement Issues

The Committee discussed proposals brought before the University Committee on Faculty Welfare for modifications to the "age factors" used to compute retirement benefits. It supported the plan ultimately adopted by University Committee on Faculty Welfare, subsequently endorsed by the Academic Council, and finally approved by the Regents, resulting in small but significant improvement in the age-factors calculations. To be specific, the changes produced a slight flattening of the curve and a modest increase in the highest value (now 2.5% at age sixty) credited for each year of service at the time of retirement.

The Retirement system, despite the recent downturn in financial markets, remains significantly overfunded, and there seems to be little immediate likelihood that a resumption of direct contributions will be necessary.

Spousal Employment Issues

The Committee met with Nancy Aebersold, Coordinator of the campus's Office of Dual-Career Services, to learn how its efforts to address the needs of faculty spouses have fared. CFW subsequently commented on the report prepared at the conclusion of the new unit's first year of operation. The Committee on Faculty Welfare is cooperating with Coordinator Aebersold in creating a database and network of existing faculty spouses willing to serve as contacts or mentors for those newly arrived. In general, the conclusion of the Committee on Faculty Welfare is that this program has been highly successful, serving a significant number of clients and providing material assistance to those seeking employment (especially in non-academic jobs, which are the objective of the great majority of those served.) The Administration apparently

shares the Committee's estimation of the value of the program, as the Director's part-time position has been modestly augmented.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ
Committee on Faculty Welfare

AS/SCP/1327-7

The Committee on Faculty Welfare had intended to initiate a broader discussion of spousal employment issues on our campus. Although a sub-committee of CFW members has met to outline a plan of attack, the volume of other pressing business required that this issue be deferred to the upcoming year.

Miscellaneous Issues

The Committee on Faculty Welfare provided feedback concerning changes to the campus calendar.

The Committee responded to an Administration request to comment on alternative strategies for the expansion of summer session. Though the Administration subsequently decided to press for accelerated implementation, the CFW response had counseled a deliberate approach that would allow UCSC to learn from the experience of other UC campuses that will precede us along this path.

The Committee was dismayed to learn in the course of the past year that long-time benefits officer Bill Brooks would be leaving our campus to take a job at UC Davis (a result, in part, of the high cost of local housing.) As many of you are no doubt aware, Bill was an exceptional individual who worked tirelessly and effectively on behalf of all UCSC employees. UC Davis is fortunate indeed to have stolen him away. However, we are pleased to report that his position has since been filled by another excellent long-term University employee, Elaine Wedegaertner whose acquaintance you are invited to make.

Consultations

Members of the Committee on Faculty Welfare sat, *ex officio* or by appointment, on the following campus bodies: Senate Emeriti Relations Committee, the Campus Welfare Committee, the Transportation Advisory Committee, the Master Plan and Building Committee for Inclusion Area D, the Senate Advisory Committee, and the University Advancement Child Care Planning Committee.

CFW invited to its meetings the following campus administrators: Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Human Resources Barbara Brogan, Coordinator Nancy Aebersold, and Director of Child Care Services Lise Bixler.

In addition to those previously mentioned, members of the Committee on Faculty Welfare met with (or sometimes consulted by telephone with) the following individuals: Associate Chancellor Julia Armstrong-Zwart, Assistant Director Elise Levinson, Lecturer Chris Rocco, Dean's Assistant Ellen Berger, Coordinator Anne Callahan, Manager Jan Cloud, Coordinator Kathy Beattie, Professor Faye Crosby, Dean Dave Klinger, Dean Marty Chemers, Lise Bixler, Director Fran Owens, and Vice Provost Linda Goff.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ
Committee on Faculty Welfare

AS/SCP/1327-8

Respectfully submitted,

THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Ilan Benjamin
Maureen Callanan
Pascale Gaitet
Anatole Leikin
Ellen Suckiel
Mark Traugott, Chair

September 27, 2001