

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Annual Report 2023-24

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), the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER), the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), the systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), and the systemwide Health Care Task Force (HCTF).

CFW's work in 2023-24 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

Chair Sher provided an oral report on the following salary analysis findings at the spring Academic Senate Meeting on May 22, 2024. The full CFW Faculty Salary Report may be found on the CFW Senate webpage.¹

A. Background:

CFW has monitored faculty salaries for over a decade with the main focus on the parity of the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) faculty salaries and those of the faculty in other University of California (UC) campuses. In addition to tracking the gap between the faculty salary at UCSC and other UC campuses, CFW has consistently argued that such analysis needs to include cost of living. Even though the Academic Senate issued a resolution in 2019-2020 asking for the cost of living adjustment (COLA) to be included in annual administrative salary analysis reports, CFW's salary reports continue to be the only reports that include a cost of living analysis.

B. Key Findings:

CFW found that based on the latest available UC-wide salary data, for the year of 2022, most UCSC faculty are paid less than their peers in other UC campuses. The comparison was done for the median salaries for the three ranks (Assistant, Associate, Full Professor), on both the Regular (REG) and Business/Economics/Engineering (BEE) Professor salary scales. The UCSC median was lower for Assistant and Full Professor ranks in the REG series and for the Full Professor rank in the BEE series. Significantly, when adjusted for the cost of living, median salaries of all UCSC Professor ranks within both series became lower than the corresponding median salaries in all UC campuses.

The Special Salary Practice (SSP) instituted in 2008 had an explicit goal of equating UCSC faculty salaries to the median salaries across the UC system (9 campuses). This goal has not been achieved. Our previous analysis showed that the modification of the SSP in 2017

¹ Committee on Faculty Welfare Homepage: <https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cfw-committee-on-faculty-welfare/index.html>

had been premature.² Figures 1 and 3 show that for most categories UCSC salaries that were behind in 2018, remain so in 2022. In fall 2023, CFW jointly with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), called for the reinstatement of the original and more generous SSP to reduce the growing gap in salaries.³ The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) concurred with the call to reinstate the original SSP, and expressed the continued need for proactivity regarding faculty salaries at UCSC.⁴

This year's analysis of the 2022 data showed a substantial decrease in the gap, which is likely due to a combination of two factors. First, a one-time salary equity increase made in 2022, where the off-scale salary portions of the faculty at the lower end of the salary distribution were increased in an automatically prescribed way, and second, an annual inflation increase that was applied, for the first time in many years, to the full salary, instead of just the on-scale component. CFW believes that it is necessary to continue the latter practice, and we are encouraged that the 2023 annual increase was applied to the full salary, and that the 2024 one is planned to be done in the same way.

We were informed only recently during the May 2024 Senate meeting, that there was an agreement made between the administration and the Santa Cruz Faculty Association (SCFA) that the one-time salary equity increases will continue with some periodicity. Given the detailed discussion and consultation that CFW and the Senate were involved in around establishing an ongoing Salary Equity Program (SER) tied to individual faculty personnel actions, we were surprised by this news. Given that we received it at the end of the year and no details were provided, we expect that CFW be updated on, and opine on, campus plans for salary equity increases during the next (2024-2025) academic year.

CFW would like to note that the effects of the 2022 equity increase have not been assessed, and believe that such an assessment needs to be done by the administrator in order to inform future equity increases. We strongly recommend that such an assessment be added to the annual reports of UCSC Faculty Salary Competitiveness within the UC that are drafted by the Academic Personnel Office (APO).

Housing prices in the Santa Cruz area make a large contribution to the high cost of living that UCSC employees face. This has been exacerbated during the pandemic, when many houses in Santa Cruz were bought by people from Silicon Valley. CFW analyzed UCSC faculty salary changes over the last seven years relative to the changes in median housing costs in Santa Cruz county. The analysis shows that housing affordability has not yet recovered to pre-pandemic levels.

In summary, lagging faculty compensation is especially worrying in the light of the UCSC's ongoing effort to recruit talented and diverse new faculty. Given the severe crisis

² Committee on Faculty Welfare Annual Report 2022-23

³ CFW Chair Sher and CAP Co-Chairs Callanan and Gillman to Chancellor Larive and CP/EVC Kletzer, 12/07/24, Re: UCSC Faculty Salary Competitiveness and the Special Salary Practice

⁴ Senate Chair Gallagher to Chancellor Larive and CP/EVC Kletzer, 1/29/24, Re: Concurrence Letter of Support for Reinstatement of Special Salary Program (SSP) and Joint Working Group

in housing availability and affordability in the Santa Cruz area, elevating UCSC faculty salaries to be on par with other UC campuses is even more critical.

II. Other Faculty Salary Issues

Cost of Living Adjustment Consultation with Miriam Greenberg and Steve McKay

Cost of living varies significantly between locations of UC campuses, with Santa Cruz being among the most expensive. In order to have a more meaningful comparison of UC faculty salaries with that of other campuses, CFW and the Academic Senate have long advocated for a cost of living adjustment (COLA) to be included in the annual administrative comparative salary report. Unfortunately, this request has not been honored.

The Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) has raised concerns about the difficulty in conducting an accurate COLA analysis. She suggested that since the largest contribution to the high cost of living in Santa Cruz is the high cost of housing, cost of living does not affect all ranks of faculty the same as Associate and Full Professors are more likely to own a home than Assistant Professors, and are therefore not impacted as much. CFW members discussed possible cost of living disparities in detail, and concluded that while the impact of housing prices is indeed different for different groups of faculty, the difference does not eliminate the need for COLA inclusion in the analysis. CFW notes that faculty are hired at all ranks, including Associate and Full Professors, and faculty who own homes may be negatively affected by the inability to secure affordable housing for their grown children and/or other family members. If UCSC is to be able to attract and retain high quality faculty, new hires and existing faculty need to be able to afford housing in the area. Furthermore, the addition of COLA does not upstage the goal for UCSC salaries to be at or above the median of the 9 campuses, as stated in 2008 at the beginning of the Special Salary Program.⁵ Instead, COLA adds a valuable dimension to comparative analysis that should not be dismissed. Rather it should be discussed, and the findings and implications used to inform future policy decisions. For example, if Assistant Professor salaries at UCSC are at the medium of 9 campuses' level, but are significantly lower with COLA, we cannot rest assured that we will be competitive in attracting the best new faculty to come to our campus. This kind of analysis is impossible without COLA, and is not affected by the possibility that housing prices may impact faculty ranks to varying degrees.

In order to discover whether it would be possible to have a more nuanced cost of living analysis that would ascertain relative impacts of different expenses (e.g. housing, childcare, food, etc.), CFW invited Prof. Miriam Greenberg and Prof. Steve McKay from the Sociology Department to consult with CFW on April 18, 2024. Professors Greenberg and McKay led the development of the cost of living calculator for UCSC graduate students and have substantial expertise in this area.⁶ We discussed the possibility of creating a similar calculator for faculty with the specific goal of being able to do the calculations not just for UCSC, but for other campuses as well. Professors Greenberg and McKay informed the committee that such a tool could be developed using publicly available data on the cost of living in areas surrounding UC campuses. The endeavor would require funding to support a graduate student for a limited amount of time, similar to what was done when

⁵ Senate-Administration Task Force on Faculty Salaries Report, September 10, 2008

⁶ Greenberg, McKay, et al., 2021. *No Place Like Home, Affordable Housing in Crisis, Santa Cruz County, CA*. https://transform.ucsc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/No_Place_Like_Home_Report_2021.pdf

the graduate cost of living calculator was developed. Funding for the original graduate student project was provided by the Graduate Division. It is not clear where the funding for a faculty cost of living calculator would come from, but CFW will continue this conversation with the administration in 2024-25.

Special Salary Program Modification

In collaboration with CAP, CFW drafted a letter to the administration calling for the reinstatement of the original SSP, and the creation of a joint administration/Senate working group to review the SSP as a whole and how it addresses both inter- and intra-campus issues of equity and merit.⁷ The letter and its rationale has been discussed within the SEC, and SEC supported the request.⁸ Unfortunately, there was no response from the administration. CFW will continue to monitor the issue and advocate for any and all measures aimed at establishing equity in compensation between faculty at UCSC and at other campuses.

III. Housing

Employee Housing Repricing Program

CFW has consistently highlighted the need to re-envision the Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program. The 2024-25 UCSC Re-Pricing Program Recommendation was prepared by Real Estate and Contract Services (RECS) under the Division of Finance, Operations, and Administration, and proposed a price increase of 2.51%. In the response to the 2023-24 program recommendation to increase pricing by 5.01%, CFW had argued that the committee remains unconvinced that the program can meet the goals that were set for it in 2007 and that a reconceptualization of the aims of this program was needed.⁹ CP/EVC Kletzer had informed CFW that a new program would be developed in collaboration with the Senate in the spirit of shared governance. When asked for an update on the plans to re-envision the Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program and when the 2024-25 proposal would be sent to the Senate for review during a consultation with VCFOA Ed Reskin on May 2, 2024, CFW was informed that the VCFOA had tasked his staff to work on the re-envisioning in 2023-24 year and that they worked on it for roughly six months, but ultimately decided that the task had too many variables and was too complex. CFW was additionally informed that the recommendation for 2024-25 would be based on the old program. CFW found this announcement extremely troubling. CFW has repeatedly noted that the Re-Pricing Program as it stands now is outdated, and the committee understood that the administration agreed with this assessment and was interested in working with the Senate to retool the program. The Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program was conceived before the housing crisis of 2008 and the COVID-19 pandemic. Both events affected the housing market significantly. Last year, CFW did not approve the proposed increase specifically because the underlying program is outdated and not accomplishing many of the program's intended goals, and the justification for the proposed increase was not clear.

⁷ CFW Chair Sher, CAP Co-Chair Callanan, CAP Co-Chair Gillman, 12/07/23, Re: UCSC Faculty Salary Competitiveness and the Special Salary Practice

⁸ Senate Chair Gallagher to Chancellor Larive and CP/EVC Kletzer, 1/29/24, Re: Concurrence Letter of Support for Reinstatement of Special Salary Program (SSP) and Joint Working Group

⁹ CFW Chair Sher to Senate Chair Gallagher, 4/027/23, Re: Divisional Review - Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendation (for 2023-24)

This year, the Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program recommended a 2.51% increase to the price of faculty housing units in 2024-25¹⁰, which will put the program units at approximately 45.7% of 2023 market rates. CFW continues to be concerned that these increases appear arbitrary, even as we understand the need to create reserves for renovation and maintenance costs. Last year's price increase was 5.01% (which would have put the housing units at 38.6% of 2022 Santa Cruz market sales), in 2022-23, a 2.43% increase was proposed and was rejected by CFW, in 2021-22 there was a proposed 2.77% increase. Our central questions about how the university hopes to achieve its aim of offering faculty affordable housing while also hoping to generate revenue and seed capital through a price increase via this program, remain unanswered. For these reasons, CFW did not support the proposed increase for 2024-25.¹¹ The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) raised similar concerns in its response and also did not support the proposal for 2024-25.¹² In their proposal responses, both committees called on the administration to make the re-envisioning of the Employee Housing Resale Pricing Program a top priority for 2024-25.

With 62 for-rent employee housing units coming online near Delaware Avenue in the near future, and a Request for Proposals (RFP) planned for Ranch View Terrace, Phase II (RVT2), the task of developing a new Employee Housing re-pricing program is even more urgent. Making any addition to the campus' housing stock without new pricing and occupancy policies would be irresponsible and have deleterious effects on the overall sustainability of the employee housing program, and our campus's ability to recruit and retain exceptional faculty and staff in one of the nation's most expensive places to live. As such, CFW expects the formation of a new Employee Housing re-pricing program to be at the top of the list of both administration and Senate action items for 2024-25.

New Off-Campus Employee Housing

Members learned that the campus has entered into an agreement with a developer to deliver 161 rental housing units (62 for employees, 99 for students) near Delaware. An announcement about this project was made during Chancellor remarks at the May 22, 2023 Academic Senate Meeting. CFW has been informed that there is a requirement for 7 of the 62 employee units to be below market rate and that 12 units will be workforce housing between 80% and 120% of the area median rent price. The campus will be leasing the housing from the developer with an option to buy in 6 years. While leasing, the campus will then rent the units to employees. This addition to the employee housing stock will need to be incorporated into the new pricing and occupancy policies, making the development of both policies that much more urgent. We were informed that this housing project will be completed in two years, i.e. fall 2026.

Ranch View Terrace, Phase II (RVT2)

We were informed that a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the construction of RVT2 is scheduled to go out summer, 2024. CFW is gravely concerned that the mode of occupancy of the new units (for rent) will be locked into the RFP. While we understand that rental housing is the preferred model for developers, it is not clear to us, in the absence of a consultation with the Senate or other stakeholder groups, that a housing project with rental units only will be optimal for our community

¹⁰ UCSC Re-Pricing Program Recommendation (2024-2025), Prepared by Real Estate & Contract Services, February 8, 2024

¹¹ CFW Chair Sher to Senate Chair Gallagher, 6/12/24, Re: Employee Housing Program: 2024-2025 Resale Pricing Program Recommendation

¹² CPB Chair Kudela to Senate Chair Gallagher, 6/10/24, Re: Employee Housing Repricing Proposal 2024-25

and meet our campus' needs. For example, depending on the rental rates, which are unknown to us at the moment, occupants might not be able to accumulate sufficient funds to successfully move to ownership (or even renting) in the surrounding market. Furthermore, an addition of 62 rental units near Delaware makes a need for additional for-rent housing on campus at least questionable, if not obsolete. CFW does not possess the necessary expertise or data to propose a specific ratio of for rent and for sale housing for RVT2. At the same time, we are certain that a new occupancy and pricing program for RVT2 needs to be carefully drafted and vetted with stakeholders (the Academic Senate and staff). This new program should be finalized before the occupancy rules for RVT2 are set.

CFW contends that an RFP for RVT2 should include both for rent and for sale options, and should go out to a wide audience of developers. Moreover, the evaluation process for the bids that do come in should involve a diverse group of stakeholders and bids should be evaluated from all angles, including occupancy and pricing rules that would best serve our campus. This would allow us to make the most optimal decision on the occupancy and price model. We hope that the RFP makes it clear that rental and for sale prices need to be competitive, i.e. below the current market, if we are to accomplish our campus's goal of providing affordable housing to attract and retain faculty and staff.

It is unfortunate, given this context, that the RVT2 Implementation Committee was disbanded. Some of the issues mentioned above could have been discussed within this committee, which had a CFW representative, and for which CFW had requested CPB representation as well.¹³ CFW members hope that the committee can be reinstated or a similar committee of stakeholders with Senate representation (CFW and CPB) could be constituted, that may act in an advisory capacity for the RVT2 project and perhaps additional on and off campus employee housing projects.

Shared Equity/Appreciation Program

In May 2024, we were provided an update on a potential shared equity/appreciation program, wherein UCSC would assist a limited number of employees with a housing down payment, and then share any appreciation when the property is sold or refinanced. We believe this could be a promising program that would help fill the void left by the *Landed* shared equity program, which is no longer available. We were informed that this new program will be administered by California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA) with rules set up by UC, and that UCSC and possibly a few other campuses will participate. CalHFA has run a similar program called California Dream, and that experience has been helpful in assisting our campus in thinking through a potential program, we were informed. We understand that initial funds to help with down payments would come from the campus. We were happy to learn that these start-up funds would be categorized as an investment rather than as an expenditure with returns in the form of a share of appreciation.

We assume that the funds available to start this program will be limited and as such, that only a small number of employees will be able to benefit from the program at any given time. Given that it can take a number of years for a house to be resold or refinanced, and that the demand for down payment assistance is high, CFW members are concerned about the length of time it would take for the program to see returns on its investments and therefore the total number of employees that could participate in such a program. We would also like to have more information about the

¹³ CFW Chair Sher to CP/EVC Kletzer, 3/09/23, Re: RVT2 Implementation Committee

qualification/selection process that will be used to determine who may participate. Much thought will need to be put into the development of such a program so that the benefits outweigh the costs, and so that it may be offered in a fair and equitable way. We understand that pending concurrence from the University of California Office of the President (UCOP), the hope is that the program would go on-line later this year in 2024; we are hoping that there will be greater clarity on these questions in fall 2024.

Housing Access Policy and Eligible Partners

This year, CFW was pleased to hear that the on campus housing application has been updated to encourage eligible partners to fill out separate applications for housing. This is a positive first step. We have also been told that changes will need to be made to the Housing Access Policy and the associated procedure document to account for situations when a married or domestic couple apply for and/or receive employee housing and then separate, and that these changes may require consultation. We believe that this and related issues need to be discussed in the framework of creating new pricing and occupancy programs, and look forward to this being a part of the administration and Senate action item list for 2024-25.

IV. Healthcare

During the year CFW monitored and addressed the persistent healthcare affordability and access issues faced by UCSC employees. Chair Sher successfully lobbied to be included in the roster of the UC Health Care Task Force (HCTF). The goal was to ensure that at least one HCTF member comes from one of the four UC campuses that do not have Medical Schools and Hospitals so that the needs of these campuses with unique care access challenges may be considered. CFW Chair Sher petitioned for, and succeeded in securing, the inclusion of a non-medical school representative to participate in the HCTF each year. Next year, another representative from a non-medical campus will serve on the HCTF. CFW will continue to advocate for better healthcare through UCFW and HCTF in the coming year.

In 2024, all of the UC-offered healthcare plans saw significant premium increases. CFW consulted with UCSC Health Care Facilitator Marianne McIvor on December 7, 2023, and discussed both the premium increases, and the continuing scarcity of providers. UC Health Saving PPO plan saw the largest premium increase: almost a factor of two. UC Care PPO saw the smallest increase: 22% to 26%. These huge increases were announced at the beginning of Open Enrollment began, which did not provide enrollees with much time to carefully consider their options. This issue has been brought within both UCSF and HCTF and relayed both to UCOP HR and to UC health. Marianne also informed CFW that the agreement that was made between Blue Cross (the administrator for UC Care) and Stanford Health reached in 2022 was set to sunset in 3 years, and therefore might not be renewed in 2025. CFW will need to monitor this in the coming year and continue to advocate through UCFW and the HCTF for a default process that would provide continuing coverage on the terms of the latest Open Enrollment in case negotiations between an insurer and a provider break down in the middle of a covered term.

Delta Dental, provided as the only dental insurance to UC employees, continues to lose affiliated dentists. This results in an increase in out of pocket cost for UC employees. This problem extends across all campuses, but UCSC is among the worst affected. Each year alternative insurers are considered, but in the end the cost/benefit analysis has led to the UC continuing to offer coverage

through Delta Dental. The issue is discussed at UCFW and the HCTF periodically. CFW will continue to monitor the situation.

While Kaiser Permanente continues to expand its footprint in Santa Cruz County, it does not yet have the same number of offices, providers, or breadth of specialists as Sutter and Dignity Health.

While on the HCTF, Chair Sher advocated for broadening the Tier 1 designation within UC Care from Sutter providers in Santa Cruz to those “over the hill” in the South Bay area. The number of Sutter providers in Santa Cruz has become inadequate to address the growing needs of UCSC employees. It has become extremely difficult to find a primary care physician, and it may take several months before a patient can be seen, even by an established physician. The inability to secure appointments with physicians has greatly impacted the Sutter Urgent Care system, which in response, has moved to an appointment system, which also makes it more difficult to be seen in a timely manner. CFW wrote a letter to Laura Tauber, Executive Director of Self-Funded Health Plans, suggesting that Tier 1 designation with lower out-of-pocket costs be extended to providers beyond Sutter in Santa Cruz to other Sutter providers over the hill.¹⁴ In response, CFW was informed by Jerome Perez, Deputy Health Plan Administrator for Self-Funded Health Plans, that “PAMF/SMBF providers at the Palo Alto/Mountain View/Sunnyvale locations when performing services at these addresses are considered Tier 1”. This information was contrary to what CFW was led to believe. Chair Sher sought clarification from HCF Marianne McIvor in summer 2024, but was unable to receive a response by the date that this report was finalized. If the Tier 1 Sutter network has been expanded, it has not been fully communicated to either UCSC employees, or Accolade, the UC designated health advocate for UC Care, UC Health Savings Plan, and CORE members. This makes for an extremely confusing situation that makes it difficult for UCSC employees to accurately gauge out-of-pocket expenses and seek and receive appropriate care. CFW will follow up on this in the fall 2024.

V. Childcare

CFW continues to monitor childcare challenges on our campus. Childcare concerns are acute and growing, especially for caretakers of children 5 years old and younger. CFW had meetings with CP/EVC Lori Kletzer and Vice Chancellor for Finance, Operations and Administration (VCFOA) Reiskin in November 2023, and with VCFOA Reiskin in April 2024. These meetings focused on short- and medium- term solutions to the lack of available and affordable childcare. Short-term solutions included the RFP process to secure slots at local childcare centers for UCSC employees, and a direct reimbursement option for childcare expenses. Medium-term solutions include the campus childcare center planned for Student Housing West. CFW asked to be informed about the progress/timeline of construction of the new campus childcare center, and the pricing structure for that center.

The decision to focus the conversation on short- and medium-term solutions responds to the urgency of the topic, and the fact that it particularly affects new hires, Assistant Professors (who are typically on the lower end of the pay scale), and women. Short-term solutions are especially critical in meeting urgent faculty needs in advance of the planned construction of the UCSC

¹⁴ CFW Chair Sher to UC Self-Funded Health Plans Executive Director Tauber, 7/17/24, Re: Expansion of UC Care Tier 1: UC Select

childcare facility. CFW appreciates the effort to secure slots at local childcare centers while we wait for the construction of the campus childcare center, particularly given that UCSC has not had a childcare center on campus in over two decades, and childcare support has consistently been at the top of CFW's concerns for many years.

1. *UCSC Employee Childcare Waitlist Placement in Local Centers*

An RFP to secure slots at local childcare centers was discussed during consultations with CP/EVC Lori Kletzer and VCFOA Reiskin in 2022-2023. During these consultations, CFW was informed that CP/EVC Kletzer would work with her staff and Campus Counsel to design an RFP and send it out to some or all of the recommended providers, but a project timeline was not provided.

CFW members were excited to learn, during an April 2024 consultation with VCFOA Reiskin, that the program to reserve slots at Santa Cruz County childcare centers for AY 2024-2025 was progressing. During that consultation, VCFOA Reiskin informed CFW that UCSC administrators had developed a contract template and established policy requirements, and that they had spoken with 9 local childcare centers. The program was formally announced in Tuesday Newsday on June 18, 2024, the last week of the spring quarter. However, the announcement included only a link to a "UCSC Employee Childcare Waitlist Placement Request Form" with few details about the program or how it will run. CFW is not aware of any other attempts to advertise the program to UCSC employees. As such, CFW wrote a letter to CP/EVC Kletzer urging the administration to launch a UCSC web page with program details, and to formally announce the program to the campus community via email before the end of academic year. CFW received a response from CP/EVC Kletzer on August 27, 2024.¹⁵ CFW was informed that further advertisement would be done quarterly through Tuesday Newsday, and that there will be work done to ensure that the program can be easily found on campus childcare resources pages. CFW will monitor progress in 2024-25.

CFW members also raised questions about the *affordability* of childcare, even when slots are secured. Existing rates at most childcare centers are prohibitive for many faculty, as faculty with young children are commonly at the lower end of the pay scale and also tend to be struggling with the cost of housing in Santa Cruz County. Another area of concern is that the program has a one-year contract, with the program sunsetting before the new childcare center is scheduled to be opened at the end of 2025 or the beginning of 2026. CFW members feel that this reservation program should not sunset, at least so quickly. We believe that the program should be in place for at least the first few years of the campus childcare center's operations, to assist families in transitioning to the new center. CFW members suggested that at least a two-year contract is needed. If the program to reserve slots in local childcares starts in fall 2024, and the campus center opens at the end of 2025 (per the current construction schedule), then a one-year contract will leave families scrambling to find options for fall 2025, while they continue to wait for the campus center to open. In addition, because a further delay in construction of the campus childcare center

¹⁵ CP/EVC Kletzer to CFW Chair Sher, 8/27/2024, Re: Childcare Placement Waitlist Program

is possible, CFW recommends that the program to reserve spots at local childcare centers not end before the campus childcare center is open.

2. *Direct Reimbursement Option for Childcare Expenses*

A direct reimbursement option for childcare expenses was discussed during consultations with CP/EVC Lori Kletzer and VCFOA Reiskin in 2022-2023. These discussions also drew from past recommendations such as the UCSC Child Care Task Force Interim Solutions from 2011.¹⁶ The results of those discussions suggested that a direct reimbursement option could be implemented immediately. At the time, CP/EVC Kletzer noted that this option seemed like a timely one, and might be implemented in fall 2023. However, during CFW's consultation with VCFOA Ed Reiskin in April 2024, the VCFOA stated that there are no current plans to provide direct childcare reimbursement to employees.

3. *Progress/Timeline and Pricing Structure for New Campus Childcare Center*

In 2022-23, during consultations with VCFOA Reiskin and CP/EVC Kletzer, CFW was informed that the construction of the new campus childcare center would begin in 2024, and would include capacity for up to 140 children. During our consultation in April 2024, VCFOA Reiskin provided an update and shared that UCSC is aiming for the new childcare center to be completed at the end of fall 2025. UCSC still anticipates 140 slots for children of UCSC employees and students, with 80 slots for employees and 60 slots for students. The current projected age breakdown of childcare for employees is: 17 slots for infants, 18 for two-year olds, 29 for preschool age, and 16 for school age children (as an after school program). All infant/toddler programs will be full-time only. CFW has been informed that the preschool program will include two full time classes and one M-F morning-only class. Programs for school age children will include an after school care program and full daycare when public schools are on holiday and UCSC is still in session (including a full day summer program).

CFW appreciated the update on the center's construction and was encouraged by these details. However, CFW maintains concerns about the affordability of childcare on campus. VCFOA Reiskin informed CFW that the childcare pricing structure is still to be determined. It was previously indicated (in 2022-2023) that the pricing would be at current market rate, but CFW would like to see the numbers. As already noted, the market rate cost of full-time childcare is prohibitive for many faculty—particularly faculty with young children who tend to have the lowest faculty salaries at UCSC—and, as mentioned above, there are currently no plans for financial assistance. CFW would like to be involved in the childcare center implementation process, including discussions on issues such as cost—including potential subsidies, such as grants already available from the state of California—and the waitlist process.

VI. Back-up Care

CFW is aware that faculty continue to express frustrations with the current Back-up Care program offered to employees through Bright Horizons. We are also aware that Institutional Research, Analytics, and Planning Support (IRAPS) conducted a Back-up Care Experience Survey for

¹⁶ UCSC Child Care Task Force, Supplemental: Interim Solutions, February 28, 2011

College, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES) in 2023. The results were discussed by CFW, and committee feedback was provided to the CP/EVC.¹⁷

One issue that was highlighted by the survey was that parents seeking back-up care from Bright Horizons often only heard at the very last minute that this care could not be provided by the organization, which meant parents had to scramble with very little time on hand to find care for their children. Under the current process, employees are not eligible for reimbursement for back-up care expenses provided by organizations other than Bright Horizons until they receive confirmation from Bright Horizons that care cannot be provided through them. Since this intimation is often received at the last minute, CFW suggested that the reimbursement requirement (to receive notice that Bright Horizons cannot provide care before seeking care from other providers) be removed. While we continue to note that it is significant and indeed, laudable that the administration has worked to create this resource, we also want to highlight and address issues that faculty have faced when using the services provided by Bright Horizons. These issues are not restricted to childcare alone but elder care as well, as CFW has been told by faculty who have tried to access this resource.

VII. Transportation and Parking

Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) is set to transition to a virtual permitting system for campus parking. This new system will use Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR) technology, with registered license plates acting as parking permits. The ALPR system is scheduled to launch in summer 2024.

According to TAPS, the introduction of the ALPR system aims to improve campus parking management by promoting sustainability and accommodating future growth, rather than focusing on cost savings. The initial installation cost is estimated at \$98,000, with annual license and maintenance fees totaling \$110,000. Staff members currently responsible for parking enforcement are to be reassigned to other roles, ensuring no job losses. The ongoing costs will be covered by parking and citation revenue.

CFW has raised concerns about the long-term financial implications and motivations behind installing this system. Additionally, there are privacy concerns related to the deployment of ALPR cameras. During an Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) meeting, it was revealed that staff will initially use handheld scanners in enforcement vehicles, with plans to install fixed cameras at key locations like parking structure entrances. The system will record license plates and track where and when vehicles are parked. While personal identifying information will be collected, access to this data will be restricted to law enforcement personnel with Department of Justice clearance.

CFW has also raised questions about the implementation of elements of this program. Specifically, how will single-day parking work for faculty in lieu of the current ‘scratch-off’ system, which will be no longer utilized? Is there a single-day parking option for faculty that need to park occasionally on campus that can be quick and easy and allow faculty to avoid stopping at the parking booth at

¹⁷ CFW Chair Sher to CP/EVC Kletzer, 6/01/24, Re: Back-Up Family Care Experience Survey - Survey Results by IRAPS, April 2023

the base of campus each time they need to park? The committee would like more details on the actual implementation of aspects of this program.

Furthermore, CFW wants to express concerns regarding the decision-making process. The implementation of the ALPR system will significantly impact campus parking, and CFW believes that it is important for faculty, staff, and students to have the opportunity to provide input. While feedback from CFW and other Academic Senate committees was eventually sought, it occurred after the decision to implement the ALPR system had already been made. Additionally, the ACCTP did not initially plan to discuss this topic until it was brought up by the CFW representative. Ensuring consultation and transparency in the decision-making process is vital to uphold the principles of shared governance.

VIII. Retirement

The work of the Retirement Administration Service Center (RASC) at the Office of the President regarding their ability to deliver user-friendly service has been monitored by a number of UC-wide Senate committees. With transition of the services to UCOP, the pandemic, and chronic understaffing, this office was not functioning optimally for several years, which led to retirees experiencing disruptions in pay, difficulty in accessing the healthcare coverage, long wait times for answers to emails and phone waits, etc.

New administrators at RASC have been in place for a year now, and the hiring and training of new staff has been accelerating. Wait time for responses to phone/email has improved significantly, and users report the current RASC staff seems much more responsive and informed. The RASC website now has more comprehensive training materials that those approaching retirement can access, and the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER) Chair who sits *ex officio* with CFW has noted that those who have retired in the last year have reported fewer crises compared to the previous period. The Council of University of California Retiree Associations (CUCRA) and Council of University of California Emeriti Associations (CUCEA) meetings have had consultations with representatives from RASC actively reporting on their improvements and work to resolve the bottlenecks. While difficulties still arise, the situation has improved significantly. UCSC Healthcare Facilitator (HCF) Marianne McIvor has remained a significant source of expertise for those who encounter difficulties and is to be thanked. The campus Pathways to Retirement Program¹⁸ with Professor Emeritus Don Brenneis serving as the Faculty Liaison, continues to work with faculty nearing retirement to think through options and plan their preparations.

IX. Additional Issues

In October 2023, CFW considered proposed changes to Bylaw 55. The suggested modification would ensure that faculty in Teaching Professor series would have the same voting rights within the departments as faculty in Professor series. Currently, determination of whether faculty within these two groups have the same voting rights is determined by the departments.

¹⁸ UCSC Pathways to Retirement Program: <https://apo.ucsc.edu/retirement/index.html>

CFW saw the merits of the proposed revisions to create a more uniform experience of participation in the personnel review process that is inclusive of Teaching Professors, but also recognized that there is value to departmental autonomy, with Teaching Professors in different disciplines perhaps playing distinct roles.¹⁹ A study of the experiences and overall welfare of Teaching Professors at UCSC would be highly informative to determine the relative benefit of the proposed changes. Since the CFW review, the UC-wide academic Senate failed to approve the proposed changes.

In 2023-24, CFW received concerns from many faculty about the limited number of places to purchase meals on campus. More specifically, concerns have been raised about the number of fresh food vendors that were on campus prior to the pandemic (which were already few and far between) that have since left, leaving faculty minimal options for dining between duties on campus. For example, the *Vivas* Mexican restaurant at Merrill (which served burritos and tacos made to order) has been turned into a mini mart with frozen and packaged food primarily serving undergraduates living in dorms on campus, and the Cowell Coffee Shop and College Eight (Rachel Carson) Coffee Shop no longer sell breakfast or lunch food, and now operate as food banks for students in food precarity. The loss of such venues has resulted in huge lines at the remaining facilities, such as Stevenson Coffee Shop, which regularly has lines extending out the door to order, and wait times of thirty minutes plus for food:



Early January, 11:45AM

¹⁹ CFW Chair Sher to Senate Chair Gallagher, 11/30/23, Re: Systemwide Review - Bylaw 55



Late January, 2:50PM



April, 12:30PM

Food facilities are places where campus community forms: faculty meet with their TAs after class to discuss instruction, have lunch with department colleagues, or get coffee to discuss collaborations. The lack of these spaces has significantly impacted our sense of community.

Easily accessible and healthy food options are also important to those squeezing in meals between classes or labs. While faculty are occasionally utilizing undergraduate dining halls because of the lack of other options, these are not ideal. Food cannot be taken ‘to-go’, faculty can’t meet with

others in the dining halls unless they are also paying to eat a full meal there, and the ‘all-you-can eat’ \$15 price tag is expensive when an individual does not want a robust meal, but merely a soup or sandwich, or a coffee and a bagel.

CFW brought this issue to the attention of the administration in consultation in spring 2024.²⁰ We appreciate that the campus has brought in food trucks to attempt to provide additional options, but we want to emphasize that these are not sufficient, and that the campus needs to expand the fresh food options available daily during the work week Monday through Friday.

X. Acknowledgments

CFW’s work would not be possible without its consultants and guests:

UCSC Health Care Facilitator Marianne McIvor
CP/EVC Lori Kletzer
VCFOA Ed Reiskin
UCSC Professor of Sociology Miriam Greenberg
UCSC Professor of Sociology Steve McKay

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Lindsey Dillon (*W, S*)
Phillip Hammack (*F*)
Dongwook Lee (*F, W*)
Yat Li
Madhavi Murty
Katherine Seto (*W, S*)
Elaine Sullivan
Xi Zhang
Kathy Foley *ex officio*
Alexander Sher, *Chair*

August 31, 2024

²⁰ CFW Chair Sher to CP/EVC Kletzer and VCFOA Reiskin, 4/24/24, Re: Our Consultation with VCFOA Reiskin on May 2, 2024