### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Office of the Chair Telephone: (510) 987-9303 Fax: (510) 763-0309 Email: john.oakley@ucop.edu Assembly of the Academic Senate, Academic Council University of California 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor Oakland, California 94607-5200

April 5, 2006

# ROBERT C. DYNES, PRESIDENT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

**RE:** Academic Council Recommendations on Campus Childcare Facilities and Priorities for the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty

Dear Bob,

As you know, the Office of the President has made available to the campuses matching funds for the construction of on-campus childcare facilities since 2001. The Academic Council is concerned, however, that due to lean University budgets of recent years campuses are unable to take advantage of such matching funds, seriously affecting the recruitment and retention of faculty. Compounding the situation, all faculty associated with campus recruitment and retention efforts are acutely aware of the current ten-percent lag in faculty salaries, impending changes to the University of California Retirement Program (UCRP), the planned resumption of employee contributions to UCRP, and the astronomical rise in the cost of health care. The Academic Council believes that the availability and funding of on-campus childcare facilities is an essential benefit for all faculty who have or plan to have children, and is a workable means of stemming the University's downward benefit spiral from both a faculty-welfare and academic-personnel perspective.

At the March 22, 2006, meeting of the Academic Council, the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) submitted the enclosed letters. Both letters point out the need for increasing resources for on-campus childcare facilities, and for placing the importance of childcare on a par with other high priorities affecting the recruitment and retention of faculty, such as faculty salaries and housing. The Academic Council endorsed both the UCAP and UCFW letters with the strong belief that these issues should remain at the forefront of the University's budget priorities, especially as new resources from the state and other funding sources become available.

On behalf of the Academic Council, I respectfully request that you and appropriate officers in the Office of the President urge campuses to take advantage of matching funds earmarked for the construction of on-campus childcare facilities, and communicate to all faculty the University of California's commitment to addressing, in the best and most expedient way possible, these faculty recruitment and retention issues.

Sincerely,

John Oakley, Chair Academic Council

Enclosures:

- 1. University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), February 8, 2006, re: Funding for On-Campus Child Care
- 2. University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), March 10, 2006, re: UCFW Recommendations on Family Friendly Policies

Copy: Academic Council

Bruce Darling, Senior Vice President, University Affairs

Rory Hume, Acting Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs

Ellen Switkes, Assistant Vice President, Academic Advancement Randy Scott, Executive Director, Policy and Program Design, HR&B

María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director, Academic Senate

JO/MAR

#### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP) ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR

anthony.norman@ucr.edu

The Academic Council 1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor Oakland, CA 94607-5200 Phone: (510) 987-9467 Fax: (510) 763-0309

February 8, 2006

CLIFFORD BRUNK, CHAIR ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: Funding for On-Campus Child Care

Dear Cliff,

At its October meeting, UCAP discussed several proposed "family friendly" personnel policy revisions giving new birth and adoptive mothers added accommodation for childbearing and childrearing. We applied these humane policies both for their importance to a productive academic environment and for their value and impact on the successful recruitment and retention of female academic personnel.

However, UCAP members noted that another family friendly benefit – on-campus child care facilities – has not been a priority for the University in recent years. Both female and male faculty are struggling more than ever to balance productive research and teaching careers with the demands of parenthood, but more often, they are finding that the child care faculties on campus are full or non-existent, or they are limited to toddlers. Although matching funds are available from UCOP for the construction of on-campus child care centers, the lean University budgets of recent years have led campuses to place such initiatives on the back burner.

From an academic personnel perspective, child care has clear value for recruitment and retention. It is an issue that affects not only our future junior colleagues, but also regular faculty members at all levels of the Professorial ranks. It is also a fiscally sound investment. One of our members estimated that when productivity and recruitment costs are factored in, it costs her campus over \$300,000 to replace each lost faculty member.

Women are entering the UC faculty ranks at a higher rate than ever, and a full range of facilities should be available to help these new colleagues participate fully in academic life. We strongly believe that now, as the University budget situation improves, increasing resources around child care, including lactation rooms, should be a top priority on a par with salary increases. As new resources from the Compact agreement and other sources become available, we urge that additional spending for child care be a high budget priority. We also urge campuses to take advantage of matching funds earmarked for the construction of on-site child care facilities. Finally, we recommend that campus planning committees and other entities such as the Regents'

# Page 2

Committee on Grounds and Buildings require new building plans and designs to always include space for child care and lactation rooms.

We ask the Academic Council to endorse this recommendation and forward it to the administration.

Sincerely,

Anthony Norman Chair, UCAP

TN/ml Encl.

cc: UCAP UCFW

Executive Director Bertero-Barceló

#### University of California President's Matching Childcare Funds Approval Status

Campus	Project Approved (PWC)	Preliminary Submittal	<u>Capacity</u>		President's		74 / 1 E		Total Project		
			Infant-Toddler	Preschooler		Funds	Mia	tching Funds		Cost	Current status of approved project
Berkeley	Apr. 20, 2005	Feb. 2002	42	36	\$	1,000,000	\$	5,260,000	\$	6,260,000	As of Dec. 05 - project under construction
Davis	Jun. 28, 2004	Aug. 2002	41	54	s	1,000,000	\$	1,829,000	\$	2,829,000	Construction to begin in January 2006
Irvine	Apr. 29, 2003	May 2002	42		\$	1,000,000	\$	687,000	\$	1,687,000	Campus re-designing
Los Angeles	Nov. 6, 2003	Aug. 2002		100	\$	1,250,000	\$	3,390,000	\$	4,640,000	As of Dec. 05 - project under construction
Merced			125 to 150			Hold					
Riverside						Hold					
San Diego		Feb. 2002		200		Hold					
San Francisco	Sep. 11, 2002	Feb. 2002	8 to 10	64	\$	610,000	\$	805,000	\$	1,415,000	Construction to begin in January 2006
Santa Barbara	Jul. 22, 2002		48 to 56		\$	750,000	\$	1,000,000	\$	1,750,000	As of Dec. 05 - project under construction
Santa Cruz		Aug. 2002	68	40		Hold					

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

1111 Franklin Street Oakland, California 94607-5200 Phone: (510) 987-9074 Fax: (510) 987-9086 http://www.ucop.edu

February 14, 2001

#### CHANCELLORS

## Dear Colleagues:

I am writing to confirm our discussion at the February Council of Chancellors meeting regarding matching funding from the Office of the President for construction of new childcare facilities for students, faculty, and staff.

Based on State requirements for capacity (square footage per child), construction costs are not expected to exceed \$20,000 per child. The following table gives the matching options discussed at the COC meeting; your campus is free to choose the option that best suits its needs.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
		\$1,500,000	
President's Matching Funds	\$750,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,250,000
Total	\$1,750,000	\$2,500,000	\$3,250,000

The funds from the Office of the President are now available and will be administered as flexibly as possible. All other standard administrative processes for amendment to the Capital Improvement Program will be observed with the following exception: the campus request for matching funds is to be accompanied by a Project Planning Guide for approval by the Office of the President.

Should you have any questions, please get in touch with Vice President Larry Hershman or his staff.

Sincerely,

President Atkinson

President

cc: Provost King
Senior Vice President Mullinix
Vice President Hershman

Budget Officers Capital Planning Directors Matching Funds Available for Childcare Facilities March 2, 2001

## DISTRIBUTION

<u>UC Berkeley:</u> Vice Chancellor Hyatt

Assistant Vice Chancellor Koster

<u>UC Davis:</u> Director Keller

Director Loessberg-Zahl Vice Chancellor Meyer

<u>UC Irvine:</u> Director Campbell

Associate Executive Vice Chancellor Dormajer

Director Mason

<u>UC Los Angeles:</u> Assistant Vice Chancellor Davies

Director Ingham-Bachman

Assistant Vice Chancellor Santon

<u>UC Merced:</u> Vice Chancellor Desrochers

**Director Graves** 

<u>UC Riverside:</u> Vice Chancellor Bolar

Director Kottler

Interim Associate Director Ralston

UC San Diego: Director Gregory

Assistant Vice Chancellor Pryatel Assistant Vice Chancellor Steindorf

Vice Chancellor Woods

UC San Francisco: Vice Chancellor Barclay

Assistant Vice Chancellor Vermillion

Acting Assistant Vice Chancellor Yamauchi

UC Santa Barbara: Assistant Chancellor Kuntz

Director Lee Director Levy

UC Santa Cruz: Director Eckert

Associate Vice Chancellor Michaels

**Director Owens** 

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



VICE PRESIDENT FOR BUDGET

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT 1111 Franklin Street, 10th Floor Oakland, CA 94607-5200 (510) 987-9101 (510) 987-0736 FAX

March 2, 2001

# BUDGET OFFICERS CAPITAL PLANNING DIRECTORS

Re: Matching Funds Available for Childcare Facilities

Dear Colleagues:

As many of you are already aware, President Atkinson issued a letter on February 14, 2001 providing for matching funds for campus childcare facilities for students, faculty and staff (copy attached for your convenience).

The President's letter was brief and did not go into detail regarding administrative procedures. Admittedly, many specifics of the program are yet to be determined. However, the Budget Office suggests that campuses begin their planning process now. Although the funds will be administered flexibly, it is our expectation that campuses will submit initial proposals (i.e., a two or three page executive summary) within approximately four to six months.

Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact Catherine Montano (510-987-9114 or <u>catherine.montano@ucop.edu</u>).

Sincerely,

**∕}∽**Lori Hoffman

Director

Non-State Capital Development and Facilities Resource Planning

Carty houton

Attachment: Atkinson Letter dated 02/14/01

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW) Raymond Russell, Chair raymond.russell@ucr.edu

The Academic Council 1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor Oakland, CA 94607-5200 Phone: (510) 987-9467 Fax: (510) 763-0309

March 10, 2006

# RANDY SCOTT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UCOP – Human Resources and Benefits Policy and Program Design

**RE: UCFW Recommendations on Family Friendly Policies** 

Dear Randy,

This letter is a revised version of a letter that I sent to you in draft form on February 3. It incorporates suggestions that were offered by members of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare at the meeting of UCFW that took place on February 10.

At its October, November, and January meetings, the University Committee on Faculty Welfare conducted a series of discussions about the problems of faculty members with children and those who are in the process of becoming parents. In these discussions the Committee gave special attention to four policies that had been identified by the Sloan Foundation as potential ways to address these problems: (1) adoption benefits; (2) emergency back-up childcare; (3) systemwide coordination of resources for childcare; and (4) educational fee waivers for faculty dependents.

At the end of its most recent discussion of these issues on January 13, the Committee asked me to inform you that the most pressing need of faculty with dependent children remains access to childcare on or near their campuses. After discussing the Sloan Foundation recommendations with divisional Faculty Welfare committees and childcare specialists, the Committee concluded that efforts to address this problem by creating systemwide programs for emergency back-up childcare and coordination of resources are likely to be more cumbersome and less effective than campus-based programs to provide assured access to childcare to all faculty on a regular basis. Our first and most important recommendation to the Office of the President, therefore, is to request that you continue to encourage and facilitate the creation or expansion of childcare facilities on every campus that are accessible to all faculty.

Second, the Committee recommends that the Office of the President develop concrete proposals for implementing the recommendations of the Sloan Foundation regarding adoption benefits. Adoption expenses are an issue of special relevance to faculty, because faculty typically spend their most fertile years in college and graduate school, and delay starting families until well after their optimal years for bearing children have passed. The Committee therefore asks the Office of

the President to make plans to make available to UC employees the adoption benefits recommended by the Sloan Foundation.

Finally, the Committee requests the Office of the President to continue to explore the possibility of providing some form of assistance to UC faculty in meeting the expenses of sending their children to college. UCFW has requested this benefit many times in the past. Each time, this request has been denied on the grounds that such a benefit would be prohibitively expensive. The Committee is aware that the current year is an especially difficult one for the University's budget, making it even less likely that the University will be able to afford any expensive new benefits this year. We further acknowledge that tuition expenses throughout the nation have been increasing rapidly in recent years, making the potential cost of such a benefit substantially higher now than it would have been in the past. The Committee notes, however, that just as rising tuition costs make it more difficult for the University to contemplate reimbursing employees for 100% of their children's tuition expenses, they also make parents with children in college increasingly in need of some form of help in meeting these costs. They also increase the advantage that universities offering tuition benefits will have over universities that do not offer such benefits in competing for the best young faculty in the future.

Sincerely,

Raymond Russell, Chair

Raymond Russel

University Committee on Faculty Welfare

Copy: UCFW

Judy Boyette, Associate Vice President, Human Resources and Benefits Mark Esteban, Director, Human Resources and Benefits, Health and Welfare