

**Minutes**  
**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**Meeting of November 5, 2015**

**Present:** Shelly Grabe, Ted Holman, Andrew Matthews, Grant McGuire, Ricardo Sanfelice, James Zachos (Chair), Shelly Errington (*ex officio*), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

**Chair Announcements**

*Online Education Course Proposal Review Committee*

A CFW representative has been requested to participate on the campus Online Education Course Proposal Review Committee. There four courses pending review. Member Grant McGuire volunteered to participate.

CFW is still looking for a member or members to participate in the new campus transportation and parking committee, and the Committee on Committees (COC) is still trying to fill vacancies in CFW's membership.

*APO/Administrative Faculty Salary Competitiveness Report*

Chair Zachos noted that the Academic Personnel Office (APO) use to produce a UCSC salary competitiveness report. The last one was drafted in 2012. APO has reported that they no longer produces these reports as they no longer have access to the Office of the President's (UCOP) full salary data warehouse and because CFW now does an analysis each year.

CFW determined that APO and the administration should be doing their own faculty salary analysis annually. In the past, CFW has compared their findings to the APO report. Further, the administration should be doing its own analysis in order to determine that the Merit Boost Plan or special salary practice is working. Members further noted that APO should be able to do this analysis using the same data that is provided to CFW each year.

CFW will draft a letter to Assistant Vice Chancellor (AVC) Pamela Peterson and request that APO resume the drafting of the salary competitiveness report.

**Child Care Services Model Analysis**

CP/EVC Galloway has requested Senate review and comment on a report that was prepared by the Faculty and Staff Child Care Services Model Analysis Team. The analysis team was charged with analyzing two specific options for a child care program for faculty and staff, a reimbursement model and a contract for services model, the latter of which involved three possible scenarios.

The Analysis Team determined that a reimbursement program was not favorable and members noted that the CFW's recommendation to have a voucher program was intended as a temporary solution until a permanent center could be created and is not an optimal plan. CFW would like to see a child care center created and members feel that an on-campus location may be a good recruitment tool and be the most optimal location for faculty. Members questioned why building on campus is so expensive. Last year, CFW

requested that CP/EVC Galloway put aside \$250k/year for childcare. The committee did not receive a response from the CP/EVC, but members note that such funds in addition to the \$700k that is already in reserved would help to off-set on campus costs, which over time will prove to be cheaper than building off campus. A suggestion was made to include the education department in the center to further off-set costs.

Members questioned why options proposed in the 2011 Child Care Task Force Report and an incorporation of employee childcare in the remodel of family student housing and the student child care center were not considered. Further questioned what the goal of providing child care should be and considered whether the goal was to offer a benefit or service to employees, attract new faculty hires, or increase equity on campus by allowing faculty to spend more time in class and in labs thereby increasing potential for advancement. CFW further considered whether any child care should be established, or if only affordable child care should be established.

Members considered whether it might be beneficial for the campus to survey those with child care needs on what services they use and what the associated costs are to get a sense if these proposed models are competitive.

Concerns were raised about the possibility of the campus contracting with Bright Horizons. Some campuses who contract with them have complained about fee increases, etc. Members are also concerned about potential conflict of interest issues as Bright Horizons was used as the consultant on this report exploring potential options. CFW will recommend that other employer child care contractors be explored.

#### **Pre-Consultation – VCBAS Sarah Latham**

CFW will consult with Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services and campus child care point person Sarah Latham on November 19, 2015. The committee will engage with VC Latham on the topic of employee childcare, including the Faculty and Staff Child Care Services Model Analysis Team Report, and potential steps for moving forward.

CFW considered the content of a pre-consultation memo. With regards to the Child Care Services Model Analysis Team Report, CFW would like to know:

- Why is it more expensive to build on campus?
- Have any of the proposed on-campus sites from the 2011 Child Care Task Force Report been explored?
- Why was including employee child care in the planned renovation of Family Student Housing and the Student Child Care Center not considered as a potential scenario by the Child Care Services Model Analysis Team?

- Was another third party vendor other than Bright Horizons considered to generate the needs analysis and projected expenses?
- Is there any data on the child care services currently being used by campus employees? Does the campus have plans to conduct a survey on these options and what employees are willing to pay for child care of the quality to be offered?

### **Partner Hire Resources**

Member Ted Holman provided the committee with a report from his meeting with campus deans regarding partner hire resources. The deans were responsive to the development of a website and list of faculty partners/spouses that could be contacted for advice with regards to the Santa Cruz career market. The question of who will house and manage this resource has not yet been determined, although members agree that it makes the most sense for such a list to be managed by the APO.

The deans would like to see a formal request from CFW to start compiling a list of names of participants. A draft document will be sent to members for review and consideration.