

Minutes
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Meeting of March 15, 2018

Present: Tesla Jeltema, Grant McGuire, Su-hua Wang, Stefano Profumo (Chair), Chad Silva (ASO)

Absent: Hiroshi Fukurai, Nico Orlandi (with notice), Yiman Wang (with notice), Barry Bowman (*ex officio / with notice*)

Chair Announcements and Committee Business

Consideration of the Draft Minutes of January 18, 2018

The draft minutes of January 18, 2018 were approved by the committee.

Report from the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting of February 20 and March 13, 2018
Update postponed.

Update from the meeting of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) on March 9, 2018

Chair Profumo provided CFW with an update from the meeting of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) on March 9, 2018. UCFW discussed the upcoming 6% salary increase for UC faculty over the next six years. 3% of this amount is to be given in off scale salary, and 3% is up to campus Chancellor discretion. Chair Profumo noted that it is unknown how these increases would be paid for. CFW questioned whether this would be an unfunded mandate. UCFW also continued its discussion of healthcare providers who refuse service based on religious beliefs.

There was additional discussions regarding the student to transfer student 2:1 ratio being placed on the UC system, tuition remission, and the assumed return rate on retirement. UCFW members noted that all campuses are different and it is unrealistic to require that all campuses have a 2:1 student to transfer ratio. However, members noted that up to \$50 million may be withheld from the UC system if the requirement is not met. The discussion regarding tuition remission was met with some resistance. A suggestion was made that tuition could be used among other options in a package to recruit faculty. The Task Force on Investment and Retirement consulted with UCFW and reiterated that a high return on investment is not very realistic.

Senate Meeting with PAMF and Open Enrollment Data - 2017 and 2018

Senate leadership and CFW representatives have been asked to meet with representatives from the Palo Alto Medical Foundation. More information regarding this meeting is forthcoming. Chair Profumo added that he has been informed that there are doctors from the Bay Area who may be interested in holding office hours in Santa Cruz for local patients.

Report from Faculty Salary Analysis Subcommittee

This discussion was postponed to accommodate the consultation with AVC Matthews.

Proposed Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay

CFW has been asked to comment on proposed revisions to renew the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay covering all academic and staff employees. Members reviewed the associated enclosures and determined that the proposed revisions looked good. No concerns were raised.

Pre-Consultation – Associate Vice Chancellor of Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services, Sue Matthews

CFW members considered questions for its consultation with AVC Matthews. Members would like to inquire about the campus's relationship with third-party childcare vendor Bright Horizons, and how the decision was made to contract with the company. Members noted a desire to ask questions regarding staffing of the center and staff pay, and the possibility of back up care.

Consultation – AVC Matthews

When asked about the history of the campus's relationship with Bright Horizons and the level of faculty engagement, AVC Matthews reported that the campus is in Phase 2 of three phases and is currently working on the design of the center, options for construction, and the cost of operations. AVC Matthews added that a 2015 agreement with Bright Horizons to consult with and advise a Childcare Services Model Analysis workgroup charged by former CP/EVC Galloway was recently amended to include the operation of the childcare center as Phase 3. AVC Matthews reported that Capstone Development is working on the facility design, and CFW childcare representative Wang was brought into the discussion early on to consider the design. AVC Matthews added that the Child Care Work Group that convened over summer 2017 made recommendations for the program design. This group will meet again on April 2, 2018.

AVC Matthews mentioned that there was a report from 2015 that CFW might not have seen, which she will forward to the committee, and suggested that the campus has already worked with Bright Horizons on a Request for Information (RFI) when Linda Rhodes represented former CP/EVC David Kliger.

When asked when the decision was made to work with Bright Horizons, AVC Matthews suggested that she did not know when the three-part agreement came about, but said she would find out.

Chair Profumo noted that CFW would like to know who made the decision to contract with Bright Horizons and why, as there are a number of vendors that the campus could have selected. He added that CFW is interested in understanding and reviewing the decision-making process prior to the three phase agreement, and suggested that it appears that once the campus selected Bright Horizons in 2015 to consult with the Childcare Services Model Analysis workgroup, no other vendors were considered. Chair Profumo further emphasized that there was no faculty representation on the Childcare Services Model Analysis team in 2015, and there was no Senate consultation either. In response, AVC Matthews noted that although there are terms in the contract amendment designating Bright Horizons as the center operator, there is a clause in the contract whereby the campus may pull out prior to operation.

AVC Matthews noted that if Bright Horizons is the center operator, it would be a sole-source agreement similar to that with UC Davis, UCLA, etc. AVC Matthews noted that she was not aware of any other request for proposals (RFP) with other vendors, but suggested that there was an RFI with Bright Horizons established in 2011. CFW members noted that there were multiple vendors during the RFI process, and it is not clear as to why Bright Horizons is the only vendor being worked with from 2015 on.

Matthews reported that there were surveys performed on the campuses where Bright Horizons is the vendor. There is some difference of opinion as to what the surveys reflected. For instance, CFW has suggested that the reviews were not positive.

Chair Profumo emphasized that CFW would like to understand the executive decision (if it was) to not consider other vendors and engage in a competitive bidding process. Chair Profumo added that CFW understands the timeline issue, but suggested that this should not preclude consultation with stakeholders such as the Academic Senate, or an RFP. Chair Profumo questioned whether there was a process in place that would make it possible for faculty to comment on moving from Phase 2 to Phase 3, and whether there was a plan for faculty engagement. AVC Matthews questioned where or what office such a RFP for operation would come from. She added that there is nothing that indicates that the administration does not intend to move forward with Phase 3 as currently drafted. Although AVC Matthews noted that there is no plan for further consultation with faculty at the moment, she did suggest that there is some indication that there will be a stakeholder workgroup. However, it is not clear whether faculty will be included.

A CFW member has heard graduate students concerns that the student subsidy will go down along with wages for staff in the childcare center, and shared this concerns with the AVC. The major concerns is that users will end up paying more for lower quality service. The member questioned whether there is any validity to the rumors regarding salary and subsidy.

AVC Matthews noted that there will be a parent group meeting during the first week of April, and explained that the funding for student payments comes from student fees (student service fees and student referendum fee) and not grants, and will still be provided based on need. AVC Matthews claimed that the childcare employees will receive a 401(k) and benefits.

AVC Matthews reported that most of these details were signed and executed last week, and they will now want to bring about a stakeholder group to talk about curriculum. Information services, she noted, will have more information about how much of the current agreement is available. When the parties discussed the composition of the new curriculum stakeholder committee being formed, CFW members suggested that the role of Bright Horizons needs to be clarified so that stakeholders can ask the right questions and so that a broader group of faculty may be engaged in this discussion. AVC Matthews noted that an invitation will be sent out to faculty regarding the design group meeting in April.

AVC Matthews suggested that the campus is struggling with recruitment for childcare center workers. She noted that the new facility will have an infant room and the high eligibility standards required to work in a childcare center poses an issue with hiring. She stated that she is confident that those are currently employed at the student childcare center who want to continue to work in childcare on campus would be able to transition to Bright Horizons. When asked if it would be difficult for staff to transition to a different facility and employer in less than a year, AVC Matthews suggested that the communication channels should be set up as soon as possible to ensure a smooth transition.

Chair Profumo emphasized that because Bright Horizons is a for profit provider, the process going forward should be very clear. Chair Profumo suggested that the campus is weakening its negotiating position by not having an active RFP, and as such CFW would like to hear concretely what consultation with faculty will look like going forward, and how the campus will make decisions about how Bright Horizons will operate.

AVC Matthews noted that as it stands now, the campus will move right into Phase 3 with Bright Horizons for a five year term. There is a mutual open-ended unconditional opt out clause for both UC and Bright Horizons to back out of the agreement prior to implementation of Phase 3 if needed.

When asked whether faculty would be involved in the selection of a center director, AVC Matthews suggested that “they” would need to talk about this. When asked whether the campus could insist on having a say in the selection of the director, specifically veto power, AVC Matthews

noted that the financial sponsorship agreement with the vendor impacts salaries of center employees. She further noted that she is a proponent of the P3 agreement.

CFW members noted that the committee was assured back in 2015 that Bright Horizons was just a consultation, and the committee is dismayed to find that the campus is now in a three phase agreement with the provider. Members emphasized that a competitive bidding process (RFP) would be a great leverage point and could show that faculty were not deliberately kept out of the discussions. Members further noted that CFW wants to make sure that this is the best vendor for the campus and suggested that there needs to be an interface with faculty so that the vendor can be made aware of the unique values and culture of the campus. AVC Matthews emphasized that it was not the intention to leave faculty out of the discussions, and suggested that the pace of the process has driven the project.

Chair Profumo re-emphasized that the committee would like to know who made the decisions at every stage including the decision to not have a competitive bid for the operation of the facility, and noted that this transparency and a proper explanation of the rationale is essential to in order to avoid further community upset.