



**Committee on Faculty Welfare**  
**Jacque Duncan, M.D., Chair**

## ANNUAL REPORT 2008-2009

**Primary Focus Points for the Year:**

- Post Doctoral Unionization
- Child Care
- Lactation Centers
- Furloughs and/or Salary Cuts
- Time and Attendance/Vacation Leave Assessment Project

**Task Forces, Special Committees, and Sub-Committees:**

- Review of Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Policies 710, 711, and 080.
- Task Force on the Development Office Funding Model Review – Susanne Mueller, Task Force Representative
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Paul Green, Representative

**Issues for Next Year (2009-20010)**

- Salary Cuts and/or Furloughs

---

**2008-2009 Members**

---

Jacque Duncan, MD, Chair  
Susanne Mueller, MD, Vice Chair  
Abe Rudolph, MD  
Carmen Portillo, RN  
David Rempel, MD  
Don Kishi, PharmD

Marie Orellano  
Paul Green, PhD

**Permanent Guest**

Pamela Hayes, Principal Benefits Coordinator, Human Resources

---

**Number of Meetings: 6**

**Senate Analyst:** Kathleen Dargan

## Systemwide Business

The Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare took up the following Systemwide issues this year:

### **Review of APM 710, 711, and 080 regarding Medical Leave and Accommodations**

The Committee reviewed the proposed amendments to the Academic Personnel Policies listed below:

- **APM 710 - amended to provide medical leave for faculty.**
- **APM 711 - amended to provide reasonable accommodations to faculty with disabilities.**
- **APM 080 - provisions for medical separation.**

With the expression of concerns the exclusion or inclusion of domestic partners, a communication to Chair Gardner approving the requested changes. ([Appendix 1](#))

### **Unionization of Postdoctoral Fellows**

In November 2008, the University of California recognized the United Auto Workers (UAW) as the representatives of system-wide UC Postdoctoral Scholars with the exclusive right to negotiate with UC management on wages, benefits and working conditions. The bargaining process began in February, 2009 without UCSF faculty representation but Christine Des Jarlais was appointed as the representative shortly thereafter.

The members of University of California, San Francisco Committee on Faculty Welfare, and their faculty, were asked for comments on the unionization of the postdoctoral for Christine Des Jarlais. A communication was submitted to Chair Gardner. ([Appendix 2](#))

### **Review of the Furlough and Salary Cut Proposed Policies**

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reviewed the proposed policies on furloughs and salary cuts that would reduce salaries 4-8%, require 21 unpaid days or a combination of salary cuts and unpaid days. In May 2009, a communication was submitted to Chair David Gardner requesting written limitation of the duration of cuts and/or furloughs as well as a request for a declaration of financial emergency from the Chancellor. Concern was also expressed for clinical faculty furloughs as they affect essential clinical and administrative services. The Committee noted that furloughs, as a last resort, were preferred over salary cuts. ([Appendix 3](#), [Appendix 4](#))

## Divisional Business

This year, the Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

### **UCSF Child Care**

Diane Wara, MD, Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Children, spoke of the need for additional child care at the UCSF campuses which has increased from approximately 300 children in 2002 to 1,100 in 2009. Most of the child-care wait list is at the Laurel Heights campus, a childcare facility that primarily serves the Parnassus campus. Although the Marilyn Reed Lucia Child Care Study Center on the Parnassus campus was scheduled to close with the opening of the Kirkham facility, the Chancellor was able to retain the Lucia facility for infant care. The Kirkham Child Care Center, also located on the

Parnassus Campus, will serve preschool children (24 months to five years). Mission Bay's Child Care Center opened in May 2006 and is licensed to care for 111 children daily. Due to the lack of both space and funding, UC cannot provide care for all students, faculty and staff who need child care or infant care. The Committee sent a Communication to Chair Gardner requesting support for the development of a second childcare facility on Lot 25 at Mission Bay. The Committee also requested that the support of this project be acknowledged in a communication to Chancellor Bishop or Vice Chancellor Eugene Washington. ([Appendix 5](#))

Also discussed was the notable absence of lactation facilities in the Woman's and Children's Hospital at Mission Bay current hospital plans. California requires employers to make available a room for breastfeeding or expressing of milk. A communication was sent to Chair Gardner. ([Appendix 6](#))

### **Time and Attendance/Vacation Leave Assessment Project (TAVLA)**

Zoanne Nelson, Associate Director of the Project Management Office and Charles Taylor, Director of Financial Analysis in the Department of Budget and Resource Management presented the Time and Attendance/Vacation Leave Assessment Project (TAVLA) Project Implementation Phase, the final of three phases. UCSF will be the first campus in the UC system to have a campus-wide timekeeping system using the Medical Center's system (Huntington Business Systems – HBS). The purpose of this combined attendance and vacation systems is to assure better quality data, more efficiency and timely timekeeping.

All campuses are required to create a fund pool to insure there is funding for vacations (ex: large amounts of accrued time upon retirement). UCSF is the last campus to implement this project. Project implementation is scheduled for Fall 2010.

### **Development Office Funding Model Review – Academic Senate Task Force – Susanne Mueller**

The Academic Senate convened a task force to work with the Development Office on devising the new Development Office Funding Model. This task force includes two representatives from the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (APB), Task Force Chair Charles Marmar and Steve Cheung; Susanne Mueller, Committee on Faculty Welfare (FW); Robert Newcomer, School of Nursing; William Grossman, School of Medicine; Lorie Rice, School of Pharmacy; and Deborah Greenspan, School of Dentistry and will work with Michael Irwin, Executive Director, Financial Services and Administration.

The Development Office currently receives no campus or state funds and must be self-sustaining. Funding comes from the following: gift assessment, foundation endowment management fees, Foundations, trust management fees, and department funding agreements. The Task Force is charged with providing a funding model that is fair to all concerned.

In an effort to better understand the duties and responsibilities, the Committee invited Michael Irwin, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, and Executive Director, Steve Downs to a meeting to present an overview of the University Development Alumni Relations. ([Appendix 7](#))

## **Going Forward**

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2008-2009:

- Child Care
- Salary Cuts
- Retirement

## **Appendices**

- [Appendix 1:](#) Communication of the Committee on Faculty Welfare to Chair David Gardner Regarding Review of APM 710, 711, and 080.
- [Appendix 2:](#) Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to Chair David Gardner Regarding Review of the Postdoctoral Unionization at the University of California – Comments for Christine Des Jarlais, Ed.D.
- [Appendix 3:](#) Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to Chair David Gardner Regarding Review the of Furlough and Salary Cut Proposed Policies
- [Appendix 4:](#) Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to Chair David Gardner Regarding Review of Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan Options.
- [Appendix 5:](#) Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to Chair David Gardner Requesting Support for the Development of a Second Childcare Facility on Lot 25 at Mission Bay.
- [Appendix 6:](#) Committee on Faculty Welfare Support for the Provision of Lactation Facilities in the new Children’s Hospital.
- [Appendix 7:](#) Invitation to Michael Irwin, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, and Executive Director, Steve Downs to discuss the Development Office.

Senate Staff:  
Kathleen Dargan, Senate Analyst  
kdargan@ucsf.edu; 415/476-1308

University of California  
San Francisco



**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

## **Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare Jacque Duncan, MD, Chair**

November 19, 2008

David Gardner, MD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

**Re: Review of Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Policies 110-4(10); 230-17; 230-18; 279-20; 360-80-a; 520-4; and 710-14-b, 710-14-1, 710-38, and 710-46; and Proposed New Academic Personnel Policy 765**

Dear Chair Gardner,

The Committee on Academic Freedom reviewed proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Policies 110-4(10); 230-17; 230-18; 279-20; 360-80-a; 520-4; and 710-14-b, 710-14-1, 710-38, and 710-46; and Proposed New Academic Personnel Policy 765

Following are two concerns indicated by members of the Committee:

- In relationship to item a (APM110-4(10)), it is not clear whether item (ii) would exclude or include a couple that was legally married in another state (i.e. Mass or Conn) or country (e.g. Spain, Norway, Belgium, Canada, etc.) under this definition of Domestic Partner.
- There still seems to be a discrepancy in APM 110-4, noted by Chair Oakley in his letter dated 5/22/07, between California law which requires domestic partners to file a declaration with the state while PPSM2 lists other options. This, however, does not seem to be a reason to prevent approval of the proposed changes.

Therefore, The Committee on Academic Freedom reviewed proposed revisions to APM and has proposed that the requested changes be approved.

Sincerely,

Jacque Duncan, MD, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Susanne Mueller, MD, Vice Chair  
Abe Rudolph, MD  
Carmen Portillo, RN  
David Rempel, MD  
Don Kishi, PharmD  
Paul Green, PhD

Senate Staff:  
Kathleen Dargan, Analyst  
[kdargan@senate.ucsf.edu](mailto:kdargan@senate.ucsf.edu), 415-476-1308



**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

## **Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare Jacque Duncan, M.D., Chair**

February 5, 2009,

David Gardner, MD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

**Re: Review of Postdoctoral Unionization at the University of California – Comments for  
Christine Des Jarlais, Ed.D.**

Dear Chair Gardner,

The members of University of California, San Francisco Committee on Faculty Welfare and their faculty were asked for input on the recent unionization of the post-doctoral fellows by the United Auto Workers union. While there are scant details regarding what the implications of unionization will be, and many faculty members are currently in the process of searching for or hiring post-doctoral fellows and are unaware that there will be changes as the union contract is finalized, the Committee has some preliminary concerns that we would like to highlight:

- Will there be a requirement to post all post-doctoral positions before hiring?
- Will post-docs be subject to the preferential re-hire requirements to which other UCSF employees are subject?
- Since most post-doctoral fellows are funded by federal grants (T32), an issue might arise if union contracts required higher salaries than NIH allows (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-07-057.html>).
- Post-doctoral fellows often waive their health insurance since they usually are covered in other ways (e.g., a spouse's coverage will cover the post-doctoral fellow). If the contract requires health insurance coverage, grants would have to bear this extra cost, thereby significantly impacting grant expenditures and activities. We recommend that the contract provide post-doctoral fellows with the opportunity to waive coverage if they are covered elsewhere.
- Will faculty be required to pay for accrued vacation time at the time a post-doctoral fellow leaves? Currently, we require post doctoral fellows to take vacation, and we do not pay for unused vacation when they depart.
- Are post-doctoral fellows paid on an hourly or salaried basis? Payment of overtime for hourly employees could become problematic for fellows paid by grants.

- Of concern is the issue of dismissal with or without cause. Are the traditional systems that are in place to provide due process for poorly performing workers appropriate for the management of post doctoral fellows who work in an intellectual realm?

We are concerned that unionization may have a negative impact on the relationship between faculty members and post-doctoral fellows. While the details of the effects of unionization are very limited, we propose the following recommendations:

- Post-doctoral fellowships should not be subject to the preferential re-hire requirements that apply to research and administrative staff positions.
- The contract should not require higher salaries than NIH allows (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-07-057.html>).
- Post-doctoral fellows paid by non-US grants, i.e., foreign governments, should be exempt from the requirement to pay union dues or fair share fees through mandatory paycheck deductions. Foreign governments should not be required to support unions or authorized U.S. charities.
- The contract should provide post-doctoral fellows with the opportunity to waive health insurance coverage if they covered elsewhere.
- The contract should provide for pay by salary rather than hourly rates.
- The contract should preserve the current status quo whereby post-doctoral fellows are hired on a yearly contract, with the possibility of dismissal with or without cause at the end of each year. It may be useful to establish a formal set of criteria for evaluation of post-doctoral fellows, as exists for students and residents, rather than having such processes determined by the union.
- There should be greater access to information about the contract negotiations. Faculty should be notified of the current status of the contract as issues are solidified and given the opportunity to provide feedback, perhaps through a website to describe the status of negotiations with the union. Furthermore, since the union may address issues directly relevant to faculty welfare, it may be useful for the Faculty Welfare committee to be involved in the contract negotiations, perhaps at a systemwide level.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this issue.

Sincerely,

**Jacque Duncan, M.D.**  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Senate Staff:  
Kathleen Dargan, Analyst  
kate.dargan@ucsf.edu; 415/476-1308



## **Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare**

**Jacque Duncan, Chair**

June 20, 2009

David Gardner, MD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the *Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan Options*

Dear Chair Gardner,

In response to the letter from President Yudof dated June 17, 2009, the Committee on Faculty Welfare has reviewed the *Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan Options* and makes the following recommendations:

- There should be a provision to “hold harmless” faculty so service credit, retirement, insurance coverage and benefits will not be adversely affected under any of the 3 proposed Options.
- Salary reductions should be limited to the portion of salaries supported by 19900 funds. Salaries supported by other sources should not be subject to reduction.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare strongly supports the adoption of a salary reduction policy that helps to alleviate the \$800 million State funding shortfall. However, a general salary cut, without consideration of the full economic impact, is irrational and not fiscally sound. Overall, 13-14% of UCSF funds are supported by State funds, while the remaining percentage comes from external sources. Not only would cutting the salary of UCSF employees who are funded by non-State funds fail to achieve the stated goal of reducing expenses, it will result in an *exacerbation* of the economic crisis for several reasons:

- UCSF will lose millions of dollars annually from indirect costs applied to salaries funded by external sources without saving any funds from State sources. Funds from the 8% reduction in salaries would of necessity be directed to the purchase of equipment and supplies rather than to hiring new employees, and these purchases do not generate indirect costs.
- UCSF and all UC medical centers system wide will lose clinical revenue if salary reductions or furloughs are implemented due to reduced productivity, decreased patient access to health care providers, and decreased ability to accept new patient referrals.
- Productivity and morale will decline if faculty members whose salaries are not supported by State funds are forced to accept salary reductions which will not improve the budgetary shortfall, and which will result in lost revenue from non-State supported sources such as extramural grants and contracts and clinical revenues.
- By reducing salaries or implementing furloughs, UC is in jeopardy of losing talented faculty members to competing institutions that offer higher salaries.
- Although we most strongly recommend that benefits and retirement funds are not affected, salary reductions could reduce contributions to the UC Retirement Program and Retiree health insurance programs, which would significantly exacerbate its current critically underfunded status.

President Yudof has indicated that he opposes salary reductions only for State-funded employees because to implement selective cuts is both unworkable and inequitable. To address these concerns, we



would like to emphasize that the University of Maryland, Baltimore County; the University of Nevada, Reno; the University of Wisconsin, Madison; and the University of Hawaii have each either implemented selective salary cuts to exclude grant-funded employees, or are in the process of instituting such an informed, rational reduction in salaries. We echo the sentiments of the University of Nevada, Reno Faculty Senate who have stated: *"We believe that it hurts the university and the state if we turn away income that costs Nevada taxpayers nothing. We also believe that any policy that reduces the incentive for seeking extramural funding is antithetical to the long-run goals of the university."*

While President Yudof's concern about the inequity of selective salary reductions is appreciated, it should be pointed out that there are inherent inequities already built into the UC system. The difference between State-funded and grant or other non-State-funded positions in terms of job security exemplifies this inequity. Adding salary reductions and/or furloughs to the existing inequities, particularly since these actions will not reduce UC system expenses, will only emphasize what is already an unequal system.

For salary reductions for State-funded employees, the Committee recommends Option 2 over Options 1 and 3 for the following reasons:

1. Furloughs are easier to reverse than salary reduction when the financial crisis has passed.
2. Furloughs will have less impact on benefits, including retirement earnings.
3. It would be preferable to offer time off without pay and allow faculty members to choose how they use their time during furlough periods.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on this critical issue. The current budget crisis has evolved, in part, due to inadequate attention to economic consequences of certain fiscal policies. We believe that strategies designed to mitigate the budget shortfall require a full evaluation of the economic effects, including the effect of the multi-million dollar loss of revenue from the loss of indirect cost recovery as a result of non-selective salary cuts, without any reduction in State expenditure.

We appreciate the severity of the budget crisis, and are hopeful that appropriate and rational steps will be taken to weather this fiscal emergency, while considering all options to try to limit any negative impact on the budget shortfall, the obligations to retirees and the morale of employees.

Sincerely,

Jacque Duncan, M.D., Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Susanne Mueller, MD, Vice Chair  
Jean Ann Seago, RN, PhD, Committee on Faculty Welfare UC System Wide Representative  
Paul Green, PhD  
Don Kishi, PharmD  
Maria Orellana, DDS, MSc, PhD  
Carmen Portillo, RN, PhD, FAAN  
David Rempel, MD, MPH  
Abe Rudolph, MD



## **Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare**

**Jacque Duncan, Chair**

June 20, 2009

David Gardner, MD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the *Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan Options*

Dear Chair Gardner,

In response to the letter from President Yudof dated June 17, 2009, the Committee on Faculty Welfare has reviewed the *Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan Options* and makes the following recommendations:

- There should be a provision to “hold harmless” faculty so service credit, retirement, insurance coverage and benefits will not be adversely affected under any of the 3 proposed Options.
- Salary reductions should be limited to the portion of salaries supported by 19900 funds. Salaries supported by other sources should not be subject to reduction.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare strongly supports the adoption of a salary reduction policy that helps to alleviate the \$800 million State funding shortfall. However, a general salary cut, without consideration of the full economic impact, is irrational and not fiscally sound. Overall, 13-14% of UCSF funds are supported by State funds, while the remaining percentage comes from external sources. Not only would cutting the salary of UCSF employees who are funded by non-State funds fail to achieve the stated goal of reducing expenses, it will result in an *exacerbation* of the economic crisis for several reasons:

- UCSF will lose millions of dollars annually from indirect costs applied to salaries funded by external sources without saving any funds from State sources. Funds from the 8% reduction in salaries would of necessity be directed to the purchase of equipment and supplies rather than to hiring new employees, and these purchases do not generate indirect costs.
- UCSF and all UC medical centers system wide will lose clinical revenue if salary reductions or furloughs are implemented due to reduced productivity, decreased patient access to health care providers, and decreased ability to accept new patient referrals.
- Productivity and morale will decline if faculty members whose salaries are not supported by State funds are forced to accept salary reductions which will not improve the budgetary shortfall, and which will result in lost revenue from non-State supported sources such as extramural grants and contracts and clinical revenues.
- Although we most strongly recommend that benefits and retirement funds are not affected, salary reductions could reduce contributions to the UC Retirement Program and Retiree health insurance programs, which would significantly exacerbate its current critically underfunded status.

President Yudof has indicated that he opposes salary reductions only for State-funded employees because to implement selective cuts is both unworkable and inequitable. To address these concerns, we would like to emphasize that the University of Maryland, Baltimore County; the University of Nevada, Reno; the University of Wisconsin, Madison; and the University of Hawaii have each either implemented selective salary cuts to exclude grant-funded employees, or are in the process of instituting such an

informed, rational reduction in salaries. We echo the sentiments of the University of Nevada, Reno Faculty Senate who have stated: *"We believe that it hurts the university and the state if we turn away income that costs Nevada taxpayers nothing. We also believe that any policy that reduces the incentive for seeking extramural funding is antithetical to the long-run goals of the university."*

While President Yudof's concern about the inequity of selective salary reductions is appreciated, it should be pointed out that there are inherent inequities already built into the UC system. The difference between State-funded and grant or other non-State-funded positions in terms of job security exemplifies this inequity. Adding salary reductions and/or furloughs to the existing inequities, particularly since these actions will not reduce UC system expenses, will only emphasize what is already an unequal system.

For salary reductions for State-funded employees, the Committee recommends Option 2 over Options 1 and 3 for the following reasons:

1. Furloughs are easier to reverse than salary reduction when the financial crisis has passed.
2. It would be preferable to offer time off without pay and allow faculty members to choose how they use their time during furlough periods.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on this critical issue. The current budget crisis has evolved, in part, due to inadequate attention to economic consequences of certain fiscal policies. We believe that strategies designed to mitigate the budget shortfall require a full evaluation of the economic effects, in particular the multi-million dollar reduction in revenue to the University due to the loss of indirect cost recovery from non-State-sourced salary cuts that would not produce any reduction in State expenditure.

We appreciate the severity of the budget crisis, and are hopeful that appropriate and rational steps will be taken to weather this fiscal emergency, while considering all options to try to limit any negative impact on the budget shortfall, the obligations to retirees and the morale of employees.

Sincerely,

Jacque Duncan, M.D., Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Susanne Mueller, MD, Vice Chair  
Jean Ann Seago, RN, PhD, Committee on Faculty Welfare UC System Wide Representative  
Paul Green, PhD  
Don Kishi, PharmD  
Maria Orellana, DDS, MSc, PhD  
Carmen Portillo, RN, PhD, FAAN  
David Rempel, MD, MPH  
Abe Rudolph, MD

Senate Staff:  
Kathleen Dargan, Analyst  
kate.dargan@ucsf.edu; 415/476-1308

University of California  
San Francisco



**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

## **Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare Jacque Duncan, M.D., Chair**

January 15, 2009

David Gardner, MD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

### **Re: Committee on Faculty Welfare Support for the Development of a Second Childcare Facility on Lot 25 at Mission Bay**

Dear Chair Gardner,

The Committee on Faculty Welfare would like to request Senate support for the development of a second childcare facility on Lot 25 Mission Bay. This location is close to the forthcoming hospital, where many of the prospective parents will be working, and could also serve as a resource for the University and the new Children's Hospital as a site for the study of early childhood development.

At a recent Committee meeting, Diane Wara from the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Children gave the following update on UCSF Child Care:

The need for child care at the UCSF campuses has increased from approximately 300 in 2002 to 1,100 in 2008 with most of the wait list at Laurel Heights, a childcare facility that primarily serves the Parnassus campus. While the Lucia facility on Parnassus was scheduled to close with the opening of the Kirkham facility, the Chancellor was able to retain the Lucia facility for infant care.

Chancellor Bishop has committed to providing students with 20% of the available care slots, and staff and faculty will receive 40% each. Due to the lack of both space and funding, UCSF cannot provide care for all students, faculty and staff who need child care or infant care.

There is discussion of broadening the definition of student to include all titles up through the fellowship years to include a broader base of UCSF students.

There is currently a location, Lot 25 at the Mission Bay Campus, that the Chancellor's Advisory Committee feels would be most appropriate for a much needed additional day care center. The Committee on Faculty Welfare is requesting that the support of this project be acknowledged in a communication to Chancellor Bishop or Executive Vice Chancellor, Eugene Washington.

Sincerely,

Jacque Duncan, M.D., Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Susanne Mueller, MD, Vice Chair

Abe Rudolph, MD  
Marie De Orrelana, PhD, DDS  
David Rempel, MD  
Don Kishi, PharmD  
Paul Green, PhD

Senate Staff:  
Kathleen Dargan, Analyst  
kate.dargan@ucsf.edu; 415/476-1308

University of California  
San Francisco



**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

## **Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare Jacque Duncan, M.D., Chair**

February 10, 2009

David Gardner, MD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

**Re: Committee on Faculty Welfare Support for the Provision of Lactation Facilities in the new Children's Hospital.**

Dear Chair Gardner,

The Committee on Faculty Welfare requests Academic Senate support for the provision of lactation facilities in the Women's and Children's Hospital at Mission Bay. The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Child Care reported that lactation rooms have been omitted from the current hospital plans, not in keeping with California Labor Code Section [1031](#), which requires employers to "make reasonable efforts to provide the employee with the use of a room or other location, other than a toilet stall, in close proximity to the employee's work area, for the employee to express milk in private". Furthermore, the absence of lactation facilities from the Women's and Children's Hospital at Mission Bay is not in accord with the 1998 California requirement resolving that all workplaces shall provide adequate lactation facilities (see below).

### **Breastfeeding at Work (1998)** **[Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 155](#)**

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, the Senate thereof concurring, That the Legislature encourages the State of California and all California employers to strongly support and encourage the practice of breastfeeding by striving to accommodate the needs of employees, and by ensuring that employees are provided with adequate facilities for breastfeeding, or the expressing of milk for their children; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature respectfully memorializes the Governor to declare by executive order that all State of California employees shall be provided with adequate facilities for breastfeeding, or the expressing of milk."

Noncompliance with these legislative requirements for lactation facilities for UCSF employees is particularly unacceptable for a new hospital dedicated to the health of women and children. For these reasons, we recommend that adequate lactation facilities be incorporated into the plans for the Women's and Children's Hospital at Mission Bay.

Sincerely,

Jacque Duncan, M.D., Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Susanne Mueller, MD, Vice Chair  
Paul Green, PhD  
Abe Rudolph, MD  
Marie De Orrelana, PhD, DDS  
David Rempel, MD  
Don Kishi, PharmD

Senate Staff:  
Kathleen Dargan, Analyst  
kate.dargan@ucsf.edu; 415/476-1308



**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

## **Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare Jacque Duncan. M.D., Chair**

May 5, 2008

Michael Irwin, Interim Associate Vice-Chancellor  
Steve Downs, Executive Director, Finance and Administration  
Box 0248  
220 Montgomery Street #2200  
San Francisco, CA 94143-0248

RE: The Development Office Funding Process

Dear Mike and Steve,

The Committee on Faculty Welfare would like to thank you for agreeing to join us on Tuesday, March 24, 2009 to clarify the process of the Development Office. Some of the questions raised following a presentation of the Development Office Funding Model Review PowerPoint presentation are:

- Development Office budget
- Development Office support allocation with respect to the percent of time spent raising specific funds
- Development Office fit in the UCSF organizational structure and to its accountability
- Current Development Office funding
- How eligibility for contributing fees and the assessment rates are determined?
- How the UCSF Development office compares with other fundraising units at UCSF?

It is our understanding that the Development Office does not receive any funding from Capital Gifts. It seems from the presentation that funds raised for Capital purchases such as buildings and infrastructure are exempt from being assessed fees used to support the Development Office. From the Committee's perspective it would seem that those types of gifts might seem to be the ones requiring the most effort by and resources from the Development Office.

The Committee looks forward to this discussion.

Respectfully,

The Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Jacque Duncan, Chair



Senate Staff:  
Kathleen Dargan, Analyst  
kate.dargan@ucsf.edu; 415/476-1308