****

**Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

October 16, 2017 11:30-12:30pm CP 206 C

***Present:*** *Sarah Hampson, Susan Johnson, D.C. Grant, Margo Bergman, Greg Benner. Absent/Excused: Gillian Marshall, Jim Thatcher. Guest, via phone: Amy Hawkins.*

1. **Consent Agenda**

The September25, 2017 Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes were approved.

1. **Discussion Items:**
   1. Childcare and Early Childhood Education

Amy Hawkins, Executive Director of Total Benefits, UW, was present via phone. UW Tacoma’s Childcare partnership with the Muse is having some challenges. There is a long wait list, it is quite expensive, and it does not provide infant care. For childcare in general there is a high demand without much ability to meet it. It’s a systemic issue, though, some community colleges have good models to look at. Amy Hawkins suggested thinking through priority and ability to invest financially. Additionally:

* Look for more partnerships with providers, i.e. YMCA
* Purchase to have priority at childcare sites/ invest in reserving slots
* UW has priority at Kindercare and Bright Horizons, but there are still waitlists and the expense is often more than people can afford
* There are childcare facilities built on campus at UWS, built using UW central funding, and the care is provided by an outside vender (through RFP process)
* The UWS childcare sites are not linked to any academic programs, but they do employ many students who are studying early childhood education
* Another option to look at leasing a larger facility and contracting with a provider
* A UWB group has done feasibility studies, has Amy as an advisor; contact - Chelsea Knodel

FAC also discussed the Back-Up Care program that UW subsidizes for its faculty, staff, and students. Many people do not know it’s available, thus, it is an underutilized program. One FAC member had used the service before and advised that the advertising includes encouragement to register ahead of time so that when the back-up care is needed, one doesn’t have to do the tedious process within a hurried time-frame.

FAC is hoping that a clearer flyer can be circulated and include:

* Encouragement to “Register Now!” so that in case you need it, you've already done the tedious part
* In-Home (or at Site) Care (need to figure out which sites in Tacoma this is applicable for and/or list the Seattle sites)
* Limited uses - 5 per year
* Subsidized by UW - $8 an hour, $32 (4 hour) minimum
* Available 24/7
* Any age (including infants)
* Up to however many children are in your home
* Information found here: <http://hr.uw.edu/worklife/child-care/backup-and-sick-child-care/>

**ACTION:**

* + - Look for emails from Amy Hawkins that will connect FAC with Bothell's Childcare initiative group (Chelsea Knodel), the feasibility studies they have done, and information on space (and outdoor space) required for childcare centers. Disseminate to FAC. - D.C. and Ruth
    - Contact Kristi Soriano-Noceda (Student Engagement, Childcare & Family Services) about partnering on flyers to advertise the back-up childcare subsidized by UW, open to students, faculty, & staff. - Ruth
  1. Equity and Inclusion in Hiring Processes

Request to Institutionalize Implicit-Bias Training for those Hiring Staff – *tabled till following meeting*

Feedback / Discussion re: Faculty Search Committee Diversity Workshops:

FAC member, Sarah Hampson, attended a new implicit-bias training offered for faculty who are on faculty search/hiring committees. She shared highlights with the group:

* Planning and preparation are key when advertising a position
* Important to check in along the way
* Networking is needed
* Getting the word out even before the ads
* Send the ad to more than just national chronicles
* Look for smaller, interdisciplinary publications
* Use Facebook, social media, think outside the box
* As a committee, talk through processes long before you have to go through them
* Work through a rubric even before advertising or writing a rubric based on an ad
* Talk about conflict-of-interest processes
* Talk about short-list processes
* Work against bias and replicating one’s own bias – think about this at the stage of funding hires, i.e. certain academic fields will have more ethnicities or underrepresented minorities than others

FAC discussed the role they could have in helping to look at the front of the equation (as a systemic issue). They decided that they need to have clear steps and asked for a volunteer to draft an outline.

**ACTION:**

* + - Review Handbook & Toolkit for faculty searches: <http://www.washington.edu/diversity/faculty-advancement/handbook/> - All of FAC
    - Draft Outline - 5 things that can be steps to take in the direction of considering equity and representation at the funding stage of faculty lines (what lines are funded, in which fields; look at beginning of equation) - Sarah
  1. Climate Survey (brief update)

Chair, D.C. Grant, offered support to previous chair, Marian Harris, in regards to the Climate Survey since she is on sabbatical. She communicated that she will continue to be involved with the group in UWS who are helping to plan the Climate Survey. FAC will keep the Climate Survey on their agendas as a reminder for updates.

* 1. Non-competitive Hiring Policy

Chair, D.C. Grant, is continuing to work with Lecturer Affairs and aims to circulate a draft for voting by the November meeting.

* 1. Parking for Faculty –Review early draft proposal

FAC Chair circulated handouts of a draft proposal for a parking garage. See appendix A.

FAC discussed proposal and came up with several actions to further investigate the possibilities/solutions.

**ACTION:**

* + - Parking Business Proposal - partner with Milgard to check numbers, strengthen draft, etc.
    - D.C. and Margo (D.C. will send draft proposal materials electronically)
    - Suggestion: Loop in/invite to a meeting James Sinding - jamess7@uw.edu - who oversees Transportation Services
    - Make contact with Mortenson Construction - Margo (via Jill)
    - Parking and Childcare Center - start conversations with those in School of Education who are interested in Early Childhood Education (Marcy Stein and Diane Kinder) - Greg
    - Make contact with Herb Simon about Parking and Childcare Center - invite to future meeting (date?) - Greg (and Ruth will contact Mimi Simon)
    - Contact BCRA, eventually, for expertise, RFP about Parking and Childcare Center - D.C.
    - Circulate Budget Primer from VC for Finance and Administration, Tye Mincker - Ruth
  1. UW Express Bus (#586) – Brainstorming exercise

FAC discussed ideas:

* Work with ASUWT to make the U-Pass part of the fee structure
* Make U-pass mandatory for faculty, staff, students
* That might give leverage for UW to ask Sound Transit to run shuttle all day
  1. Teaching Evaluations – Any volunteers to lead this effort?

The current status of teaching evaluations is poor because faculty are subject to student bias, and how the student feels they are doing in that class, more than objectively how the instructor is teaching. Peer evaluations could also be more useful. Currently, they work as a confirming mechanism because no one wants to include something negative in someone else’s permanent file (affecting P&T). UWS’ TLC provides institutional support for teaching. UW Tacoma’s TLC is more geared for students. There are some individual faculty members who receive training and help support the teaching in their academic units, for example, Kent Nelson in Milgard (it counts as part of the service load.) FAC discusses ideas to have this training for faculty who are interested, for advisors, and for TLC staff.

* + - Reread Teaching Eval Campus Fellows Report – Ruth will send to FAC members
    - Work on policy to review at 11/13 meeting (i.e. that all academic units have trained SGID's - like Kent Nelson in Milgard). - Sarah and Greg
    - After 11/13 meeting, ask for input from Sushil et al. (Campus Fellows group) and APT Committee. Goal to report back to FAC at 12/11 meeting. - Sarah and Greg

1. **Adjourn**

Appendix A – Parking Proposal & Related Documents from meeting

**Draft Parking Garage Proposal A –** DC Grant

**2210 South C Street:**

Site has a total of 109,000 square foot of floor space available on three floors.  
Assuming a 35% space loss for access, leaves about 70,850 net space for parking.

Allocating 120 sq. ft. per space on average, (typically between 7.5 to 9 feet wide and 10 to 20 feet long).   
There should be about 590 new parking spaces made available.

If the facility is open at least from 5:00a to 11:00p (18 hours minimum):   
Average occupancy rates should average about 9 hours per spot per day for 300 days per year

The building is listed for $6.4M – **renovation estimated at $2.0M – so around $8.4M total invested.**

At $0.50 per hour per spot this yields:

590 spaces \* 9 hours \* 300 days \* 0.50 = $796,500 per year.  
**So the pay-back period given those assumptions is a little over ten and a half years.**

This plan also enables other parking areas on the campus to be used in different ways.

If hourly rate is increased to match other options in the area, $/spot increase, but occupancy drops.  
*Current charges average $1.00 per hour with various options for a reduced rate on ‘all-day’ parking.*

Reserved parking could also be sold at a monthly or quarterly rate to increase occupancy figures.  
Current parking passes range from $85 to $198 per quarter, for non-reserved (first-come) parking.  
Reserved spots could be sold for $180+ per quarter. Let’s say 125 of those (which is $67.5K per year).

This would reduce available hourly spots by 8%, but increase occupancy on the remaining 465 spots.

The new equation looks like:

465 spaces \* 12 hours \* 300 days \* 0.50 = $837,000: $837,000 + $67,500 = $904,500 per year. **Dropping the payback period to roughly nine years and three months.**

If the parking facility lasts for 25 years without major renovations required, the net profit is: $14.2M.  
Of course, by that time parking rates will likely go up (probably outpacing the annual inflation rate).

Providing 24 hour security at $15 per hour is $131,400 (+25% fringe benefit load) is $164,250 per year.   
Which would extend payback ($8.4M/$632,250) to a maximum of 13 years 4 months and 25 years net revenue could drop to (11.67\*$632,250) just under $7.4M, which would easily pay major renovations.  
Meaning that the long term net revenue would be high due to the facility easily paying for itself.

But, revenues may actually increase due to citations, and payback time could drop (hard to calculate).

**Draft Parking Garage Proposal B –** DC Grant

**2210 South C Street:**

Site has a total of 109,000 square foot of floor space available on three floors.  
Assuming a 35% space loss for access, leaves about 70,850 net space for parking.

Allocating 120 sq. ft. per space on average, (typically between 7.5 to 9 feet wide and 10 to 20 feet long).   
There should be about 590 new parking spaces made available.

If the facility is open at least from 5:00a to 11:00p (18 hours minimum):   
Average occupancy rates should average about 9 hours per spot per day for 300 days per year

The building is listed for $6.4M – **renovation estimated at $3.6M – so around $10.0M total invested.**

At $0.50 per hour per spot this yields:

590 spaces \* 9 hours \* 300 days \* 0.50 = $796,500 per year.  
**So the pay-back period given those assumptions is a little under twelve years and seven months.**

This plan also enables other parking areas on the campus to be used in different ways.

If hourly rate is increased to match other options in the area, $/spot increase, but occupancy drops.  
*Current charges average $1.00 per hour with various options for a reduced rate on ‘all-day’ parking.*

Reserved parking could also be sold at a monthly or quarterly rate to increase occupancy figures.  
Current parking passes range from $85 to $198 per quarter, for non-reserved (first-come) parking.  
Reserved spots could be sold for $180+ per quarter. Let’s say 125 of those (which is $67.5K per year).

This would reduce available hourly spots by 8%, but increase occupancy on the remaining 465 spots.

The new equation looks like:

465 spaces \* 12 hours \* 300 days \* 0.50 = $837,000: $837,000 + $67,500 = $904,500 per year. **Dropping the payback period to just over eleven years.**

If the parking facility lasts for 25 years without major renovations required, the net profit is: $12.6M.  
Of course, by that time parking rates will likely go up (probably outpacing the annual inflation rate).

Providing 24 hour security at $15 per hour is $131,400 (+25% fringe benefit load) is $164,250 per year.   
Which would extend payback ($10M/$632,250) to a maximum of 15 years 10 months, and 25 year net revenue could drop to (9\*$632,250) just under $5.7M, which would easily pay for major renovations.  
Meaning that the long term net revenue would be high due to the facility easily paying for itself.

But, revenues may actually increase due to citations, and payback time could drop (hard to calculate).

**How much does it cost to build the average parking garage?**

There are many variables to such a project, and dominant issue is size. The Means CostWorks site places the average parking garage at **145,000 square feet**. This is assuming a **five-story** construction with each story measuring in at ten feet in height.

The building of parking garage requires a knowledgeable contractor, an architect or an architectural firm, a team of subcontractors, and a cooperative developer/owner to get the job done in a reasonable time frame. It is also going to entail a great deal of site preparation and machinery costs.

* Most parking garage projects should use materials and techniques that fall under the highest quality ratings possible in order to ensure stability, safety and longevity. Such a building would run at an average of **$8.56 million** to complete. This does not include acquisition of the land or any demolition costs, however.
* The above figures place this construction at a **$59 per square foot** cost, though a national average is from **$50 to $70** for most projects. This pricing structure assumes that **masons and excavators** charge an average of **$70 per hour**, **electricians** between **$65 to $85 per hour**, and **plumbers** between **$45 and $65** **per hour**. Should the work be done in the **"open shop"** format, and without union labor, the total costs would decrease by an average or roughly $1.2 million. This would drop the cost per square foot to roughly **$51 per square foot** for the same project and materials, but not all areas can legally create structures of this kind with non-union labor.
* **Materials** would cost around **$6.5 million**, **contractor fees** would cost roughly **$1.6 million** and the **architectural costs** are roughly **$392,000.**

**Cost breakdown**

Steel **framing**, Concrete block backup, Brick **facing** on complete structure, all plumbing, masonry, carpentry, and electrical services as needed.

Most developers of parking facilities rely on both an architect and a contractor, and the architect will require approximately **6% of the total building budget;**

* An architect or architectural team will:
  + **Determine** the scope of the project and establish a preliminary budget;
  + Draft list of **proposed work, budget, and outline** of plans;
  + **Create the schematic design** and draft **floor plans** with elevation drawings. Then work with any structural engineers and meet with **planning agencies** to verify any requirements;
  + **Finalize** drawings and incorporate all details about **materials and finishes**, any **fixtures or equipment,** and all **systems** in the structure;
  + Serve as the **overall development manager** and review the plans with any required **local agencies** while also obtaining necessary **permits**. (If contractors are to be used it is at this point that they must be selected);
  + Serve in an **advisory capacity** to select contractor and help the client through the **bid review process** as well;
  + Complete **construction documents**; and
  + **Administer the construction**, ensure that contractor's requests for payments are accurate and that all "final" details are corrected or finished by the contractor
* A contractor will:
  + **Provide the services and materials** required for the entire job;
  + **Hire subcontractors** according to need;
  + **Suggest** plans and ideas to architect/owner to help them meet goals;
  + Deliver **final cleanup** of entire job site;
  + Pull all **permits** for work and utility installation; and
  + For doing all of the **day to day management** of the project the contractor earns around **$12 per square foot**. They may also "mark up" supplies and services as well. For example, on a parking garage project, as described here, the contractor would earn around **25% of the budget** and could account for **more than $1.5 million in markup** and indirect fees.

Retrieved October 2017 from: https://www.fixr.com/costs/build-parking-garage#sQ1

**The Top 10 Issues Affecting the Cost of Building a Parking Space**

* Watry Insights

*Original Source:*[*"Parking Today"*](http://watrydesign.com/insights/watrydesign.com)



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Spending money on constructing parking is one of the biggest decisions that an owner can face. The cost of parking can have a substantial impact on the financial aspect of a project. As an example, the square footage for parking each car is generally more than one person takes up for his or her office.   Below are the top 10 issues that affect how much it costs to build a parking space.  1- Geography – Where the project is located has an effect on the cost of parking. Construction costs vary by location due to regional factors such as the cost of labor and availability of materials. In addition, factors such as higher seismic regions and soil conditions have a large impact on cost.  2- Number of parking levels – In general, a larger-footprint parking structure that is shorter will cost less per parking space than a taller structure with a smaller footprint. The cost per square foot of the first level that is on the ground is less than levels that are elevated above the ground. A lower-height, larger-footprint structure will have a higher proportion of the cost in the first level. The taller a structure is the heavier it is, and this affects the foundation cost. A taller structure generally has a less efficient parking layout, which translates into more square feet for each parking space.   3- Parking below-grade – Parking below-grade is much more expensive than parking above-grade. A parking structure that is five levels above-grade may cost, say, $50 per square foot. If this same structure is depressed one level into the ground, the cost can increase approximately 15% to $57.50 per square foot. If you take that same structure and put two levels below ground, the cost increases even more because of the impacts of having to dig deeper. This cost would then be around 45% higher than the original cost or approximately $72 per square foot. |  |



4- Structural system – 60% to 70% of the cost of parking is in the structural system. Therefore, the selection of the framing system will have a significant effect on the cost of each parking space. There are two general types of framing layouts and there are different types of structural systems. The two types of framing layouts are short-span and long-span. Short span is where you have a column approximately every three parking spaces (27x30 feet square) to support the floor slab. Long-span is where you have columns spaced 60 feet apart, with beams spanning over the stalls and the drive aisle. Generally, short-span systems cost less per square foot, but the efficiency is not as good. Long-span systems cost more per square foot, but you are getting more stalls in the same square footage. The structural system of a parking structure can be either Cast-in-Place Concrete, Precast Concrete or Structural Steel. Which system is more cost effective depends on the location of the project and the preferred methods of construction in the region. This is a case-by-case analysis. The selection of a system that is not common in the area will generally cause the structure to cost more.  
  
5- Foundation – Since the structural system is such a high cost of the project, the foundation system has a large impact on the cost of structured parking. Structures built in areas with poor soil conditions that require more expensive, deeper foundation systems will cost more. The difference between a shallow and deep foundation system can increase the price approximately 10% overall – taking the cost from, say, $50 to $55 per square foot.  
  
6- Architectural façade treatment – The appearance of a parking structure is important to the surrounding environment. The cost of making that structure more pleasing can have an effect of up to 15% on the cost of the parking space. If you can use the structural system to create the architectural look, the cost per square foot will be less, because the structural system is such a large cost of the project. However, the use of additional architectural elements on top of the structural system will increase the cost. If the architectural design creates an inefficient structural system, then you will hit the top end of the price range.  
  
7- Total parking spaces – The overall size of a project has an effect on the cost per parking space. A smaller project will cost more per space than a larger project. A 200-stall parking structure on a small site may cost about 30% more per square foot than a 1,000-stall structure on a “reasonably” sized lot.



8- Efficiency – This is the amount of square footage it takes for every parking stall overall. The cost of a parking space is the cost per square foot times the square foot per parking stall. So, the more square feet you have to build per stall will increase the cost per stall. For example:

• Typical efficiencies for short-span structures: 330-390 sf/stall  
• Typical efficiencies for long-span structures: 300-340 sf/stall  
• Efficiencies for mixed-use structures can be well over 400 sf/stall  
• The more square feet you build for each stall, the more expensive it will be.

For example: Assume the structure costs $45/sf and there are 500 stalls:  
a- 330 sf/stall \* 500 stalls = 165,000 sf \* $45/sf= $7,425,000  
b- 360 sf/stall \* 500 stalls = 180,000 sf \* $45/sf= $8,100,000  
c- This is a difference of $675,000, or $1,350 per stall!  
  
9- Added items –Program elements added to parking will increase the cost per stall. Items such as a photovoltaic system covering 50% of the top level can add approximately 25% to 30% to the cost per square foot of the building. There may, however, be operational cost savings that can support this increase. A mixed-use component in the project will increase the cost per stall. It will usually impact the efficiency, and the structural framing system, which, as described above, have a large effect on the cost. Special site conditions such as the need to reroute utility lines or perform substantial demolition will increase the cost.  
  
10- Market conditions – As we have seen over the last few years, the cost of parking can be affected by market conditions. Costs can go both down and up. The swing can be 10% or more. A normal bid market will generate four to six bids from qualified contractors. An aggressive bid market might see 10 or even more bids, some not necessarily from qualified bidders. This will cause the price to decrease but can create concern if the bidders are not qualified. An impacted bid market might see one to three bidders and price increase due to lack of competition.  
  
Taking the time to strategize the approach to your structured parking project will increase its chances for success and could generate a savings.   
  
(You can test sample scenarios using the online Parking Structure Cost Calculator at <http://watrydesign.com/garagenator/SelectState.jsp>.)  
  
WIP Leadership Board Member Michelle Wendler, AIA, is Principal of Watry Design. She has been creating parking solutions for the firm’s clients for more than 24 years. Wendler, a licensed architect in 12 states, is responsible for the design of more than 150 parking projects. She leads parking studies and parking structure design for Watry.   
Contact her at [mwendler@watrydesign.com](http://watrydesign.com/).



