To be received and placed on file:

During the 2003-2004 academic year, the Committee on Faculty Welfare met two times, and dealt with the following issues:

1. In the 2002-2003 academic year, the Committee on Faculty Welfare was asked to examine the compensation paid to emeriti when they are recalled for part-time teaching during retirement, and to consider whether the campus needed to modify or augment its existing policies regarding it. The Committee found that the Academic Personnel Manual is ambiguous on the subject of part-time compensation for emeriti. On the one hand, Table 10 of the APM provides a pay scale for recalled emeriti. On the other hand, other provisions of the APM permit the negotiation of by agreement contracts that compensate recalled emeriti at higher or lower levels of pay. When the Committee inquired last year into the practices in effect on our own campus, we discovered that although the EVC’s office encouraged deans to adhere to the APM pay scales, there were in practice wide disparities in policy and in levels of compensation from one college to another. In May of 2003, the Committee recommended to then EVC David Warren that in order to ensure fairness, compensation for part-time teaching by emeriti should wherever possible follow the salary scales provided by Table 10 of the APM. Insofar as up-to-date pay scales for recalled faculty are not provided in the APM, recalled faculty should be paid according to the current salaries of faculty who hold the same rank, not the historic salaries of the individuals at the time of their retirement. “By agreement” appointments may be used to provide higher compensation to emeriti whose skills are in especially strong demand, but should not be used to provide lower compensation than that recommended in the APM.

In 2003-2004, the Committee has remained concerned that in this period of declining budgets, there is a risk that by agreement appointments might be used to drive the compensation of part-time emeriti significantly below the levels specified by the APM. In April 2004, the Committee wrote to Interim EVC Jury asking him to remind all deans that the EVC’s office expects them to compensate recalled emeriti at levels no lower than those provided in Table 10 of the APM.

2. The Committee continued in 2003-2004 to consider the problems of faculty who retire due to disability. Faculty who opt for disability/retirement do not actually retire at the time of their separation from the university. Instead they receive UCRP disability
income and continue to earn service credit toward retirement until they elect to retire and begin receiving a pension. Because such faculty do not actually retire when they leave the university, they do not automatically earn the title Professor Emeritus, and must instead petition the President for authorization to use it. Affected faculty have in the past had difficulty finding out that the option of acquiring this title by petition is available to them. In March 2004, the Committee asked the Human Resources & Benefits staff of the Office of the President to examine ways in which the opportunity for disabled faculty to acquire the title Professor Emeritus could be both facilitated and communicated more effectively to affected faculty. The OP staff have promised to bring proposals for addressing these problems to a future meeting of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare.

3. The Committee advised the University Committee on Faculty Welfare regarding participation by UCR faculty in UC’s Mortgage Origination Program (MOP). Committee members could cite many instances of faculty whose efforts to acquire homes had been facilitated by MOP loans. We joined UCFW in encouraging the Office of the President to make this form of financing available to as many faculty as possible.

4. The Committee advised the Chancellor’s Committee on Campus Morale regarding its plans to include faculty in future surveys. The Committee was concerned that in the current period of growing class sizes and shrinking budgets, a survey of faculty morale that did not explicitly address such problems might miss too much, and could in the end be counter-productive. The Committee asked that it be shown and allowed to comment on any questions that are intended to be included in a survey of faculty morale before they are distributed to faculty.

5. The Committee responded to inquiries from faculty regarding the higher monthly premiums for health plans that went into effect at the beginning of 2004. The main cause of these increases in premiums was a substantial increase in the fees charged by insurance companies and HMOs to insure UC employees. To prevent less highly compensated employees from being priced out of the market for medical care by these increases, this year’s health care premiums also reflected a new policy of making monthly premiums paid for health plans partially dependent on compensation. According to this new policy, employees who earn less than $40,000 per year are charged below-average premiums, while those who earn more than $80,000 per year pay above-average fees. Prior to its implementation, this policy was discussed and approved both by the Divisional Committee on Faculty Welfare, and by the University Committee on Faculty Welfare.
Also affecting the health care premiums paid by many faculty beginning in 2004 was a decision made by the Office of the President to contribute more toward the costs of covering dependent children than it does toward the cost of covering spouses or domestic partners. Spouses and domestic partners in many cases have jobs of their own, in which case they may be eligible for health coverage from their own employers. In any case, they are likely to have better opportunities than dependent children to contribute to the incomes of their households.

While these two new policies are generally of greater benefit to staff than to faculty, one longstanding UCOP policy toward health care premiums continues to be of greater benefit to faculty than to staff. The premiums that UC pays for each employee are risk-adjusted. The highest risks are associated with older employees, employees with older dependents, and employees who choose the most generous plans. Because faculty are more likely than staff to fall into these categories, UC continues to pay more in health care premiums for faculty than for staff.

6. The Committee responded to two requests that it consider the visa problems of UCR faculty who are not permanent residents of the United States. Faculty members with visa problems have trouble finding someone within the campus administration who has the expertise and authority to help them. In one instance, an eight month delay occurred between the time when a faculty member submitted a green card application to the UCR administration, and the time when supporting documentation was submitted to the INS. When faculty encounter visa problems at other campuses, their administrations often contact local Congressional representatives for help in breaking bureaucratic logjams. At UCR, faculty receive no such help. In April 2004, the Committee wrote to Chancellor Cordova asking her to designate one individual within the administration as the person whom faculty with visa problems can contact and expect help from.

7. The Committee responded to a request from the Committee on Committees to review the charge and composition of the Committee. The Committee decided not to recommend any changes it its charge or composition at the present time.
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