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During the 2009-2010 academic year, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) met 10 times, and dealt with the following issues:

1. The Conflict of Interest Statement for 2009-2010 was adopted.

2. The Committee considered the proposed technical revisions to Academic Personnel Policies 015, Part II; 036-0; 140-33-b; 150, Appendix A; 230-20-h; 220-4-b; 310-17-c. The Committee understood that the language was being changed to conform to current laws and regulation and had no impact on faculty welfare.

3. The Committee reviewed three proposed new SMG (Senior Management Group) policies and had no objection to the adoption to the proposed policies.

4. The CFW Committee was charged with the award process for The Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship beginning with the 2008-2009 academic year and annually thereafter to one or more emeritus professors for teaching, research, or public service activities. The award amount is $6,000 for 2010-2011. The call for applications went out on February 12, 2010.

5. CFW was asked to review the Furlough Exchange documents. CFW recommended that the Chancellor be guided by the principle that faculty members, regardless of the type of appointment, should have the option to buy out as many furlough days on extramural funds as the granting agencies will permit.

6. The Committee received the proposal to split the AGSM Department of Finance and Management Science into two departments. The Committee found the justification for the proposed action to be unconvincing and questioned the impact of the proposed action on the welfare of faculty participating in the merit and promotion process in the new departments. These concerns were transmitted to the Executive Council.

7. The Committee approved recommendations to changes in Bylaw 2 concerning the election of the Divisional Chair and Vice-Chair, but these changes were not adopted by the full Senate.
8. CFW sent a response to the Division Chair concerning a memo from The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity requesting that language be added to the Call that CAP read and study APM 210 at one of their early meetings. CODEO also requested to add a separate section for the candidate to the e-file system to describe their contributions to diversity. CFW recommended that this matter is one that should remain internal to CAP and the office of Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and opposed modifying the e-file system because the modification is neither necessary nor in compliance with APM 210.

9. The Committee on Faculty Welfare has been charged along with the Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity to manage the Faculty Exit Survey and the Faculty Climate Survey.

The goal of the Faculty Exit survey was to find out why faculty left for the period from 1998 - through 2007 campus-wide. The final report of the Faculty Exit Survey was submitted to the Academic Senate March 30, 2010.

The Faculty Climate Survey is a basic assessment of morale and job satisfaction. The final report of the Faculty Climate Survey was submitted to the Academic Senate April 26, 2010.

10. The Committee reviewed an early version of the Systemwide Post Employment Benefits Task Force presentation on potential changes to retirement and retiree medical plans.

11. The Committee reviewed and provided feedback on the first draft of the campus Strategic Plan and the two subcommittee reports on Campus Climate and Community Engagement. CFW determined that their concerns fell into one of five core issues:

#1 – **Shared Governance** – The Administration as well as the Senate should heed the Regents Standing order 105.2.b, which gives the Faculty full responsibility for all curricular matters.

#2 – **The Call and the APM 210** – The Call merely describes how APM 210 is implemented on campus for review and promotion of faculty members. It should be carefully noted that any changes to The Call must be consistent with APM 210.

#3 – **Training and Compliance** – CFW strongly suggested that any proposed training programs be carefully evaluated in terms of their expected benefits relative to the cost and time lost by faculty who are forced to participate in such programs.

#4 – **Decentralized recovery of costs vs. broader goals of the campus and campus-community interactions** – Too many entities on campus seem to have their specific financial goals in mind at the expense of larger campus issues.
Administrative Support for Faculty Grantsmanship – Most faculty members feel that the Office of Research Affairs has been more of a hindrance than a help in obtaining extramural support.

12. The Committee reviewed the proposal to establish the UCR Program for Professor of the Graduate Division (PGD). The Committee generally favored the proposal and noted that there would be no cost to the Campus to establish this program.

13. The Committee was asked to respond to the UCFW/TFIR Recommendation on Assuring Adequate Funding for UCRP. CFW agrees with the UCFW/TFIR recommendation that reducing future benefits will not solve the funding problem. In principle, the proposal of Pension Obligation Bonds (POBs) is a more reasonable and effective solution. The Committee does recognize certain risks and disadvantages of POBs and recommended that a more detailed and quantitative proposal be developed for further study.

14. The Chair of the committee responded to several issues raised by individual faculty members and was able to resolve those issues without needing to bring them to the full committee.
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