To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare is an important part of faculty governance and collegial responsibility in the University of California system. As a committee of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, Faculty Welfare is appointed by the Senate’s Committee on Committees and consists of at least seven members, two of whom are emeriti/ae professors. It is the duty of this Committee to report to the Division on any and all matters of faculty welfare. In addition, the Committee is responsible for the award process of the Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met eight times during the 2014-2015 academic year and undertook the following actions:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare adopted a revised Conflict of Interest Statement which expanded the statement regarding personal affiliations. Members of the Committee on Faculty Welfare are asked to identify when they may have a potential conflict of interest on any items before any discussion. This includes recusal of a member if the action or discussion involves their current or former spouse, partner or family member.

The Committee conducted a review of its current bylaws to put forward an organizational change and to consider further articulating the committee’s purpose reflective to that of other UC campuses. In addition, the Committee considered expanding its charge to include language that makes oversight over senate review of administrative processes for responding to grievances of discrimination, harassment, and lack of equity. The Committee is continuing progress towards developing a formal proposal.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the candidates for the Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship and selected three recipients. Professor Emeritus Rodger Ransom in the Department of History, Professor Emeritus Malempati Rao in the Department of Mathematics, and Professor Emeritus Richard Sutch in the Department of Economics have been named a 2015-16 Edward A. Dickson Emeritus Professor on the Riverside campus. They will hold the title “Edward A. Dickson Emeritus Professor” from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

In keeping with its charge to opine on matters pertaining to faculty welfare, the Committee considered the following items received for Systemwide review:

**Proposed Revisions to APM 080 - Medical Separation**

The intent of APM - 080 remains a non-disciplinary method to medically separate a faculty member or other academic appointee who has exhausted eligible leave and who remains unable to perform the essential functions of his/her position or another vacant position for which the
appointee is qualified, due to a disability or medical condition. Proposed revisions are intended to 1) bring APM - 080 into conformance with Regents Standing Order 101.1(b), Employment Status, 2) clarify authority to medically separate faculty with and without tenure or security of employment and appointees who are not members of the Academic Senate, and 3) revise language so that it is congruent with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Additionally, the proposal is responsive to campus administrator and faculty requests to clarify the medical separation review process and to delineate the required consultation with the Disability Management Office, the written notice of intent to separate, the written notice of medical separation, and the appropriate approval authority.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the proposed revisions to APM 080 – Medical Separation and could not support the proposed changes. While the committee recognizes there are some extraordinary and exceptional instances in which unilateral separation is necessary, the language throughout the document seems inappropriate and gives increased authority to administrators rather than assuring protections. The Faculty Welfare committee is perplexed to the perceived need for increased administrative capacity to terminate employment. The necessity and intent of the proposed changes are unclear and give too much latitude to unilateral administrative decisions without clear Senate process when it comes to tenure appointments.

The Faculty Welfare committee has serious concerns whether this policy’s original and modified language is compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The committee is concerned especially with the line on page 1, paragraph 2 stating” with or without reasonable accommodation”. The Faculty Welfare committee suggests the entire paragraph excerpted below be revised, but at a minimum the word “without” be removed.

“An appointee’s inability to perform the essential assigned functions of the position or another vacant position on campus for which the appointee is qualified, with or without reasonable accommodation, due to a disability or medical condition, will constitute a good cause for separation, and an appointee may be separated after the required review is completed.”

**Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence**

The University of California issued a revised Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence that updated the University’s policy on preventing and responding to allegations of sexual misconduct on its campuses. The proposed revisions are intended to update the policy in accordance with Final Regulations implementing the requirements of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) that was reauthorized by President Obama in 2013. These Final Regulations were issued by the U.S. Department of Education on October 20, 2014 and become effective July 1, 2015. Additionally, proposed revisions address outstanding issues with the efforts of the President’s Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault, and improve clarity as requested by faculty, students, and staff.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the revisions to the policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence and had nothing substantive to add regarding the latest draft. However, the
Committee noted with satisfaction that its earlier suggestion has been incorporated into the present draft by adding links to federal regulations.

**Proposed New UC Policy on Open Access**

This new policy on Open Access is intended for UC authors who are not members of the Academic Senate. (All Academic Senate members are already covered by an Open Access Policy approved on July 24, 2013.) The proposed new policy extends open access rights and responsibilities to all non-Senate members of the UC community who are authors of scholarly articles, including faculty, other academic personnel, students, administrators, and staff. The policy allows non-Senate authors of scholarly articles to maintain legal control over their research articles while making their work freely available to the public. In addition, the proposed policy outlines procedures for implementing the policy for all UC authors, both Senate and non-Senate. Although the policy assumes all authors will make their scholarly articles available to the public, there is a procedure, which must undertake proactively, to opt out of the open access process.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the proposed new policy on Open Access for UC authors who are not members of the Academic Senate. The committee is supportive of extending open access rights and responsibilities to non-Senate members of the UC community who are authors of scholarly articles. However, some members expressed concern with non-Senate members who are not contracted nor compensated by UC to produce research being considered in the UC production and contribution of knowledge.

**Proposed Revision to APM Section – 210-1-d**

**Revisions of Language on Evaluating Contributions to Diversity**

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) and the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) worked together on a proposal to modify APM 210-1-d to clarify its language regarding evaluation of contributions to diversity in merit and promotion reviews. The proposed changes are intended to precisely state the University’s commitment to faculty diversity while also avoiding the misperception that research in some fields will be valued more highly than research in others without regard to its academic quality.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the proposed revisions to APM 210-1-d and agreed with the policy’s intent to encourage contributions to diversity.

**UCR’s CALL Inconsistency with APM & Other UC Practices**

The Committee further considered the language found in APM 210-1-d compared to UCR’s interpretation as outlined in the CALL and put forth a memo to the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel suggesting inconstancies with the CALL in relation to the APM and other UC practices.

The UCR Committee on Faculty Welfare requests that the office of the UCR Vice Provost of Academic Personnel review an inconsistency between UCR’s CALL and the system-wide Academic Personnel Manual. Specifically, per the request of several CHASS faculty, including a department chair, CFW compared the current CALL and UCR personnel review practices with
Specifically, APM 210-1-d (2), which pertains to the evaluation of research and creative work states: “Publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. *Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible....*”

However, as noted by the CHASS department chair, “… we all know that we are now rigorously forbidden from mentioning, much less assessing ‘work in progress.’ Even work that’s complete and ‘submitted’ can only be mentioned ‘briefly.’ Here’s a few Call texts giving the spirit:

UCR The Call (2014-15), p. 28: (on material to be listed): “Items that are "in preparation" or "in progress" should not be included in the bibliography or difference list except in cases of reappointment of Assistant Professor.”

UCR The Call (2014-15), p. 29 (on categories of material permitted in candidate files): “Submitted items should not be counted in the review nor mentioned in the department letter except briefly.”

UCR The Call (2014-15), p. 34 (on the department letter): “Conditionally or provisionally accepted and in-prep items should not be listed except in cases of reappointment of Assistant Professors.”

CFW has reviewed the APM and THE CALL and agree that there appears to be a contradiction between UCR personnel review practices and the broader, system-wide APM. Further, we note that on the UC Berkeley campus, their Merit Review form explicitly refers to APM 210 as guiding the merit appraisal process for research productivity, publications, and creative activity.

In light of our findings, we request that the office of the VPAP review the UCR CALL and current personnel practices in merit, promotion, and appointment reviews with attention to discrepancies regarding the treatment of research and work in progress (e.g., completed chapters for a book in progress, submitted materials, conditionally-accepted manuscripts) in merit, promotion and appointment reviews.

**Draft Guidelines for Pilot Program to Accept Equity for Access to University Facilities or Services**

The document is a set of draft guidelines for the pilot program whereby UC would be able to accept equity form companies on return for access to facilities and services associated with incubators and accelerators around the UC system. It was developed by staff within the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (specifically Innovation Alliances and Services and Research Policy, Analysis and Coordination) and the Office of General Counsel in consultation with
representatives from the UC Berkeley and UC Davis programs that will be the first participants in the pilot.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the draft guidelines on accepting and managing equity in return for access to University facilities and/or services. Members opined that the proposed pilot program and the effects it may have on faculty are difficult to evaluate given that many of the implications will depend on how the program is implemented. Overall, the Committee is supportive of the pilot with the three-year safeguard built in; however, Faculty Welfare would like to stress that the Senate and all relevant entities reserve the right to reevaluate the program after the pilot ends and before the guidelines become a formal policy.

In keeping with its charge to opine on matters pertaining to faculty welfare, the Committee considered the following items received for Campus review:

**Proposed Revisions to UCR Target of Excellence (TOE) Program**
The proposed revisions to the TOE guidelines extend the program to include appointing outstanding scholars as well as those adding to campus diversity. In addition, the revisions provide clarification to the appointment process and requirements at each level of review.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the revised guidelines for UCR’s Target of Excellence program, finding the wording to be reasonable the Committee voted in unanimous support of the revised policy.

**UCR Revised School of Medicine Health Sciences Compensation Plan Implementing Procedures**
The School of Medicine is required to revise its UCR School of Medicine Implementing Procedures for Health Sciences Compensation Plan Participants to comply with the new APM 671 policy. The new policy requires the deletion of references to APM 025 and APM 670, Appendix B, Guidelines on Outside Professional Activities and the inclusion of language that refers to the new APM 671. New APM 671 allows one method for managing income from outside professional activities, which combines elements of the two previous options – the University-wide Standard Requirement and the Alternative Option.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare considered the revised School of Medicine Implementation Procedures for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan and found the suggested revisions to comply with APM 671.

**Review of Climate, Equity, and Discrimination Task Force Report**
One of the issues currently facing UCR is the need to ensure that our processes for dealing with matters related to climate, equity, discrimination and harassment are fair and effective. To this end the Senate convened a Task Force to examine these concerns and provided a report to the Executive Council. Executive Council in turn asked that this report be reviewed by relevant Senate committees for comment before it is forwarded to the Chancellor.
The Committee on Faculty Welfare offered its support for and endorsement of the Task Force Report and recommended that it be broadly distributed to the faculty and campus community and made available on the senate website.

Faculty Welfare is very concerned about the Task Force findings that faculty grievances are not being addressed or resolved and, further, that some faculty who have brought complaints to administrators have experienced “retaliation” and “secondary victimization.” Given the centrality of these findings to faculty welfare, we request that the senate review this problem with the administration, including the processes by which faculty are, or are not, being accorded whistle-blower protection against retaliation.

The senate should participate fully in the ongoing administrative process to revise campus procedures and offices for responding to discrimination and harassment. This may mean the relevant leadership should meet regularly with the key administrative offices and participate in joint committees with administration.

The senate should also be willing to revise its own processes and practices as the campus moves to improve its responsiveness. With respect to the senate’s efficacy as a structure for protecting the faculty from discrimination and harassment, Faculty Welfare reiterates the report’s recommendation that the senate needs to communicate more effectively and consistently to the faculty the resources it has available in this regard. The senate website should provide a distinct link for grievants (for those who have suffered discrimination or harassment) that describes clearly its resources and processes. On this webpage, the senate grievance process should be broken down clearly for the grievant, step-by-step, providing examples of the various ways in which a case can move through the senate and administration. A timeline (time to response) for each step of the process should be determined and clearly listed. The same page should include the relevant forms and contacts. The same page should also include information about how many grievances cases are heard by the senate each year, the time and duration of review for these cases, and provide concrete examples of various types of actual outcomes without disclosing the identity of the grievant/defendant. The senate should create time to completion guidelines for every stage of the response to complaint process.

**Straw Vote on New College – Proposal for the Realignment of Academic Units at UCR**

The Provost/EVC has put forth the idea of merging the two largest colleges in the campus. He has generated a summary that contains a rough description of the proposed new college, together with the rationale for embarking on this process. The document, though lacking in detail, does provide a rough description of the realignment. Senate Chair Wudka is requesting an expedited response in order to collect opinion on simply whether the campus should embark in the formal process that will lead to this merger or not. The question before the committee is whether the campus should pursue this idea, with the understanding that the final proposed college structure might differ from the one outlined in the proposal supplied for review. Should the campus decide to move forward with the college merger, there will be opportunity to propose revisions, and the final proposal
requires approval by the Divisional Senate. This process is described in section IV.C of the Compendium and is summarized in one of the attached documents for consideration.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the idea to merge CNAS and CHASS and took a straw vote as to whether the campus should embark in the formal process that would lead to the merger or not. A majority of the committee voted against the campus embarking in the formal process that would lead to the merger and felt that the proposal is premature as there are other situations that demand attention of the administration and faculty which have priority, the Committee on Faculty Welfare suggests administrative energy and resources be focused on fixing UCR’s salary issues. The Committee noted that the administration has not articulated a persuasive vision to the faculty as to how the college merger contributes to faculty in their research and teaching and advances the scholarly enterprise.

In considering this matter, the Committee expressed the following opinions:

**Resolving Issues Internal to CNAS**
The provost’s document identifies two problems remedied by the new structure, a clumsy administrative structure at the level of the deans, and internal dynamics within CNAS, including especially a sense of marginalization among the physical sciences. Some CNAS members present felt that the merger would only exacerbate the lack of representation of the physical sciences departments, for example. Botany and Plant Sciences and most of agricultural department have hired faculty who are not strictly agricultural. Rather, they provide cutting edge technology that people that do research in agriculture can then more easily access. This structure would be dismantled by the merge because some people would go to an arts and sciences environment and some people would remain in the agricultural environment.

**Increased Administrative Complexity**
There was a concern that the new structure of the dean’s office under the merged college would mean that faculty had less direct access to decision making administrators and that decision making power would be held by administrators outside of their disciplines and fields. There was concern about the new position of an “uber dean” as well as of the role of the chairs within the new proposed administrative structure. Faculty worry that in the new structure they will not have an advocate from their discipline. The merger would make it more difficult for the college dean to decide the merit worthiness of faculty research and programs in disciplines and fields very distinct from their own. Introducing a new level of hierarchy removes an advocate who particularly understands the discipline and subordinates those people to a much more hierarchal structure.

Faculty expressed concern that the proposed model would make UCR a much more bureaucratic place. In the current structure, a faculty member can now have a relationship with a dean who has some rough idea of what that faculty member’s obligations and contributions to the college. Under the proposed plan, the deans’ role could become much more administrative and less of an advocate for faculty. Faculty worry that the plan as proposed would decrease the power of the faculty.
Favorable Opinion
The CHASS faculty member on our committee who supports the merger noted that while there is less support for the merger among CNAS faculty generally, that CHASS faculty across the college tend to be more divided, with some in favor, and some opposing. The committee member who supported the merger attended graduate school at both a private and a public university where there was a college of Arts and Sciences and thought the merger might have the potential to improve scholarly and collegial relations between scientists, social scientists, and those in the arts and humanities. Further, this faculty member argued that an administrative structure that consolidates those departments in academic disciplines strengthens the campus overall, and creates a clearer role between academic programs (on the one hand) and professional schools (on the other).

Some faculty on the committee suggested that that there already exist collaborative models and projects for faculty across colleges, and making interdisciplinary programs and hires does not require a merger. One CHASS faculty member who was previously at a large public university with a merged College of Arts and Sciences noted that faculty in the social sciences and humanities felt isolated from and under-valued by the Dean who was a chemist, contributing to low morale.

Organizational Redesign: Safety, Diversity, Risk and Compliance
Recent changes in the legal and social context surrounding sexual assault/sexual violence (i.e., reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act or VAWA, and California’s “yes means yes” legislation), diversity, compliance, and risk have caused the Chancellor to reflect upon the campuses institutional organization and leadership. Any structure must put foremost the safety of our students, staff, and faculty, at the same time that UCR strives to become a national model. The Chancellor has announced an administrative reorganization designed to help UCR achieve these goals, by providing robust support and resources for the entire campus community. The changes reflected in this Organization Redesign become effective April 1, 2015 and will result in increased effectiveness in leading and managing these effective issues. Senate committees are asked to evaluate the new structure and list concerns and positive aspects.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the new administrative reorganization to include a new position of sexual assault/sexual violence (CARE) advocate. The Committee applauds administration’s efforts to create a more effective and accountable system. However, Faculty Welfare would like to emphasize that its greatest concerns with the reorganization is that the new structure be functional, provide clear protection against retaliation for those who do bring grievances, and that the design not create a “siloing” of grievances. The Committee recommends that positions within the new structure be subject to a yearly review process to ensure effectiveness.

Review of CNAS Teaching Policy
The College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences has recently proposed a teaching policy that has caused concern in certain parts of the College. Though the Senate has not been asked to opine Chair Wudka believes the Senate would be remiss in its charge if it ignored this development. In addition, the fact that the policy has not been finalized provides the opportunity to affect the final outcome. Chair Wudka therefore requests that relevant Senate committees review the policy and
provide an opinion to Executive Council. Council will then discuss the issue and provide a
document to the administration. The intent of this review is to provide a constructive evaluation
for the draft policy, listing pitfalls and, whenever possible, providing remedies or alternatives. In
preparation to this review Chair Wudka asked all College department chairs to provide comments
and opinions they felt would be useful to committees in their deliberations and are provided in the
review packet. Several documents make reference to IR and OR faculty lines, concepts that might
not be familiar to all members of committees. A brief description of these terms is also included
in the review packet.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the proposed College of Natural and Agricultural
Sciences’ Teaching Policy and the responses from department chairs. Members expressed concern
with the appropriateness of Dean’s creating academic policy that influences programs as well as
time to graduation. The Committee felt the policy as presented requires further study to produce
factual details and a less complicated outcome that can be applied equitably across the college.
The Committee recommends the policy be redrafted to allow flexibility for each department to
assess teaching loads according to its own requirements and structure.

Although the Committee agrees with the concept that faculty should receive additional credit for
teaching large classes, this compensation should not place faculty who teach smaller classes at a
disadvantaged by receiving very little or no credit. The campus might consider alternative ways to
compensate teaching large classes as courses listed in Riverside’s catalogue should not be worth
less than one credit.

Throughout the year the Committee addressed several issues raised by committee members and
other faculty. Included were consultations, discussions, suggestions and/or recommendations as
appropriate concerning the following items.

**Provide informal advice to Senate Chair Wudka regarding potential changes to healthcare**

The Office of the President may soon be proposing to cancel the Healthnet Blue and Gold plan in
2016. The intention is apparently for the UC to have two plans: UC Care and Kaiser. As this change
can seriously affect our faculty Chair Wudka asked the Committee on Faculty Welfare to look into
the issue and, if this change is indeed in the works, to provide recommendations to the Division.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed Chair Wudka’s request to look into the healthcare
issue regarding the Office of the President considering a proposal to cancel Healthnet Blue and
Gold and for the committee to provide recommendations. Faculty Welfare understands that UCOP
is considering replacing Healthnet Blue and Gold by an expanded UC Care, starting in 2016 or
2017 and asks that the UCR Academic Senate consider putting forth a statement opposing the
change at this time. Our reasons are as follows:

1. There is no clear plan for the treatment of UC campuses that lack Medical Centers. A
satisfactory plan must be provided before the UCR Academic Senate can approve the changes
under consideration.
2. UC Care has an unsatisfactory record providing benefits to UCR employees. We note in particular that Healthnet provides access to Riverside Community Hospital (RCH) while UC Care provides tier 1 access to the Parkview Hospital (PH) rather than to RCH. RCH is much closer to UCR than Parkview, has a trauma center (PH does not), and is of higher quality than PH, which is considered marginal in quality assessments.

We feel that the rush to institute UC Care has had unfortunate consequences, especially for campuses without Medical Centers. We believe that any expansion of UC Care should be done in a more fully-planned, consultative, and deliberative manner. If UC Care can demonstrate improvements in the benefits it provides UCR employees and a satisfactory plan is provided by UCOP for the treatment of non-Medical Center campuses, the UCR Academic Senate is willing to reconsider its opposition.

**UC Faculty Welfare request for data on UCR’s Child Development Center**
Child care is a frequent topic for UCFW. To help the committee gain a better systemwide perspective of the current child care offerings, each campus was asked to provide basic information on their local childcare facility.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare submitted basic data for this request including if the childcare facility was located on campus, distance from campus, costs per month, capacity, wait list length, and other notables.

**Concern raised over UCOP’s inadequate support on pension and retirement advising**
In response to receiving an inquiry regarding the new systemwide structure on pension and retirement advising, the Committee on Faculty Welfare consulted Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Jadie Lee, regarding the concerns as well as brought the issue to UCFW’s attention and asked them to follow up.

**Student Loan Debt for Assistant Professors**
Consulted with Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Jadie Lee, regarding the student load debts that burden some of UCR’s assistant professors (and even associates) and how the campus might support these faculty. In particular, there is a federal student loan forgiveness program for educators at public institutions yet few faculty are aware of this program or understand how to access it. The Office of Human Resources conducted research on the program and redesigned their website to include a page dedicated to Public Service Loan Forgiveness under Work / Life & Wellness.

**Potential for Annual Survey of Administrative Offices Related to Grievances**
The Committee on Faculty Welfare considered the possibility of including faculty review of administrative offices/officers related to discrimination, equity, and harassment. The Committee felt that it was important that the senate take on this task and recommends the senate send out a fairly simple annual satisfaction survey asking for feedback on various offices with place for narrative comment. The recommendation is that these would be rotating: so one year the survey
concerns the CCO and VPAR, another year of title IX and affirmative action, the next year the CCO and VPAR again, for example. The data could be reviewed in a single meeting, made available to Executive Council, and a brief oral report made back to the Executive Council for discussion. The Committee on Faculty Welfare recommends that this task be adopted by P&T as P&T has a closer view of how the administration is handling cases and can interpret the survey results within this context. Further, the Committee felt that regular senate faculty review of these offices/officers will help them to function optimally, and will therefore, ultimately, lesson the work (lighten the case load) of P&T. In the event that P&T refuse this role, the Committee on Faculty Welfare would further consider taking it on, rather than see it disappear.
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