

**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
December 6, 2016**

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.

In addition to reaffirming its Conflict of Interest Statement, 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. The Committee also 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. Faculty Welfare considered various inquiries regarding campus policy received from faculty, informally provided feedback on UCR's Early Childhood Services Shared Governance policy, provided comments on a working proposal for a faculty tuition waiver at the University of California, and discussed the possibility of crediting completed chapters of a book in progress in the merit and promotion process. The Committee on Faculty Welfare met ten times during the 2015-2016 academic year and undertook the following actions:

a. Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship

The Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship Award is presented yearly to an emeritus/a professor on the basis of a compelling project in teaching, research, or public service activities. Awardee(s) shall be known as the Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professor for the duration of the award (one year) and receive up to \$6,000 monetary award and up to \$3000 research support, subject to all policies and requirements of the University of California and the Riverside Campus.

Edward A. Dickson served as a regent of the University of California from 1913-1946, the longest tenure of any Regent. His vision is credited with helping to make the Los Angeles campus a reality. In 1955 Mr. Dickson presented the University with an endowment to provide for annual special professorships for retired faculty.

In 2003 the funds for the Dickson award were separated into ten endowments, one dedicated to each campus. The responsibility for making the awards was delegated to the Executive Vice Chancellor or chief academic officer at each of the ten campuses. On the UCR campus, award oversight and evaluation is performed by the UCR Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the candidates for the Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship and selected two recipients. Professor Emeritus Lawrence H. Harper in the Department of Mathematics and Professor Emeritus Susan B. Carter in the Department of Economics have been named a 2016-17 Edward A. Dickson Emeritus Professor on the Riverside campus. They will hold the title “Edward A. Dickson Emeritus Professor” from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

b. Discussions with and Policy Recommendations to the Administration
Inconsistencies between UCR’s CALL and the APM

In the spring of 2015, Faculty Welfare sent communication to the VPAP expressing the opinion that UCR is inconsistent with the system wide personnel manual with respect to the assessment of research publications that are works in progress. Lower salaries at UCR may be associated with the harsher standard for merit increases to which UCR faculty are improperly subject.

In particular, the committee indicated that the language in the APM specifies that works in progress should be assessed whenever possible in merit and promotions while the UCR CALL notes that departments are rigorously forbidden from mentioning much less assessing work in progress and even work that is complete and submitted can only be mentioned briefly. Further, according to UCR’s CALL, items that are in preparation or in progress should not be included in the bibliography or difference list. Faculty Welfare strongly recommended revising the CALL to be in compliance with the APM

Early Childhood Services (ECS) Reorganization

The Committee on Faculty Welfare wrote to administration in regards to the proposed reorganization of Early Childhood Services (formerly the Child Development Program), something of central importance to the faculty, staff, and students of UCR. It noted that realignment plans were worked upon “for the past year” according to the report sent January 22, 2016, by Andy Plumley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Auxiliary Services, to Ron T. Coley, Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services. However, the Faculty Welfare Committee was advised of the proposed reorganization only on June 13th, only 24 hours before the general campus announcement, and without adequate time or adequate financial details to make recommendations. Yet this announcement came seemingly eighteen months after discussions at the level of administration had commenced. That is, in all this time the faculty have had no opportunity to provide meaningful input. This is a violation of the principle of shared governance. Shared governance is the foundation of the University of California and it is precisely the structure that ensures the excellence and success of our mission and operations.

Therefore, the Committee requested that the planned reorganization be postponed for six months to allow active participation by both the Faculty Welfare Committee and affected parents. Toward this end, the Faculty Welfare Committee required adequate financial and operational details to make its own comprehensive recommendations and specific proposals. Additionally, it noted that the Childcare Center at UCR has had a history of active parental involvement through participation in a parental advisory group that consulted monthly with the center director precisely

on substantive issues of budget, tuition, enrollment policies, planning, etc. Unfortunately, that group has not been functional for the past several years. The Committee suggested that a parental advisory group be revived (or a new Parent Advisory Council be convened) as a stable body of members, and charged with playing a major role in the reorganization process. The absence of faculty and parent consultation and involvement has led to the current distress to and upheaval in the campus community that could have been easily avoided.

In the interim, the Committee made the following points, which are elaborated briefly below: (1) It is appropriate for UCR to subsidize to a certain extent childcare for faculty, staff and students, and the proposed \$300 thousand subsidy is inadequate; (2) Early Childhood Services (ECS) should not be charged for infrastructure or the accumulated debt; (3) by cutting back on its support for ECS, UCR will be moving against the growing concerns systemwide about the need to improve childcare services and moving against UC's family-friendly tradition.

The Committee noted that there are certain basic services on our campus that we do not expect to be self-funding; we do not expect the UCR Police Department to make a profit, for example, nor to raise revenues equal to its cost to the campus. Since faculty and staff wages have lagged behind those at competitor institutions, and since the California state legislature is unwilling to fund competitive salaries for UC, the childcare costs for younger faculty and staff especially have proved increasingly burdensome. At the most recent systemwide Faculty Welfare committee (UCFW) meeting the rising costs of childcare relative to stagnant salaries, especially in the humanities and social sciences, was raised. One member commented, "If you don't come from a family with a fair amount of wealth, you can't be a faculty member with children in the Humanities at UCB or UCLA." The UCFW members also agreed that every UC campus should provide for a childcare center in its campus plans.

The Committee recognizes that the financial stability of Early Childhood Services is a serious concern and will continue to push for collaboration in resolving these issues.

c. Advice to the Academic Senate

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

Retirement Options Task Force (ROTF) Report

1. Background

In the post-World War II period, defined benefit (DB) retirement plans were widely used by major corporations and certain institutions such as universities. These plans were a means of attracting and retaining employees. Many public bodies such as K-12 schools and government also used such plans. Over time, these plans fell into disfavor with both corporations and state and local governments for different reasons. For corporations, DB plans meant that the companies were assuming the pension risk. Since company and industry competitiveness may diminish over time, companies increasingly preferred to switch to defined contribution (DC) retirement plans; these shifted the pension risk to individuals. Companies and their employees typically both made

contributions to their retirement plans. The resulting funds were invested and provided the employees with income on their retirement. How much they would receive depended on the success of the investments; the risk was shifted entirely to the employees.

Private firms were subject to the risks of the business cycle and long-term shifts in their competitiveness and the competitiveness of their industry. Thus the automobile and the steel industries, for example, found themselves subject to intense competition from overseas suppliers, with many driven into bankruptcy by obligations they could no longer afford, including pension obligations. This was not the problem of state and local governments. Rather, they increased over time their pension obligations without funding them properly. In addition they facilitated retirement at early ages and established systems subject to manipulation. Many employees could increase their final salaries by working overtime in their final year and not taking sick days that were due them, thereby spiking their pensions. The failings of state and local governments have begun to come due in recent years, with cities like Vallejo and San Bernardino in California, unable to pay their obligations, forced into bankruptcy. Moreover, even for cities remaining solvent, pension obligations have begun to account for a substantial share of their budgets, reducing or eliminating funds for other important public services.

In this context, the California state legislature and governor have become extremely hostile to defined benefit programs. Without a full understanding of the intense competitiveness that exists among leading universities, they have sought to limit pension benefits to University of California faculty. In 2015, When UC President Napolitano sought to restore some of the cuts the state had made during the financial crisis that began in 2008, she and the governor formed a 2-person committee to negotiate critical portions of the UC budget. The governor made some modest additional resources available to UC in return for President Napolitano's agreement to make a few concessions, most notably on limiting the traditional defined benefit pension received by UC faculty. To live up to this agreement, President Napolitano appointed the Retirement Options Task Force to prepare options for a new UC retirement plan with the same defined benefit cap as that of state employees, whose cap (the PEPRA cap) is currently \$117,020 and increases only with inflation. The ROTF gave her its plan on December 15, 2015, and she made it public on January 15, 2016 with a request for feedback by February 15. She will decide on the details of the plan later in February, in time to present it to the Board of Regents in time for its March meeting and implementation for new UC hires on or after July 1, 2016.

2. Core elements of the new UC pension plan

According to the ROTF plan there are 2 options. The precise consequences of either option depend on a series of assumptions, but both plans would result in a dramatic reduction in faculty compensation. The following descriptions of the 2 plans is taken from a blog by Michael Meranze, Prof. of History at UCLA:

- 1) The first (Plan A) is a hybrid plan. In it, an employee would participate in the Defined Benefit Plan offered by UCRP (with benefits calculated on income up to the PEPRA cap) with a Supplemental Defined contribution Plan (with University contributions) on income between the PEPRA cap and the Federal Cap (now about \$265,000). Employees who choose Plan A would continue to vest after 5 years (as is the case now) and would continue to contribute the same amount annually to their pension as do employees hired before July 1, 2016. Once in Plan A you would be committed to

Plan A. Plan A is proposed as the default choice. It is important to note that the Defined Benefit portion of this proposal would operate under the conditions imposed on the 2013 tier—who already had a later retirement age than earlier hires.

- 2) The Second Plan (Plan B) is a Defined Contribution Plan with both the employee and University contributing up to the Federal Cap. Again, the amount that the employee would contribute would be the same as Plan A. Employees who chose Plan B at hiring would be allowed to switch to Plan A after 5 years of employment (this would be a one-time opportunity).

Accompanying the ROTF report received by members of the Academic Senate was “A guide to reviewing the recommendations of the Retirement Options Task Force” written by the two UC faculty members who were members of the Task Force, Dan Hare and Jim Chalfant, Chair and Vice Chair of the (systemwide) Academic Senate. In their report, they note that “the Task Force was limited to working within a small universe of options bounded by a ~8-10% employer contribution, a ~4-6% employer-paid UAAL surcharge (to reduce the underfunding of UCRP), and a 7% employee-paid contribution. All of the proposed plans would allow limited variations around this small range of parameters. The more generous the plan, the less feasible it is from a budgetary perspective; the cheaper the plan, on the other hand, the less competitive UC will be for recruitments and retentions of faculty necessary to maintain the University’s excellence. Moreover, the combined contributions from employees and the University for cheaper plans will fall short of the amount required to achieve retirement readiness.”

Consequences of the new retirement plan

The UCR Faculty Welfare committee believes that the Plan was forced on President Napolitano by a governor who fails to appreciate the importance of the University to the culture and economy of California. The committee takes into account the following considerations in reaching its position on the Plan:

1. Negotiated in secret by the President of UC and the Governor, the plan marks a definitive break with the principle of shared governance. The faculty is being asked for its views on implementation of a basic policy decision that was made without its participation. A decision of this magnitude must have extensive faculty input. We are being consulted only about the implementation of an unwise policy whereas we must have input on the policy itself if shared governance is to be meaningful.
2. We are now at a critical turning point in the future of UC. UC now lags its comparison 8 universities by about 12% in total compensation. We note that much more than earlier generations, new UC faculty members face extremely high housing costs and many arrive burdened by student debt. We should be doing everything possible to eliminate the gap with the comparison 8. The new retirement plan widens the gap to disastrous dimensions. Consider the following example: Two years ago a UCLA humanities professor was recruited by Princeton. The Princeton salary offer was 50% higher than his UCLA salary; that is a measure of the underpayment of UC faculty members. In addition, when he pointed out to Princeton the UC defined benefit pension, it offered to compensate by paying him an additional \$20,000 yearly salary for the next 10 years, providing him additional cash he could put into a retirement fund. He

ultimately decided to stay at UCLA (even with a salary offer \$9,000 below that of Princeton), but is much more likely to have opted for Princeton without the existing defined benefit plan. Some of his faculty colleagues with similar outside offers were similarly swayed by the existing DB plan.

3. At present the average UC faculty member retires in his/her mid to late 60s. With the new plan reducing retirement benefits, it is likely that average retirement will be pushed back considerably, perhaps by about 10 years. And many faculty members will find themselves unable to afford retirement. Faculty renewal is an important factor in maintaining UC's excellence and the new system will surely undermine it.
4. The logic underlying the shift away from DB plans in the private sector and in state and local governments does not hold for UC. With some police and firemen able to retire in their 40s and clerical workers at 55, and strategies to spike their pensions in the final year of work, and often lacking funded pension plans, public employees' retirements often put a great burden on local government budgets. These conditions do not prevail in the case of UC, and the competitive conditions facing private firms are quite different from those facing UC.
5. The change in the pension plan means that UC will institutionalize unequal pay for equal work. Two professors step 3, for example, presumably with equal professional qualifications, will receive different total compensation if one was hired before July 1, 2016 and one after that. If UC is successful in increasing the representation of women and minorities in its faculty, moreover, then their compensation would be lower on average than that of their male/white counterparts.
6. The presumed savings to the state are unlikely to materialize since UC will be absolutely uncompetitive without materially higher salaries and retention offers. Alternatively, the quality of UC will diminish sharply along with the compensation of its faculty. We note as well that operating multiple kinds of pension plans simultaneously will increase their administrative cost, further diluting or even eliminating any possible savings from the new plan.
7. California will suffer. UC makes great contributions to the state in fields like agriculture, industry, technology, the environment and health care. Moreover, it is attractive to individuals concerned with affordable college education for their children and with firms seeking to attract well-educated employees with the same concerns.
8. Shifting the burden and risk to UC employees of managing their retirement money has no legitimate justification. In general, firms have done so to increase their profitability and to minimize their risks by shifting them to their employees. There is no principled reason for the state to do the same.
9. From the standpoint of UC, there is a small and temporary benefit in increased funds from the state that the governor (but not the legislature) has promised, but a permanent diminution in its faculty compensation and competitiveness vis-à-vis other educational institutions. As Prof. Meranze notes "The three year state contribution (to UCRP) addresses only a very small amount of the unfunded liability. And according to the Task Force, establishment of the new (retirement) tier will speed up the elimination of the unfunded liability minimally if at all. In fact, under certain scenarios the elimination of the unfunded liability might be faster under the 2013 tier (with borrowing) than under most of the 2016 options."

10. UC has been trying to move away from above-scale compensation and back to the formal salary scale as much as it can. There is much to be said for this as a matter of “equal pay for equal work” and equal qualifications. The new pension plan, unfortunately, promises to shred these efforts. Since deans and provosts will be unable to offer improved pension plans, they will have to resort to ever-larger salary offers to attract and retain faculty.

In view of these considerations, we believe that the Academic Senate should firmly oppose the secretly negotiated pension plan as incredibly harmful to the future of the University of California.

Follow-up to Task Force Recommendations

In February of 2015, the Senate Task Force on Climate, Equity and Discrimination submitted its report to the Senate Executive Council. The Senate then forwarded this report to the Chancellor.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare wrote to the Senate Chair to follow up, in particular in light of the recent substantiated charges of sexual harassment against a faculty member at UC Berkeley and President Napolitano’s subsequent communication to the chancellors on 10/15/2015.

The Committee recognized that UCR’s new senior administration has taken steps to improve campus climate and campus responsiveness to grievances and complaints. In the interim, the administration has also implemented an Organizational Redesign for Safety, Diversity, Risk, and Compliance that includes consolidation of investigative roles under a new Chief Compliance Officer.

At the same time, many of the recommendations articulated in the Task Force Report have yet to be implemented or addressed. Among these is the position of Campus Climate Equity Officer. The Task Force regarded this position as analogous to recent positions created at UCLA that have been effective in advocating for faculty complainants in particular. This new position could be charged to work toward implementation of some of the Task Force recommendations. Faculty Welfare would like to see this position advertised and filled as soon as possible. In any event, we would like to know where these responsibilities will be housed.

Potential Changes to UC Healthcare

At the request of Senate Chair Wudka, the Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the possible changes to the UC healthcare system and the concerns raised by University Committee on Faculty Welfare. UCR’s Committee on Faculty Welfare did not have any substantial points to add, but agreed with UCFW’s memo wholeheartedly noting the lack of Senate and faculty oversight in the process. Of particular concern was the potential conflict between UC’s business interests and the interests of UC employees built into UC Care as well as administrations focus on saving money rather than the concern of the faculty.

UCR’s Five-Year Planning Perspectives for 2016-21

Perspectives consist of information on proposals to establish new programs, schools and colleges as well as to transfer, consolidate, discontinue or disestablish those already in existence. Given the

importance of periodically examining the academic planning pipeline-both in aggregate and via its component parts, the Perspectives process is being continued. Once gathered from all campuses, information reported on the form will provide an updated picture of academic plans and allow for analysis of trends since these were last collected.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met to discuss the campus five-year planning perspectives and found the list of proposed programs for establishment, transfer, consolidation, discontinuance and disestablishment to be reasonable. However, the Committee felt the intent of the suggested item listed as “Renaming or establishing Cell Biology and Neuroscience” was not clear as the Cell Biology and Neuroscience department has already been established and is a functioning department. The Committee on Faculty Welfare approved of the proposed document with a recommendation to revise or clarify this item.

Proposed Changes to iEval

iEval is a Tool used to Collect Student Evaluations of Teaching. The submitted report identifies current issues and possible improvements.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met to discuss the proposed changes to iEval and did not support the recommendations. The Committee noted that the proposal does not address who is requesting the proposed changes nor does the proposal contain any evidence to demonstrate that the system is broken. It is unclear what problems have been identified and how the proposed recommendations are designated to solve each issue. The Committee felt that tinkering with a fundamentally flawed and ineffective system does nothing to address the real issues of bias as the current method of student evaluations do not demonstrate a true reflection of the instructor. The Committee considered the five recommendations listed within the proposal and had particular reluctance about removing items listed in recommendations 3 and 4.

CNAS Reorganization Proposal

The Interim Dean of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences presented a proposal for the reorganization of the college. The main components of the proposal are (i) the establishment of two new departments "Molecular, Cellular and Structural Biology" (MCSB), and "Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology" (EEOB), followed by (ii) the voluntary relocation of the faculty from the departments of Cell Biology & Neuroscience (CBNS) and Biology to the new departments; (iii) the disestablishment of the departments of Cell Biology & Neuroscience and Biology once they are empty; and finally (iv) renaming of the department of Environmental Sciences to “Environmental and Ecosystem Sciences”.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met to discuss the material received for the CNAS reorganization proposal. The Committee understands the proposals intent is to resolve long enduring problems within the college and was received in the Senate in advance of the new CNAS dean’s effective start date. Faculty Welfare noted the proposal does not include official communication about how this proposal was received by the effected departments, CNAS faculty as a whole, the CNAS Executive Committee, nor comments from the new Dean. In the absence of

this important material, the Committee on Faculty Welfare could not make a sufficient judgement regarding the proposal. In addition, Faculty Welfare is aware of the historical problems and concerns of the physical sciences; however, the Committee felt that the current proposal was not persuasive in solving nor addressing any of these preexisting issues. It is unclear how graduate programs would be effected by the proposed changes and how this proposal or any life science reorganization would enhance the interdisciplinarity of existing faculty. Faculty Welfare advised that none of the proposed actions take place until the appropriate people are consulted and a complete proposal with sufficient context is received for Senate review.

Campus Proposal to Modify APM 245 – Department Chairs

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity reviewed APM 245 regarding the Duties of Department Chairs (or Equivalent Officers) and discussed how well department chairs were keeping diversity issues at the forefront of faculty's minds in the hiring process. It was determined that some colleges are doing very well while others seem to struggle in diversifying their faculty profile. CoDEO feels that to succeed in these areas there needs to be strong leadership that is willing to promote diversity and create awareness among the rank of faculty as well as language in the APM that may require chairs to ensure their faculty are receiving information regarding the goals of diversity.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met to consider the Proposal to Modify APM 245 Appendix A: Duties of Department Chairs. The Committee appreciated the opportunity to opine on the proposed APM change; however, Faculty Welfare respectfully requested additional information before moving forward with its recommendation. Specifically, Faculty Welfare requested a sample campus and departmental affirmative action program for faculty and staff personnel.

Concern about Conflicts of Interest and Outside Letter Writers

The Provost voiced concern that outside letters for promotion files are being solicited from individuals who serve as a candidate's major professor for their PhD or who have been co-authors on publications or who were colleagues at a former institution. UCR's solicitation letter does not ask specific individuals to declare themselves ineligible on the basis of a potential conflict of interest. The Senate was asked to consider if additional guidelines should be established for letter writers recuse themselves as well as establish guidelines for letter writers suggested by the candidate.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met to discuss the concern about conflicts of interest and outside letter writers for promotion files. The Committee considered the three proposed restrictions in addition to the current guidelines outlined in the CALL and felt that asking letter writers to recuse themselves provides an undue burden on the solicitation process. Rather, as not to deter qualified extramural reviewers from writing letters, the Committee suggests that department chairs receive thorough training on how to effectively vet suggestions from the department and the candidate at the beginning of the solicitation process. If the campus begins to arbitrarily exclude letter writers that should not be excluded, then departments will be forced to solicit writers that have nothing to do with the candidate's field of research.

School of Medicine (SOM) Request for Exception to APM 275-16-f(3)

The Interim Dean of the School of Medicine put forward an exception request to APM 275-16-f(3), which in essence states that in order to maintain a balance between research and education and clinical service appointees in the Professor of Clinical X series should not exceed 1/6 of all local Senate members in all clinical departments on the campus. The request seeks the Academic Senate's review of the appropriateness of adding new members to the Professor of Clinical X series without being unreasonably constrained by the 1/6 ratio rule.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met to consider the exception request from the School of Medicine to APM 275-16-f(3), a 1/6 limitation on appointments to Professor of Clinical X series. The Committee appreciated the opportunity to opine on the proposed exception for the School of Medicine; however, there are a few items in which Faculty Welfare respectfully requested clarification before moving forward with its recommendation. Specifically, Faculty Welfare sought clarification on how many current faculty represent the 1/6 ratio. Faculty Welfare would also like clarification on how many Professor of Clinical X faculty the school plans on increasing its number to within a single year.

Academic Senate Consultation on Professors Assigning Their Own Texts to Students

CAP was asked to review and opine on UCR's position regarding the requirement of a text authored by the faculty member teaching the course and measures that should be in place to avoid the conflict of interest or appearance thereof.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met to discuss the issue of requiring a text authored by the faculty member teaching the course. The University's Academic Personnel Manual states the important principle that University researchers must be free to pursue knowledge and that this freedom, which is essential to the research process, must not lightly be abridged. The Committee strongly affirmed the right of our faculty to assign their own work in their classes. We recognize that our faculty are field experts and have in many cases written definitive and important texts from which the students may benefit. Reading a faculty member's work is one of the benefits of studying at a research university. We also recognize that this may need to be explained or articulated to our undergraduate students who may be encountering the practice for the first time. Steps should be taken to educate students and thus to avoid future confusion. We suggest the development of a published policy that can be referenced in syllabi and course websites.

The Committee also recognizes that a conflict of interest or the appearance of such conflict may emerge. The Committee on Faculty Welfare does not agree with the exploitation of textbooks in the classroom for personal financial gain. When a researcher has a financial interest similar in nature to those required to be reported under the University Conflict of Interest Code requiring disclosure, his or her judgment may appear to be affected by potential financial gain rather than by the pursuit of knowledge. Therefore we suggest that campus policy urges faculty assigning their own texts to also consider making these texts available in no-cost form when possible (by placing copies on library reserve or making available password protected pdfs).

The Committee recommends that a statement be formulated to guide faculty and educate students. This statement should include links to relevant policy such as APM 028-10 and be placed on appropriate venues like the registration webpage.

Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment

The proposal revises the current Interim Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence to comply with policy requirements mandated by the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA 2013) and federal guidelines addressing domestic violence, sexual violence, and sexual harassment. The UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment is a systemwide Presidential policy that applies to all University employees, which includes all faculty and other academic appointees, students, and staff.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment and felt the revisions provide a sharper document. The Committee unanimously supported the changes; however, in light of the recent harassment issues apparent at UC Berkley, the Committee noted the ongoing need for clear and subsequent guidance on procedures to follow at the campus level for cases of noncompliance.

Report from the Joint Committee of Administration and Academic Senate

President Napolitano established the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate to review the disciplinary processes for faculty related to sexual violence, sexual assault and sexual harassment. She tasked the Joint Committee with creating recommendations around the following areas: 1) investigation, adjudication and sanctions processes in cases involving faculty, 2) University policies and procedures, 3) reporting mechanisms for all members of the University and 4) interim measures. The report provides draft recommendations around these areas.

In general the Committee supported the intention and recommendations of the report and affirmed that many of the recommendations will improve the climate for faculty and students on our campus.

Proposed Revisions to APM Policy Sections 278, 210-6, 279, 112 and New APM – 350

Revisions to the existing policies and the creation of new policy were proposed in response to academic administrator requests to update these policies. Proposed revisions strengthen and refine criteria for appointment and advancement depending on type of academic clinician and differentiate policy language for volunteers (APM - 279) and policy for salaried and without salary faculty (APM - 278 and APM - 210-6). New policy (APM - 350) proposes to repurpose the Clinical Associate title, a non-faculty academic title, to be used for 1) without academic salary and paid staff clinicians with no teaching duties, and 2) without academic salary, volunteer appointees employed by University health system network sites and satellite facilities.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met to discuss the proposed revisions to APM sections 278 - Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series, 210-6 – Instructions to Review Committees Which

Advise on Actions Concerning the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series, 279 – Volunteer Clinical Professor Series, 112 – Academic Titles and the creation of the new APM section 350 – Clinical Associate. The Committee found the revisions to be reasonable and supported the suggested modifications without further recommendations.

Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California

The document describes new UC system-wide minimum standards for the consideration of the use of search waivers and allows campuses to set further restrictions as needed.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the Guiding Principles for Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California. The Committee noted that section B is intended to address non-senate faculty and other academics; however, the spousal/partner hire category under this section specifically addresses criteria for the successful recruitment or retention of a senate faculty member. The Committee feels that additional language should be provided to clarify if the intent of this category is to retain senate faculty or non-senate faculty. Overall the Committee agrees with the proposed guidelines as a minimum criteria, but feels that an additional search waiver category should be included to address the retention of CE Specialists and spousal hires which are non-senate faculty.

Proposed Revisions to APM - 360, Librarian Series and APM - 210-4, Instructions to Review Committees

Proposed revisions update policy so that the terms and conditions affecting non-represented librarians are consistent with those affecting represented librarians. Policy revisions cover the definition and criteria for appointment, terms of service, merit increases, promotion, advancement to career status, personnel review procedures, and the new point-based salary scale.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met to discuss the proposed revisions to APM 360 - Librarian Series and APM 210-4 - Instructions to Review Committees. The Committee agreed that updates to the Librarian Series were needed and found the proposed revisions to be reasonable. The Committee supported the suggested modifications without further recommendation.

Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 140 – University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

In the past several years, the scope of UCAAD has broadened, reflecting the increasing spectrum and expression of diversity throughout the state. Rights, protections, and concerns for undocumented students, transgender individuals, and victims of sexual violence have been discussed at the division and systemwide levels, as have micro-aggressions and unperceived bias. In response, UCAAD felt that its mission would be better expressed through the inclusion of the word “equity” in its name and bylaws. This addition is meant to underscore the attention UCAAD intends to focus on issues of equal treatment as well as its historical roles tied to affirmative action and diversity issues.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 140 – University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity and felt the inclusion of the word “equity” in the University Committee title would allow the committee to open up the category to deal with more broad cases of difference beyond women and minorities. The Committee strongly endorsed the revision and motivation behind the change.

d. Representation at Systemwide Senate and the Executive Council

The Committee on Faculty Welfare continued its active participation on the systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW). The 2015-16 UCFW representative was Victor Lippit, who updated committee members of the issues under discussion at the statewide level. Chair Jennifer Hughes represented the committee on the UCR Academic Senate’s Executive Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Hughes, Chair
Erica Edwards
John Ellison
Liz Kotz
Victor Lippit
Julia Lyubovitsky
Al Page
Rick Redak
Jacob McClinton – GSA Representative
Giselle Ozuna – ASUCR Representative