

**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION**  
**December 5, 2017**

**To be received and placed on file:**

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) 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. The Committee is also 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 bylaws and put forward an organizational change to expand its membership from at least seven members to twelve members to gain a broader representation of the campus. This change was approved at the February 28, 2017 Division meeting.

The Committee considered the inquiries from the campus at large concerning various topics:

- a discrepancy in APM 661-18b regarding compensation for summer teaching
- request for faculty representation on UCR Integrated Healthy Campus Initiative
- uneven quality of building maintenance across campus
- Business and Administrative Services (BAS) staff cuts decreasing faculty productivity
- Reckless skateboarding and bicycle use on campus

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met nine times during the 2016-2017 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 one recipient. Professor Emeritus Wendy Ashmore in the Department of Anthropology has been named a 2017-18 Edward A. Dickson Emeritus Professor on the Riverside campus. She will hold the title “Edward A. Dickson Emeritus Professor” from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.

**b. Discussions with and Policy Recommendations to the Administration**

***Request for Data on 3 Years of 1.5% Campus-Discretion Salary Increases***

As UCOP planned to have a third straight year of 1 1/2% across-the-board salary increases and 1 1/2% campus-discretion increases (deans’ discretion in the case of UCR), the Committee on Faculty Welfare requested data on how the funds were distributed by each college over the last two years at UCR and the projection for the coming year. The CFW feels it is important to provide faculty input before this year’s plan is implemented at UCR.

Specifically, the CFW requested from the Deans the specific plans used to distribute the 1.5% discretionary pool for each of the last two years, details on how the criteria was applied to each school/college, aggregated data broken down by rank, step, gender, ethnicity, and an explanation on how the faculty were informed of the application for each plan. In addition, the CFW sought the 2016-2017 plan for each school/college and the rationale for its intended distribution.

The committee considered the material received and urged Executive Council to advocate for the University to allocate current and future salary increases in an across the board fashion to all faculty.

***UC Path and Activity Based Costing (ABC) Model***

The CFW met with Ron Coley, VC of BAS, Maria Anguiano, VC of P&B, and Aamee Walker, VPAP to gain a basic understanding of the new campus Activity Based Costing (ABC) Model and UC Path.

UC Path is being established to create a single payroll system for the entire UC. It is managed from UCOP and housed at a Riverside site. UCOP asked UCR to lead the effort and pilot the program. As the pilot campus, UCR gained resources from UCOP and the ability to make leadership changes in the beginning of the process to meet campus needs. If the campus chose not to pilot, the campus would have had to pay for the implementation and would not have the opportunity to request specific changes to meet campus needs. UCOP staff were the first wave to transition to the system. Faculty will be the next to transition with a targeted implementation date of January 2018. More time was given to the project to smooth out the transition and anticipate problems that will arise. There is a planning team dedicated to attending to issues. A system will be in place to notify the team of errors that exist. The reason for the delay is that every paycheck is being double checked to create the system that will provide the error alerts. January is the cleanest period for faculty paychecks. Shared service centers have been created and are responsible for administering

paychecks. Leading the project is Project Director Chuck Rowley along with Project Co-Sponsors Ron Coley – VC BAS, Maria Anguiano – VC P&B, and Ameae Walker – VPAP.

### ABC Model

It is important to note that the UCR budget and ABC model are two different things. The ABC model is about understanding cost structure. The system will capture the direct costs of running a classroom as well as the indirect costs such as administration, library, etc. to provide a full picture of the total costs. The system is meant to provide information by gathering data for deans and department chairs on the cost of running courses on a per student basis. Right now there are cross-subsidies all over the campus which make it hard to nail down costs associated with a course. The point is not to remove the subsidies, but to get a real cost of doing business.

CFW noted that the new model will change the cost per room with a fee above the marginal cost because the model will be using an average. A higher cost would be imposed rather than charging less for certain events that the campus may care about. Before any campus decisions are made, consultation should take place. People need to be consulted on how to use the information. CFW further noted that it is unclear how the ABC Model will help department chairs because they do not have a budget to manage. They only have needs that have to be met. UCR's academic mission requires that the budget move to meet its needs. This variable information means the data will be constantly changing.

### *Early Childhood Services (ECS) Unit*

Toward the end of the 2016 Spring quarter, the UCR Early Childhood Services (ECS) unit announced the need for significant staff layoffs. An estimated 10-12 teacher positions were proposed to be eliminated. Those being laid off, would be allowed to apply for lower salaried positions. The justification at the time provided for such a draconian measure was to address an approximately \$1,762,957 structural deficit in the ECS operating budget.

In a meeting with Chancellor Wilcox, Provost D'Anieri and CFW members Hughes and Redak, the Chancellor made it clear that he is willing to continue to subsidize the ECS, but the subsidy from Housing and Student Services must be eliminated and the auxiliary support must be reduced. The subsidy from Housing and Student Services is derived from revenue generated from housing fees and other fees that non-users of ECS pay into the campus as part of their normal activities. The net result is apparently elevated housing costs relative to other UC campus (we have not verified this other than to determine the housing costs for UCR and UCB are within a few dollars of one another).

The current proposed administrative solutions to this problem is two-fold. First, simply lay off multiple individuals that are currently classified as Teacher I or II and rehire them, if they so choose, as Teacher Assistants. The savings in salary and benefits will be substantial, but cannot be accurately calculated until it is determined exactly who is laid off and rehired. Second, raise tuition across the board for all users of the facilities. This is to occur with a concomitant switching

to classrooms that are NAEYC accredited with higher staff to child ratios. The end result will also lead to fewer staff overall.

The CFW recognizes the serious problem the campus faces in maintaining a viable, high quality child care center; however it saw some alternative solutions that could help address the situations and further pushed for collaboration in resolving these issues. The CFW met with administration and the ECS unit to discuss possible budgetary solutions and come to a compromise.

**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:

***Campus Review***

***GSOE Bylaw Change 1.1 to 5.1.1***

The Committee did not see any issues with the proposed changes and unanimously endorsed the modified language.

***Consultation on Abusive Conduct and Bullying Guidance and Statement***

The Committee considered the material provided and recommended the following modifications:

- The document refers in a couple of places to “the employer’s legitimate business interests” or “legitimate business reasons.” However UCR is not a business, therefore suggest the word “business” either be dropped or replaced by “organizational” or “educational.”
- Remove “without a sufficient pedagogical justification”
- Modify “spreading misinformation or malicious rumors” to read “knowingly, maliciously spreading misinformation or malicious rumors
- Modify “unwarranted physical contact” to read “inappropriate physical contact”

***Request from the Special Committee regarding the Provost***

The Committee considered the request received from the Special Committee to provide feedback regarding the amount and type of input and consultation between the campus administration and the Committee. The Committee saw no need to respond as a whole, but encouraged members to respond individually to the confidential online form.

The Committee offered no comments on the following campus review items:

- *Request for Input Regarding Visiting Dignitary Protocol*
- *Proposed Addition to Riverside Divisional Bylaw 1.2*
- *CoDEO Bylaw Change 8.6.1 & 8.6.2*

***System-wide Review***

***Proposed Revisions to APM 015, APM 016, and Senate Bylaw 336***

Proposed revisions add sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, as a form of Unacceptable Conduct to The Faculty Code of Conduct (APM - 015). Proposed amended language clarifies when the Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of The Faculty Code of Conduct (APM - 015). Proposed new language institutes a new timeline and

deadline after the imposition of involuntary leave for the Chancellor to inform an accused faculty member of the reasons for the leave, the allegations being investigated, the anticipated date when charges will be brought, a statement concerning when the leave will end, and the faculty member's right to grieve the involuntary leave, to be handled by the Privilege and Tenure Committee on an expedited basis (APM - 016).

The Committee considered the proposed revisions to APM 015 – The Faculty Code of Conduct, APM 016 – University Policy on Faculty Conduct and The Administration of Discipline, and Senate Bylaw 336 – Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees – Disciplinary Cases. The Committee endorsed the modified language and did not have any substantial comments to add.

***Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy: Business & Financial Bulletin (BFB) G-28 - Travel Regulations***

Proposed revisions allow reimbursement, in limited circumstances, for travel (including childcare) expenses for spouses, domestic partners, dependent-care providers, and dependents of employees traveling on University business and candidates for employment at the University of California traveling to UC locations for recruitment purposes.

The Committee endorsed the modified language and did not have any substantial comments to add.

***Second Review of Revisions to APM 278, APM 210-6 Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series***

The Proposed revisions in Academic Personnel Manual Sections 278 – Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series and 210-6 – Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series differentiate the Health Sciences Clinical Professor title from the Volunteer Clinical Professor title, identify responsibilities for faculty appointed to a Health Sciences Clinical Professor title, and strengthen and refine review criteria for appointment and advancement.

The Committee found the numerous editorial and organizational changes to be inconsistent at times, but found the context to include a range of opportunity to fulfil requirements. Overall, the Committee found the revisions to be reasonable and did not have any substantial comments to add.

***Proposed Revisions to APM 285, APM 210-3, APM 133, and APM 740***

Proposed revisions modify language intended to make the title more accurately reflect the requirements for advancement in the series and make hiring, evaluation, and promotion practices more consistent across the UC system.

The Committee considered the proposed revisions to APM sections 285 – Lecturer with Security of Employment Series, 210-3 – Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series, 133 – Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles, and 740 – Leaves of Absence/Sabbatical Leaves, but has

no substantial comments to offer in the recommended title change and numerous editorial and organizational changes found in each APM section.

***Presidential Nondiscrimination Policy and APM 015***

Proposed revisions modify language to comply with: California state law (AB 1433), by extending non-discrimination and non-harassment, protections to individuals applying for or engaged in positions as “volunteers, unpaid interns and trainees;”, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) Pay Transparency Rule, prohibiting certain employers from discharging or discriminating against employees and job applicants for discussing, disclosing or inquiring about compensation; and amendments to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), requiring employers to develop and distribute anti-harassment and discrimination policies with certain required elements.

The Committee considered the proposed revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action regarding Academic and Staff Employment and Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Policy Section 015, The Faculty Code of Conduct. The Committee found no issues with the modified language and did not have any substantial comments to add.

***Draft Presidential Policy on Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS)***

The Policy is to establish minimum standards for the safe use and operation of UAS and Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (SUAS), including drones and model aircraft, on any University Location or at any Authorized University Activity. This policy requires that all UAS operations are performed in a manner that mitigates risks to safety, security, and privacy, and ensures compliance with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–95) and all applicable laws.

The Committee considered the material received and commented that the policy does not seem to apply additional constraints on faculty beyond the expectations stated in the APM and FAA guidelines. However, UCR will have to wait for the implementation of the policy to foresee any issues that may arise. Overall, the Committee found the policy to be reasonable and did not have any substantial comments to add.

***Proposed Technical Revisions to APM 190 Appendix G – Retirement Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary***

Proposed technical revisions modify summer salary retirement contributions language to include the Defined Contribution Plan (DC Plan) Supplemental or Savings Choice contributions to the DC Plan under the 2016 retirement Choice Program. In addition, policy is modified to reflect that the summer salary retirement benefit will be transferred, prospectively, from the DC Plan to the Tax Deferred 403(b) Plan. The changes are applicable to future contributions only (effective November 1, 2016); existing summer salary benefit amounts will remain in the DC Plan.

The Committee did not have a chance to convene as this request came early in the academic year. Although no consensus position was developed regarding the proposed modification to APM 190 – Appendix G, the Committee offered the following suggestions raised by members who responded to the circulation of the proposal.

The change as described is largely driven by IRS issues and it does not yield any adverse consequences on our faculty. However, assuming our faculty will read about this change, some thought should be given to presenting some concrete examples on how the changes might affect faculty. Several examples such as: "Consider a professor hired in 2004. Here is how the change affects this person." These examples could help faculty understand the change quickly because they could probably identify themselves in one of the examples.

***Draft Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3)***

The policy provides a security framework that protects UC's Institutional Information and IT Resources from accidental or intentional unauthorized access, loss or damage, while preserving UC's collaborative academic culture. It is modeled on a recognized set of best practices and security controls from the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). Use of a standards-based approach is crucial for UC to obtain cybersecurity insurance, take advantage of vendor services based on these standards, and ensure faculty eligibility for certain federal research contracts that deal with Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI).

The Committee considered the draft policy, but did not have any substantial comments to add. The Committee offered no comments on the following system-wide review item:

- *Second Review of Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336*

**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 2016-17 UCFW representative was Victor Lippit, who updated committee members of the issues under discussion at the statewide level. Chair Lippit also represented the committee on the UCR Academic Senate's Executive Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Victor Lippit, Chair  
John Ellison  
Piotr Gorecki  
Sherine Hafez  
Daniel Jeske  
Thomas Payne  
Richard Redak  
Traise Yamamoto  
Drew Story – GSA Representative  
Simi Cole – ASUCR Representative