

**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
December 3, 2019**

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 twelve 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 and conducting a review of its bylaws, the Committee considered inquiries from the campus at large concerning various topics:

- Faculty salaries
- Skateboard policies
- Police Advisory Board
- Chancellor review
- Budget model modifications
- Long Range Development Planning
- eFilePlus
- Formal procedures involved in handling SVSH cases
- Joint department voting rights
- Faculty engagement with Healthy Campus Initiative and programs
- Faculty's role in campus health
- Transportation and Parking Services
- Faculty Equity Advisor program at UCR

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met nine times during the 2018-2019 academic year and undertook the following actions:

a. Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship

The Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship Award is presented annually 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 three recipients. Professor Emeritus Carlos Cortes in the Department of History, Professor Emeritus Howard Friedman in the Department of Psychology, and Professor Emeritus Johnathan Turner in the Department of Sociology have been named a 2019-20 Edward A. Dickson Emeritus Professor on the Riverside campus. They will hold the title “Edward A. Dickson Emeritus Professor” from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

b. Discussions with Campus Leadership and Recommendations to the Administration to Senate. *re Initiating a Public Records Request*

It was suggested by one Faculty Welfare Committee member that a senate committee should make a public records request for "any document from the University of California's Office of the President pursuant to the whistleblower protection investigation related to James Sandoval." The motivation behind this idea is to make visible efforts to ensure that no information has been kept from the campus community about who knew what and when they knew it. While all members of FWC support the desire for full disclosure of all facts that are publicly available in this case, some members were less convinced that this line of inquiry should come from FWC. As such, it was unanimously agreed our best course of action is to offer the idea to executive council for their discussion and their opinion on what a suitable next step might be.

to Senate. FWC Recommendation for a Campus Climate Survey

The Faculty Welfare Committee recommends conducting a climate survey similar to the one carried out in 2014 by Rankin & Associates, Consulting. In the nearly 5 years since that survey, the campus has seen significant growth, significant turnover in campus administration, and significant change in its portfolio of challenges. We believe it is appropriate to survey the faculty, staff and students to measure important dimensions of our campus culture. We request that Executive Council take up a discussion on the merits of our recommendation, and if it concurs that conducting the survey is a good idea, discuss further who might be responsible for designing and administering the survey, and in what time frame.

UCR Faculty Climate Survey, 2019

A survey was developed by UCR's Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare to assess the overall climate of UCR. It was developed by the faculty for the faculty. The survey was comprised of questions on seven topics, to which faculty could provide numeric ratings and/or narrative answers: Research; Teaching; Advising/Mentorship; Service; Equity; Campus Climate; Leadership and Governance. This survey was administered by the Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare. The FWC will analyze the data with the help of selected graduate students if needed, and the survey's main findings (in the aggregate) will be posted on the senate website.

This report will not include any identification of individual respondents or responses. No one else at the University, including the administration, will have access to the responses.

to Chair Rodriguez. Committee's thoughts on UCR Strategic Plan

1. What do you envision as an effective and thoughtful process for creating the next UCR strategic plan?

FWC supports active involvement by the senate, rather than what might otherwise be a passive review role.

2. Are there key areas of emphasis that your committee would suggest be included in the strategic plan?

FWC discussed several areas that should be given considerable thought:

- A post-mortem assessment of the progress toward the stated 2020 goals, and a discussion of unanticipated problems that resulted from working toward those stated goals.
- A description of when and how progress toward 2030 goals will be assessed.
- Achieving the right mix of undergraduate and graduate students
- Achieving the right size for class, discussion and lab sections. To what extent are section enrollment caps in line with other campuses? How many students/sections constitute a full workload TA?
- Improving the competitiveness of graduate student support packages
- Articulation of the motives and quality standards for online courses, including where the revenue from these courses should go. Ladder faculty in departments who have these professional programs should have a say in where those funds are directed.
- A student growth plan that has rationale beyond following orders from Sacramento. To address the challenges posed by the increasing gap between educational preparedness, growth plans should include increased support of resources to tackle this issue.
- Sound growth strategies and fiscal plans for the professional degree programs

3. Are there specific contributions your committee would like to make in the drafting of the strategic plan?

FWC expresses interest in reviewing drafts of the proposed strategic plan, and in providing assistance with measuring the impact and consequences of the 2020 strategic plan.

4. Does your committee wish to offer any other ideas or input on the strategic plan process, rubric, or anticipated content?

- Realistic costs for proposed initiatives together with a realistic plan for where the needed funds will come from
- Transparent plan for how development funds will be invested in the campus

to Chair Rodriguez. Academic freedom and the faculty's right to participate in boycott movements

The Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) discussed the right of faculty to participate in boycott movements. FWC is unanimous in believing faculty should feel free to express their views through boycotts. The committee feels the Chancellors overstepped when they wrote a letter about their collective personal thoughts as if those thoughts reflected the entire UC community. The committee believes this was a mistake without any particular motive, and that by now the

Chancellors see that the letter improperly circumvented shared governance. It might calm a lot of angst if they were to acknowledge that.

to Administration via Senate Chair. re Salary Inequity

Efforts to close the gap between UC system wide faculty salaries and the comparison 8 institutions have narrowed that gap from 8.4% to 6.4%. However, campus to campus variability in the gap is quite extraordinary. UCB and UCLA are generally on the plus side compared to the comparison 8, while UCR lags behind by 18% at the Assistant Professor rank, 20% at the Associate Professor rank, and 23% at the Full Professor rank. Campus-to-campus variability in faculty salaries can be seen as another type of salary inequity. This inequity is exacerbated when only specific Chancellors supplement system wide scale increases with off-scale increases. Those campuses not participating are further disadvantaged because the off-scale adjustments at specific campuses further close the average system wide gap (the only metric people are looking at) without benefitting the entire system wide faculty.

There is an argument that coastal campuses should have higher compensation packages for faculty due to the relative cost of housing expenses. Off-scale salary adjustments are not a good way to address this issue. Faculty salaries are intended to reflect merit and an ‘equal pay for equal merit’ value system. We note that APM 190 provides for housing allowances as well as attractive mortgage options, and individual campuses provide alternative lower cost housing communities for faculty. To some extent, a higher cost of living should be expected in return for the upside of living in the coastal communities. The Faculty Welfare Committee requests priority be given at UCR for participating in an off-scale salary adjustment to avoid our campus falling further behind our peer campuses in merit-based pay. The larger the disparity between campuses, the more it would seem that the UC system is not a system after all, but instead a collection of ‘haves’ and ‘have nots.’ Aside from the injustice of being a ‘have not,’ UCR becomes vulnerable to having their stellar faculty lured away by the ‘haves.’

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

- Summary White Paper on RUSD STEM High School on the UCR campus
- 3rd Round: School of Public Policy Regulations
- Provost’s Taskforce for Hybrid and Online Education Final Report
- Proposed UCR Long Term Academic Calendar
- Extension of Exception to APM 275-16-f(3) Restrictions: 1/6 Limitation on Appointment to Professor of Clinical X Series
- Endowed Term Chair for Teaching, Research and service in CNAS
- Bylaw Appendix 5 (5.3.1 and Addition of 5.311)
- UCR Campus Multi-Year Framework

System-wide Review

- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
- Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-RMP-7 Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information
- Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUD-46 (Use of Vehicles and Driver Selection Policy)
- CORRECTION: Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUD-46 (Use of Vehicles and Driver Selection Policy)
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336
- Executive Summary (Draft)-Report of Task Force on University Policing
- Proposed UC Transfer Admission Guarantee
- Proposed Revisions to SVSH Academic Frameworks
- APM – 011, Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees
- Limited Review of Interim Policy on Responding to Immigration Enforcement Involving Patients on UC Health Facilities
- Research Grant Program Office – Current State Assessment Report
- APM – 230, Visiting Appointments

The Committee's formal response to each issue is located on the Academic Senate website and can be found at: <http://senate.ucr.edu/about/issues/2018-2019/>

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 2018-19 UCFW representative was Daniel Jeske, who updated committee members of the issues under discussion at the statewide level. Chair Jeske also represented the committee on the UCR Academic Senate's Executive Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Jeske, Chair
Begona Echeverria
Abhijit Ghosh
Piotr Gorecki
Jacob Greenstein
Marta Hernandez Salvan
Stefano Lonardi
Patricia Morton
Thomas Payne
Caroline Roper
Raymond Russell
Traise Yamamoto
Mark Wiley – GSA Representative
Josiah Davis – ASUCR Representative