COUNCIL ON FACULTY WELFARE, DIVERSITY, 
AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM (CFW) 
MINUTES 
Tuesday, January 15, 2013 
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

I. CHAIR’S REPORT
Cabinet Meetings
APM 430 – Visiting Scholars, APM 700, Leaves of Absence, and APM 015 – Faculty Code of Conduct were all endorsed by the Senate Cabinet. The UCI White Paper and the Open Access Policy were both contentious issues. Comments were forwarded to Michael Clark and Systemwide respectively.

II. CONSENT ITEMS
The minutes from November 27, 2012 were held for approval at the February 12, 2013 meeting.

III. SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERITI AFFAIRS – Status Report
Retirement Housing
Bill Parker is chairing the subcommittee on retirement housing.

Mailing Lists for Emeriti Faculty
It was recently discovered any emeriti faculty not retired with salary or hired back into the university fall off of the computer mailing lists. Michael Burton is working on behalf of the subcommittee to ensure this practice is discontinued.

Health Sciences Coordinator
The subcommittee is working to ensure the health care coordinator, Glen Rodriguez stays on campus. Members feel it is vital for people to have access to a person to facilitate health care issues as opposed to a dial up system.

IV. FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW
A. CFW sites.uci/scfw Blog
Discussion
OIT is working to enhance the functionality of the CFW blog page. To date, the image header was successfully removed from the homepage and a list of posts was added to the right side of the page. OIT is undergoing some internal changes and has asked until February 2013 to explore options for the e-mail functionality for comments. At this time, they do not have the jetpack necessary for this function.

Action
Council analyst will follow-up with OIT and investigate possible independent use of wordpress.com

B. UCI Mental Health Initiative
Discussion
The memo endorsed by the council at the November 27, 2012 meeting was forwarded to the Senate Cabinet and Chair Mary Gilly meeting with Interim EVC/Provost Sue Bryant to discuss. The Senate Cabinet noted this topic was discussed a few years back. They will pull the relevant documents and forward to CFW for review. No specific recommendation has been forwarded from Cabinet to the administration.

Council members strongly expressed a need for a presence on campus, people within the schools where people can go directly to discuss issues and a need for confidentiality. It was noted a similar model exists for sexual harassment advisors within the units which might be able to serve as an example. The current model is administered by the Cascade Center and lacks the resources for early detection. A system needs to be developed for a first level of contact.
Action
Chair Meenakshisundaram will follow up with Senate Cabinet leadership on next steps.

V. UCI SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW
   A. UCI Review of UCI Abroad White Paper
      None

VI. UC SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW
   A. UCOE IP Agreement
      Discussion
      Online education is being administered independent of the Senate through University Extension. Faculty may elect to teach a course and develop materials for coursework. However UCOE owns the materials and if a faculty member decides to discontinue teaching the course, all materials developed by said faculty member may be taken by UCOE and given to another instructor for use in teaching the course. The new instructor also has the ability to modify all materials developed for the course.

      Council members strongly opposed the IP agreement and feel UCOE owning the teaching material is a large disincentive for faculty to participate in the program.

      Action
      No action required at this time.

   B. UC Composite Benefit Rates
      Discussion
      UCI has a different composite benefit rate for each member of the campus. UC Davis has 10-12 different rates; it varies from campus to campus. UCOP wanted to have a composite benefit rate for the entire system. This is becoming increasingly important as the university moves closer to centralization of the payroll system. At this time, three campuses are participating but it is expected all will transition within two to three years. Summer salary and how it might affect retirement rates was a big part of the discussions. An announcement was made on January 11, 2013 via a phone call that a separate rate for summer salary, health sciences faculty, and emeriti will be set for 0%. A written confirmation is expected soon.

      Action
      No action required at this time.

VII. STATUS REPORTS
   Faculty Welfare Subcommittee – Gopi Meenakshisundaram, Rep to UCFW
   APM 015 – Faculty Code of Conduct
   UCFW has asked the clause “when acting as a faculty” be removed from the language.

   Future Health Care
   A proposal has been introduced for self-insurance within the UC community called UC Care. A savings of $50 million out of $1.8 billion is estimated if this new insurance is introduced. The proposed program would not be administered by UC and campuses with medical centers would need to purchase networks to administer the program. UC will underwrite the program. Finances and Risk Management are at odds with the HR and Benefits group regarding the program. Both Senate consultation and 3rd party mediation between the two groups is necessary. The proposal will have to be closely evaluated. It is possible the proposal could benefit everyone but it is also possible the program will become monopolistic and not meet the needs of the UC population.

   Total Remuneration Study
   UCFW has requested a new total remuneration study for ladder-rank faculty. In 2009 a student was generated comparing faculty benefits together with health care (total remuneration) with other private and public university systems. The conclusion was UC was approximately 13% lower in
compensation that other institutions. Several issues existed with these results. Faculty, at the time were not contributing to UCRP. Contributions began after 2009. Now that faculty are contributing towards retirement, the salary has decreased by 5%. In terms of take home salary, this places faculty at an even lower position than in 2009. As a result, the Academic Council chair is pushing for a new study with ladder-rank faculty used as the focus group. The Faculty Recruitment and Retention at UC report released by the Legislative Analyst’s Office compares UC to four other public university systems showing us close to the other four university systems but far off from other California schools. The report does not consider the cost of living. Additionally the report states there is a 15% increase in the UC budget while California State University (CSU) only has a 3% increase. However the UC total includes retirement money given by the state while the CSU number does not. Financial aid paid out of the UC income is considered in our total but left out of the CSU total.

Retirement Expenses
The employee contribution has increased from 5% to 6%. The contribution has now risen to 7% and is expected to go up to 8%. The employer contribution was supposed to go from 12% to 14% at a cap of 18%. This 18% plus 25% was required to fund UCRP to fund the program at 95 – 105% by 2035. It now seems as though the employee contribution will be 8% and the employer contribution 14%. The respective campus EVC’s have shared the operating budgets will decrease if the rate moves past 14%. This would delay the goal of 95-105% to 2038. UCFW is pushing for the UCOP portion to rise to 18% temporarily to help ensure UC reaches the 95-105% goal by 2035.

Affirmative Action Subcommittee – Grace Tonner, Rep to UCAAD

Mentorship
UCAAD is discussing whether or not there should be a uniform policy across the UC system for mentoring faculty or if it should be departmental. The committee noted although each school may have different practices for mentoring opportunities there should be some broad principles or requirements for established for mentoring faculty. Additional concern was expressed for associate level faculty who often get lost in the middle. Mentorship will be discussed at the UC Advance systemwide roundtable. The next scheduled meeting will be at UC Riverside on April 10. A report regarding this will be released soon.

APM – 010, Section 1D
A recommendation was made to redraft the language in Section 1D of APM – 010. Concern was raised regarding the role of scholarship in diversity and equal opportunity. The language was clarified and presented to the university community on Academic Personnel to show no one should be denigrated for doing diversity and affirmative action in terms of scholarship. This will be reviewed in the coming months. The draft language will be shared with CFW at our next meeting.

Additionally, a proposal was made to have dean evaluations and hiring committee/person evaluations be affected by diversity numbers. The goal is to create a consequence for those not pushing or recognizing diversity in faculty.

Academic Freedom Subcommittee – Jean-Daniel Saphores, Rep to UCAF
No Report

Academic Personnel – Joan Tenma
No Report

Equal Opportunity and Diversity Status Report – Gwen Kuhns Black

Campus Climate Survey

Overview
The campus climate survey was brought about due to several incidents at various UC campuses which brought scrutiny to the UC’s climate of inclusion. President Yudof formed a systemwide
Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion and each campus formed a local Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion. UCOP then contracted with an outside consultant, Rankin & Associates, to assess the campus climate at all UC locations through the administration of a survey. The climate survey will assess the experiences and perceptions of students, staff, and faculty both of which are said to affect academic and professional success as well as retention.

Participants will need to complete at least 50% of the questions for the survey to be counted in the analysis and incentive. Not all questions have to be answered. For instance, some questions are specific to students, which staff and faculty will not be able to answer. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Most campuses have launched the survey. The few who have not will be launching in February. The UCI target deadline is February 14.

Confidentiality
The survey could not be administered completely anonymously due to the lack of control of duplication and the possibility of people outside of the UC system affecting the results. Instead, the survey participation request will be generated from UCOP using a unique identifier for each participant. The unique identifier will come through the e-mail link sent to everyone. The survey response will go to one of sixteen servers managed by the Penn State Faculty Member who will strip the unique identifier before compiling the data.

Data
Once the data is compiled, UCOP will get a report from the consultant. All public records requests and IRB requests will go through UCOP. The study is designed to pass IRB review. Any administrative approval and use of the data will happen locally. The Office of Institutional Research will administer the data at UC Irvine. Both AGS and ASUCI were involved with getting transparency of the data. Results for the survey will be posted on both the UCOP and UC Irvine websites. The results will serve as a foundation for surveying four to five years from now.

Incentives
Local incentives include a catered celebration for one UCI academic and one UCI administrative unit, lunch with UCI Chancellor for five faculty, five staff, five students, and gift cards of various amounts for numerous UCI faculty, staff and students. Systemwide incentives include a $10,000 scholarship for one undergraduate, $5,000 stipends for two graduate academic or professional students, $5,000 research grants for two faculty members, and $2,000 professional development grants for five staff. Additionally two iPads per campus will be awarded.

Human Resources Status Report on Benefits – Melody McCulloch
No Report

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS
None

IX. NEW BUSINESS
A request was made to include the proliferation of administration on the February agenda.

X. ADJOURNMENT: 5:35 P.M.

Submitted by Charlene Mandau