COUNCIL ON FACULTY WELFARE, DIVERSITY, AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM (CFW)
MINUTES
Tuesday, October 30, 2012
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

I. CHAIR’S REPORT
Senate Chair Welcome
Senate Chair Mary Gilly welcomed everyone to the Council on Faculty Welfare and thanked them for their service to the Council. Senate Chair Gilly also informed the Council total remuneration was discussed at the last Academic Council meeting. In regards to retirement accounts, UC is falling behind the Comp 8 schools. In 2008-09 total remuneration (salary, medical, dental, vision, life insurance, retirement, etc.) was at 29% positive relative to the Comp 8 schools. In 2012-13 UC was at -8%. The 2013-14 projection is even lower at -14%. More information regarding total remuneration will be given to CFW in the near future.

Informational Items
Chair Meenakshisundaram reviewed informational items with the Council including the membership roster, meeting schedule, subcommittee assignments, information sharing, bylaws, retreat agenda, senate recusal policy, annual report, status of ongoing business, and the Council Web site.

CFW Message Board
Chair Meenakshisundaram introduced a new message board with the Council. The web page address is http://sites.uci.edu/scfw. Members are encouraged to access the page to review and comment on discussions items in advance of scheduled meeting dates so as to facilitate a faster review process. As new items are introduced, they will be posted to the blog with a notification sent to each member. At this time no automatic notification process exists for new comments posted. Chair Meenakshisundaram and the senate analyst are working with OIT to address this issue. In the interim, the senate analyst will monitor the site daily and send the Council notifications as new comments are added. Each member was sent an e-mail notification to their UCI account inviting them to join the site. Members who have not yet joined were asked to complete their registration. Once members have joined, their respective e-mail address can be changed from UCI to other service providers such as Yahoo or Gmail.

UCI Mental Health Initiative
Chair Meenakshisundaram attended the October 18 UCI Mental Health Initiative group meeting. The group created a three point agenda to be presented to the EVCP and has requested CFW support for the initiative. To that end, a letter from the Council will be drafted incorporating the three points listed below.

1. We ask you to consider the development of training programs for new Chairs on dealing with colleagues who are in acute distress, and to promote a culture of openness in the department in dealing with these issues.

2. We ask you to expand the scope of mental health training programs now available for students to include staff and faculty, include specific issues that bring about distress among the faculty and how to handle them. This may include both information sessions to provide and educate about the resources available for this purpose, and also wellness programs like stress management.

3. Finally, we ask you to consider the development of a program that would identify a faculty representative in each School, who would be the “go to” person for faculty and staff who seek assistance in dealing with students or colleagues who are in acute distress. These individuals would obviously not be trained psychologists or psychiatrists, but they would receive training in how to link those in need with the appropriate resources on campus. This would give heightened visibility to the importance of mental health as a key part of our commitment to
creating a culture of “wellness” on campus. If it came with the official imprimatur of the EVC and Chancellor, it would also, we are convinced, do much to destigmatize the problems associated with mental illness and encourage those in need to seek assistance.

II. CONSENT ITEMS
The minutes from June 12, 2012 were unanimously approved with no changes.

III. SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERITI AFFAIRS – Status Report
None

IV. FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW
None

V. UCI SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW
None

VI. UC SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW
A. UC Review of “Rebenching” Report
   Issue: Request for Formal Systemwide Review and Comment
   The Council was asked to review and comment on the UC Review of “Rebenching” Report and recommendations made by the Rebenching Budget Committee. The intent of rebenching is to increase transparency and equity in the formula for allocating state funds across campuses in the UC system. Rebenching is scheduled for implementation starting 2012-13 with recommendations the funding be spread out over six years through 2018 using new State General Funds.

   Discussion
   Council members agreed with the Rebenching Budget Committee’s consensus the University needs a more transparent and equitable process for allocating funds received from the State of California to its ten campuses. However the Council did not believe the rebenching report and recommendations adequately address this process.

   Council members expressed concern the rebenching model did not address adequately the redistribution of resources during a time of waning resources and assumes there will be new state funds. Members noted the UC system has experienced a significant decline in state funding since 2008 and if Proposition 30 does not pass on November 6, state funding will continue to decline. Campuses such as UC Los Angeles and UC Berkeley have the ability to increase non-state revenue to balance the drop in funding while schools similar to UC Irvine and UC Merced cannot. Further, UC-San Francisco’s differential funding through increase and decrease of state funds is not proportionate.

   Council members noted several exceptions to the rebenching model for UC Merced and UC San Francisco. Members also noted the overall intent to provide growing campuses such as UC Merced funding enabling them to grow their graduate programs through hiring additional faculty and building laboratories to attract graduate students; essentially prefunding graduate growth. Council members felt these exceptions will create an inequitable playing field benefitting schools such as UC San Francisco while continuing to disenfranchise schools such as UC Irvine who have historically been underfunded.

   Council members support the idea that increased transparency and equity is needed. The proposed formula would allocate funds based on the number of California resident students based on target numbers. However the actual target numbers are not clearly laid out.

   Action
   Council comments will be forward via memo to the Senate Cabinet.
B. UC Review of Negotiated Salary Plan

Issue
The Council was asked to review and comment on the negotiated salary trial program for the general campus. The trial program is a result of the systemwide review of proposed APM – 668 in 2011 – 2012. The goal of the proposal was to make salaries more competitive by making technical changes in the way salaries are computed using grant or other external funding.

UC Irvine, UC Los Angeles, and UC San Diego will participate in the trial program over the next four years. At the three year mark, a report will be made on the progress. The trial period is applicable for faculty who have received a normal merit increase over the past two years. The benefits will continue to be computed based on the actual salary. The UC Retirement Plan will not be affected by the increase.

Discussion
Council members shared the report offers a framework with unclear implementation details. In order to proceed with the trial, the Council believes that certain questions must be answered. How will the trial be evaluated? What parameters are being used to measure success?

The Council believes there may be positive side effects with the trial program. For example, faculty would be incentivized to pursue additional grants. Faculty may choose more non-modular grants. If properly administered, there could be an increase in funding to the university. But, it should also carefully consider the impact of shifting allocation of money earmarked for other research expenditure towards faculty salaries.

Council members felt if the trial moves forward, under local implementation in the department, there should be metrics for ensuring faculty obtain the same agreement regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, or a person’s ability to negotiate to prevent exacerbation of equity issues already in place. Council members suggested Advance or an equity advisor be consulted when crafting the local guidelines for implementation.

Council members noted not all funding sources can be used in this plan. If within the same department, two faculty members with two different funding sources, both highly and equally competitive may be unequally treated under this plan, not because of the relative merits of the faculty, but purely because of the differences in funding sources. This may lead to unpleasant situations if they are in the same department since faculty within the same department affect each other’s professional life more than those in different departments. Members suggested implementing this plan within a department only if all faculty have access and opportunity to get funding from the sources that allow use of funds in the negotiated salary plan.

Action
Council comments will be forward via memo to the Senate Cabinet.

VII. STATUS REPORTS

Faculty Welfare Subcommittee (UCFW, 10/12/12) – Gopi Meenakshisundaram, Rep to UCFW

University of California Online Education (UCOE) Copyright Issues
UC San Diego raised concern regarding copyright issues of faculty contributing to the UCOE program. Once faculty contribute teaching material to UCOE, the copyright is held by UCOE. UCOE will give first preference to faculty if there is a need for modifications to existing course material. However if faculty decline or fail to make modifications within a certain period of time, UCOE reserves the right to change the course material provided by the faculty and can use another instructor to teach the course without participation of the original faculty member contributing to the course. More information regarding this issue is coming soon.

Lab Safety Issues
Instructions regarding lab safety procedures and regulations can be received from the UC Irvine safety managers and director. New regulations have been put into place that go far beyond the
settlement terms that the UC Regents agreed as a result of the UC Los Angeles lab accident where a student was killed. The issue centered on a lack of documentation the student to show the student was trained correctly and that the student was not wearing proper protective gear. The faculty member at UC Los Angeles was tried. The UC Regents were let go based on an agreement to put in place regulations, training, etc. for staff and faculty using labs. UCFW is working with the Director of Lab Safety for the UC system. Issues such as whether or not visitors get trained if they visit will be evaluated.

Health Care Task Force
Open enrollment started October 29. Co-pays have increased across the board. Monarch has left Healthnet Blue and Gold, but Healthnet has picked up two additional groups including Memorial Care. In 2014, UC will get bids for all healthcare plans with the exception of Kaiser.

UC Irvine now has a healthcare facilitator on campus, Glen Rodriguez. He can facilitate any issues related to healthcare or insurance including authorization, billing issues, and Medicare.

Members also have the option of switching to Blue Cross PPO when traveling outside of the country beyond three months as this is considered a disruption in service and many plans only cover emergency service outside the country. Additionally, members can switch back to their original plan at any time upon their return.

Affirmative Action Subcommittee – Grace Tonner, Rep to UCAAD
No Report

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
Climate Survey
The Climate Survey will launch on January 14, 2013 at UC Irvine. Systemwide there have been incentives committed to the survey. Incentives include one $10,000 scholarship for an undergraduate student, two $5,000 stipends for graduate/professional students, two $5,000 research grants for faculty, and five $2,000 professional development grants for staff. In addition, two iPads per campus will be awarded. This is based on participants that complete the survey.

The work team is reviewing whether or not to have incentives locally and what they will look like. It’s been demonstrated in the past that smaller incentives proved to be successful in increasing participation rates for undergraduate students. The graduate student representative on the work team shared that for graduate students, it comes down to whether or not faculty encourage students to participate. The goal is to get at least a 30% response rate across the system and in local areas to get useful information. The higher the response rate the better. ASUCI and AGS have asked about the transparency of the report. The consultant will write the report for each campus and the system. There is a Web site for the survey http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/.

UCOP plans to post all reports. The survey has been written to meet IRB requirements as much as possible so that any faculty that want to use the date for research purposes should be able to undergo an expedited IRB review. The work team has considered ideas to help increase response rates, such as giving travel grants or funding to schools. Any ideas for the work team to consider should be forwarded to Gwen Kuhns Black. This is the benchmark year. Another survey will be done in four or five years to measure comparatively.
Department of Labor Audits
Chief Personnel Officers in each school and academic unit have been asked to contact all faculty and staff who have not identified their race/ethnicity and encourage them to complete the Demographic Data Transmittal Form. This is a voluntary form. The reason for this that unknown ethnicity has been one issue that has come up at all of the recent UC audits and the government states it cannot do the statistical analysis they want to do. We are on notice because this is an issue that has come up on three recent UC audits. The next step after the chief personnel officers is to have OEOD reach out to faculty and staff directly. One campus is in a conciliation agreement with the Department of Labor and Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. The goal is to reduce the percentage of “unknowns” to no more than 2-3%. Systemwide is thinking of broadening categories to include mixed races.

Sexual Harassment
The Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity is providing options for faculty to fulfill the state mandate for sexual harassment prevention training. Life Theatre will be coming on November 7 from 10 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Life Theater is offered twice a year, in the Fall and Spring, offering an engaging sexual harassment prevention training option. Instructor-led training is also offered through OEOD several times a year as an alternative to the online version.

Human Resources Status Report on Benefits – Melody McCulloch
Health Care Coverage
Open Enrollment began October 29 and will close on November 20 at 5:00 p.m. Health Net is more expensive than Blue Cross at this time. Flexible spending and Dep Care is also going on now. Members must re-enroll every year to maintain coverage. The limit has been reduced from $5,000 to $2,500. The old cards expire on December 31. If members choose not to re-enroll, they can still incur expenses for 2012 through March 15, 2013 and have until April 15, 2013 to file claims. Members who choose to re-enroll have the same grace periods and will receive new cards in January. Additionally, there have been three name changes in insurance carriers: Accidental Death and Dismemberment Insurance has changed from Charter to AIG, United Health has changed to Optum, and Sitter City has changed to Select Plus and will now have senior care. Secova will continue to handle family audits. Whenever a family member is added, an audit will follow two months later to verify dependent eligibility.

Fidelity Funds
UC is reducing the Fidelity Funds that members can invest in. Anyone with funds to be closed will be notified with the option to transfer to another investment. There will be a brokerage fee for members who choose to keep the investments. If members do not changed their investment, the funds will default to whatever fund has been chosen by UC.

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS
None

IX. NEW BUSINESS
None

X. ADJOURNMENT: 5:20 P.M.

Submitted by Charlene Mandau