



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Minutes of Meeting

March 14, 2025

Attendance: Juan Pablo Pardo Guerra, Chair (UCSD); Karen Bales, Vice Chair (UCD); Nancy Wallace, UCB; Janet Foley, UCD; Ben Lourie, UCI; Jayson Beaster Jones, UCM; Salman Asif, UCR; Amy Adler, UCSD; John Saucedo, UCSF; Laurie Freeman, UCSB; Yat Li, UCSC; Vickie Mays, HCTF Chair (UCLA); Jill Hellenbach, TFIR Chair (UCSF); David Kleinfeld, UCRS Advisory Board Representative (UCSD); Zoran Nenadic, UCRS Advisory Board Representative (UCI); Joel Dimsdale, CUCEA Chair (UCSD)

I. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Steve Cheung, Academic Council Chair

Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Council Vice Chair

- A joint Senate-administration workgroup continues to examine APM 015, 016 regarding faculty discipline timelines and consistency. Some have suggested creating a systemwide network of discipline committees for high profile cases or a case monitoring system to collect and analyze data. There are calls for more careful reporting of settlements and informal resolutions, too. The workgroup will return to the question of simultaneous disciplinary and merit actions later in the spring.
- The state budget outlook is still poor, now made worse by wildfires and other disasters. Contingency planning is underway at multiple levels. The budgetary impacts of changes to federal funding practices are being measured, and contingency planning is underway here, too. It is unlikely that philanthropic efforts can close the gap.
- The Senate will launch a dedicated committee to consider adaptations to disruptions in the current environment, but the chaotic nature of the changes makes planning more challenging than usual. Community safety and health care delivery are at risk, in addition to research funding and support for diversity-related programs and projects. Broad cuts to Medicare and/or Medicaid would only worsen the targeted cuts and further destabilize faculty on soft money. Campuses are engaged in contingency planning, but local autonomy hinders systemwide guidance and goal setting. Nonetheless, the Regents and the President are considering options.

- A Special Assembly meeting will be held later this month to discuss 1) decision-making regarding the academic calendar including possible divisional votes and 2) a proposal to delay salary adjustments for administrators at the dean's level or above to October 1, to match the administration date for faculty.
- The Davis division certified a vote of no confidence in President Drake based on budget conditions, MOP's funding status, and recent salary increases for chancellors. There was a 20% turnout.
- The UCSF memorials regarding Senate membership for clinicians and adjunct faculty are still being reviewed by the divisions. Responses are due next week. If at least 3 divisions totaling 35% of the Senate approve, the items will go for a full systemwide faculty vote.
- In the presidential search, the Senate's Academic Advisory Committee recommendations match the Regents preferences, and final candidates are being contacted.
- The top candidates for UCSB chancellor are being reviewed.
- A listening tour for the UCR chancellor has been concluded, and the review committee is reading vitae.
- The report of the systemwide academic calendar workgroup is out for systemwide review.

II. **Chair's Announcements**

Juan Pablo Pardo Guerra, UCFW Chair

- Following proposed changes to indirect cost recovery practices and caps, the issue has moved to the courts for adjudication. Local funds flows are in question.
- The University continues to grapple with how to regard DEI type activities and programs. For admission and hiring, is Prop 209 compliance adequate now? How such activities should be treated in merit reviews is even more in question than before. Several campuses may suffer federal funding freezes inflicted upon other universities, and the threats seem to already be having a chilling impact in the classroom.
- As noted above, the Senate is launching a dedicated body to consider adaptations to disruptions. Early topics include 1) academic freedom, 2) career advancement and the use of achievement relative to opportunity (ARO) principles, and 3) workload impacts in response to projected budget cuts. Members noted the possibility of more retirements than usual further impacting the University, and others noted a discrepancy in the rate of layoffs between the academic side of the house and administration side of the house.
- A preliminary discussion with Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP) regarding a faculty-assisted survey panel and tool for robust in-house use was well received.
- A draft letter for Senate service recognition for use in personnel files is being developed.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs (FAAP) and Systemwide Academic Personnel (SWAP)

Douglas Haynes, Interim Vice Provost, FAAP

Amy Lee, Deputy Provost, SWAP

Kelly Anders, Executive Director, SWAP

Jean Chin, Academic Data Compensation Director, SWAP

A. Comparison 8 Salary Analysis

Director Chin reported that the gap had closed to 3.1% from 3.6%, but there have also been slight methodology changes due to other institutions declining to share directly, leaving UC to mine AAUP public data for analysis. For longitudinal analysis, the last 10 years were adjusted to reflect the change. Law school faculty and Professors of Teaching data were newly available, so they were added to the study. COLA considerations are included in the methodology, and campus breakouts were not prepared since that would be a change in precedent. The ability to map COACHE data into this study is unclear at present.

B. Upcoming APM Actions

- Revisions to the Librarian series (APM 360) to clarify wording regarding instructional activity will be issued soon.
- A re-revised APM 500 (Recruitment) draft will remove duplication with HR functions and clarify which previous misconduct findings must be disclosed at what point in the recruitment process. The accompanying guidelines are being revised, as well.
- How best to implement changes to APM 036 (Employment) and new state law requiring limiting the official use of letters of recommendation is still being discussed. Current thinking is that a standard disclaimer should suffice to indicate whether the LOR is an official document being issued on behalf of the University or a personal assessment of scholastic capacity of another individual or team.

C. Faculty Discipline Workgroup

Interim VP Haynes noted that the current focus of the workgroup is on consistency in the administration of faculty discipline. Factors to be considered in evaluations include the policy violated, the impact of the violation, and any mitigating/heightening factors. Other ideas under consideration include cross-campus evaluators for privilege and tenure hearings, changes to deadlines, and changes to administrative practices for un/paid leaves. A report to the Provost is due in April ahead of a scheduled presentation to the Regents in May. Faculty review would follow endorsement by the Regents.

IV. TFIR Update

Jill Hollenbach, TFIR Chair

- On the Benefits Survey, there has been good communication between the faculty advisors, but there are still methodological concerns since the faculty

advisors were brought in relatively late in the survey development process. The level and timing of consultation with systemwide Human Resources, especially when external contractors are involved, still needs further clarification.

- Some TFIR members continue to point out that UCRP's managed investment returns do not out-perform market-available index funds. The target setting practices employed by UC may be out of date, but the process has many factors. TFIR also discussed the incentive pay structure offered to the Office of the Chief Investment Officer.

A UCRS Advisory Board Representative noted that the same topics were on their agenda, too, especially as the latter recently came up at the Regents. Both were reported to industry standard.

V. Executive Session

Other than action items, no notes are taken during Executive Session.

VI. Campus Updates

UCD- 1) Many on the campus have reported difficulty with retirement planning with RASC, and the Health Care Facilitator has limited access to necessary records. More localized training is proposed, in addition to more counselors, overall. 2) Some have questioned the treatment of items submitted to the Assembly from the Davis division.

UCSB- 1) Retirement counseling is also an issue here. Calls for a local specialist have been met with circular reasoning and argumentation.

UCR- 1) A lot of attention has been spent on the potential single academic calendar and how it can truly be evaluated.

UCSC- 1) A retirement process participation study showed awareness and participation vary widely by division. 2) The local housing resale program has been suspended, but the wait-list must still be followed even for direct sales between individuals. An advisory committee is being formed. 3) Methods to reserve some MOP funds for future use are under consideration.

UCB- 1) MOP funding contingency plans are being considered, but caps and deferred maintenance issues complicate the process. 2) Junior faculty are concerned about housing, child care, health care, and other normal living expenses, but they are seldom able to be at the table for relevant discussions. Given the commutes that new faculty must now face, UC is becoming a less-desirable employer. The campus recently created an organization for associate professor leadership development.

Determining when to involve junior faculty in the Senate given their teaching and research obligations can be tricky and may be issue-dependent. Demonstrating Senate efficacy can also impact decisions to become involved in Senate service in one's early or mid-career. Senate service pipeline development concerns are common across the campuses, as well as systemwide.

UCI- 1) The local committee recently met with the campus police chief and Academic Personnel leadership regarding discipline and expressive activities. No decisions were reached, but the discussion as engaging.

UCM- UCM is experiencing the same issues noted above.

UCSD- UCSD noted that most of these issues are intertwined and will require coordinated strategies to address, not one-off efforts.

VII. Further Discussion and New Business

None.

Adjournment: 3:30pm

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Juan Pablo Pardo Guerra, UCFW Chair