

## **COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**

### **MINUTES**

October 13, 2020

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 9:00 a.m.

Present:	Patricia Morton, Chair	Absent:	BCOE member - TBD
	Jacob Greenstein		GSA Rep. - TBD
	Begona Echeverria		ASUCR Rep. - TBD
	Brian Federici		
	John Heraty		
	Manuela Martins -Green		
	Megan Robbins		
	Bradley Hyman		
	Urmee Khan		
	Sika Zheng		
	Venugopala Reddy Gonehal		

#### **Chair Announcements**

Chair Morton asked members to introduce themselves and then provided a brief overview of the committee's charge. The Chair informed members of the Senate Remote Policy regarding confidentiality of meetings conducted via Zoom.

#### **Approval of the 2020-2021 Conflict of Interest Statement**

The Committee reviewed the draft 20-21 Conflict of Interest statement and approved it as is by a vote of +11-0-0.

#### **Systemwide Review of Proposed 20-21 Curtailment Program**

The committee discussed the proposed Curtailment Program and expressed several concerns. Overall, the committee felt the proposal lacked transparency and provided limited detail, specifically on the potential impact to faculty, for the committee to provide an informed response. CFW viewed the plan as a way to cut faculty salaries without corresponding reduction in duties.

As a result, CFW raised the following questions, which they believe must be answered and conveyed to University's stakeholders before any such plan is implemented:

1. What is the target dollar amount expected to be saved by the proposed curtailment program? Will the target vary by individual campuses and units? How are the targets set?
2. How will the income tiers be determined? Who will set the income tiers? Will they apply to all employees, including staff and faculty, or will they be specific to the type of employment status?
3. How will the reduction in academic-year faculty salaries be determined? On a per diem basis? As a percentage of salary? Another method?
4. How will the reduction in salary or increase in curtailment days impact retirement benefits? What types of changes would be made to the University of California Retirement Plan and other policies? Is a Capital Accumulation Provision such as was implemented in the 1990s one of the options?

5. Is it possible to modify UCPATH adequately and in a timely manner to ensure there will be no payroll disruptions?
6. What is the total number of vacation hours held by fiscal-year academic faculty? Can they be voluntarily redistributed?
7. How will this program affect undergraduate and graduate student employees, teaching assistants, postdoctoral fellows, and other non-faculty academic employees, including those belonging to unions?

### **Campus Review of the Report of the Academic Council Teaching Evaluation Task Force**

The committee reviewed the Report of the Academic Council Teaching Evaluation Task Force and was highly supportive of the aims and goals (better teaching and fair evaluation) and warnings (i.e., of bias) laid out in the document. The committee felt it would be appropriate to benchmark how well UCR is doing with regard to the goals laid out in the report and that perhaps a checklist could be developed of UCR best practices and how they align to the recommendations of the report.

CFW proposed the following questions and it was noted that many of the points discussed in the report were also being addressed by the Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Teaching:

1. How well does UCR train junior faculty on teaching standards and practices?
2. How well does UCR train faculty on the promotion and evaluation process?
3. Is UCR providing adequate feedback for junior faculty on the process of teaching evaluation?
4. Is the current system of teaching evaluation adequate?
5. Are CAP, administrators and ad hoc committees being adequately trained on bias and file evaluation on a consistent basis? Do faculty know if this happens (i.e. transparency)?
6. At what level are students being trained in how to evaluate?
  - a. Can student response rates be improved by building on a concept of professionalism and the importance of evaluations? Can bias be addressed by training?
7. Is graduate student mentoring being adequately evaluated, with feedback to faculty?
  - a. Mentoring is an important aspect of our evaluation, and yet we have no method for evaluating how well it is being done. Should this be an assessment (private) or an evaluation process?
8. Shifting to a focus of "Teaching Evaluation" to an "Evaluation of Learning" is a repetitive theme throughout the documents. Is UCR moving in this direction?

CFW's recommendation is to form a working group to document the campuses success at meeting the aims and goals of the TLC report beyond just a restructuring of the "evaluation of learning process" to a documentation of the process of evaluation at all levels.

### **New and Continuing Committee Goals for the Year**

The Committee reviewed ongoing projects carried over from the previous year including:

- Faculty Climate Survey, in which it was discussed how best to distribute the report to the campus and what type and from whom feedback would be requested.
- Graduate Student Funding, with attention to teaching assistant positions.

Potential new topics for discussion included:

- Early Childhood Services due to news of pending layoffs
- Campus Safety Task Force to be appointed by the Chancellor to advise on how UCR could improve safety, and the feeling of safety, for all members of the UCR community.

**UCFW and Executive Council update**

Chair Morton provided a brief update on topics discussed at the October 9<sup>th</sup> UCFW meeting. Topics included a feasibility study to replace the ACT/SAT, impact of COVID-19 on advancement of women and faculty of color, and UC initiative to address climate crisis and decarbonization. Chair Morton also provided a brief update on the topics discussed at the October 12<sup>th</sup> Executive Council meeting which included discussion with Chancellor Wilcox on the campus budget and the upcoming Provost candidate visits.

**New Business/Open Discussion**

Members discussed the following potential topics for future consideration:

- Mandatory flu vaccinations

The next meeting is scheduled to take place on Tuesday, November 17, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Minutes approved on: November 17, 2020