Annual Report: Academic Year 2013-14
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Faculty Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 9</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: monthly</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total proposals/items reviewed: 27</td>
<td>Total deferred proposals from the previous year: none</td>
<td>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:** None.

**Listing of committee policies established or revised:** None.

**Issues considered by the committee:**
- Report: Enhancing the Student Experience
- 2nd Review: APM 600 Revisions – UC Wide Review
- Moreno Report
- Moreno Report Workgroup
- Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55
- Proposed Revisions to APM 035, Append. A-1 and A-2
- Draft Announcement: Faculty Hiring Investment Program (HIP)
- Joint Task Force Report – Analysis of Faculty Salary Equity
- APM Review – Conflict of Commitment with Outside Activities & Health Science Compensation Plan
- Academic Personnel Streamlining Implementation Workgroup Report
- Graduate Tuition Allocation – Discussion Paper – Version 2
- REVISED: Academic Personnel Streamlining Implementation Workgroup Report
- UC Davis Policies and Regulations Governing Travel
- Proposed PPM 390-55 Video Security
- Recognizing Teaching Work Group Report
- Joint Academic Organization Task Force Report
- 2nd Review – Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55
- Proposed PPM 400-01 Freedom of Expression
- PPM 290-50 Protective Clothing and Equipment
- APM 190 and Whistleblower Protection Policy Revision Proposal
- ADVANCE Policy & Practices Initiative Recommendations
- PPM 230-07 Objectivity in Research
- Academic Calendar Proposal 2016-2023
- 2nd Review – UCD APM 240 – Appointment & Review of Deans
- ADVANCE Policy & Practices Initiative Recommendations
- APM proposed Revisions – 133, 210, 220 and 760
- 2014 – 2015 Proposed Parking Rates

**Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:** None.

**COMMITTEE’S NARRATIVE**

The committee met nine times during the 2013-2014 academic year. Meetings were scheduled immediately after the University Committee on Academic Welfare (UCFW) meetings. Committee Chair Lori Lubin served as the primary representative at the UCFW meetings. Committee members Charles Hess and Aldo Antonelli each attended the Oakland meeting once as alternate representatives.

Throughout the year, efforts were made to streamline the management of the business before the committee. The Academic Senate Information System (ASIS) was used to notify members and distribute
relevant information about the committee’s upcoming meetings. Committee members were encouraged to read and comment in advance on requests for consultation that required a committee response.

The committee began the year discussing issues relating to the changes in health benefits and the retirement system. Vice Chancellor Susan Gilbert was invited to attend one of the committee meetings to provide information on the Retiree Administrative Service Center (RASC) and other services provided to UC retirees.

**Faculty Salary Equity**
The committee brought forth the issue of salary disparities between UC Campuses to Provost Ralph Hexter that was revealed in the recent “Faculty Salary Analysis” by the UC Santa Cruz (UCSC) Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW). The UCSC CFW has been monitoring faculty salaries at UCSC compared to other UC campuses since 2009. The committee sent an official request to Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Ralph J. Hexter to review the UCSC “faculty Salary Analysis” report and report back to the committee by Fall Quarter 2014. Based on subsequent discussions with Vice Provost Maureen Stanton and Academic Senate Chair Bruno Nachtergaele, this issue will be revisited as part of the new Joint Administration-Academic Senate Oversight Task Force on Faculty Salary Equity Analyses, of which FWC Chair Lubin is a member.

**UC Care**
Major changes to the health care program were made in 2014. Throughout the academic year the committee addressed concerns with the changes in the health care program, primarily with UC Care. One of the primary concerns with UC Care is that it offers limited access to local medical facilities, and many services are not available at the UC Select level of coverage. An official letter addressing these concerns was sent to Chancellor Linda P.B. Katehi on November 25, 2013. A follow up letter regarding these concerns was sent on June 19, 2014 encouraging the Chancellor to discuss the campus’ issues directly with Lori Taylor, Executive Director of Self-Insured Health Plans at UCOP and Michael Baptista, Executive Director of Benefits Programs & Strategy.

**2014-2015 Provost Forum**
The committee will be participating in the Provost’s Forum on November 20, 2014 on the topic of “Creating a Culture of Excellence and Trustworthiness in Higher Education.” Haavi Morreim, JD, PhD, Professor, University of Tennessee Health Science Center has been confirmed as the forum’s keynote speaker. In association with the forum, the committee has requested funding from Chancellor Linda P.B. Katehi, Vice Chancellor for Research Harris Lewis, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Ralph J. Hexter, and School of Medicine Dean Julie A. Freishlag for a half-day symposium/workshop with the goal of developing recommendations to the Chancellor and Academic Senate concerning core values and best practices for accountability and ethical behavior at our institution. An official request for funding was sent on June 19, 2014.

**Proposed 2014-2015 Parking Rate Increases**
The committee was concerned about the proposed increase in 2014-2015 parking rates, especially for the lower cost L permits. The committee sent a letter on May 27, 2014 to Chancellor Linda P.B. Katehi asking her to further examine the proposed rate increases and insure that the Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) was sufficiently reducing costs as parking demands declined. The Chancellor responded favorably, freezing any increases in parking rates until a new task force, to be established in the Fall, could review the campus’ parking needs and how they translate into costs and rates.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lori Lubin (Chair), Aldo Antonelli (Member), Julie Dechant (Member), Mike DeGregorio (Member), Charles Hess (Member), Kirk Klausing (Member), Lisa Miller (Member), Stephen White (Member), Adam Siegel (Academic Federation Representative), and Judi Garcia (Analyst).

Letters enclosed
The UC Davis Division of the Committee on Faculty Welfare would like to bring to your attention issues with the new medical plans offered by UC, in particular UC Care. Our first concern is the deficient process. Major changes to the health care program were made within a short time period (less than six months) without the appropriate consultation with the relevant Academic Senate committees, including the UC Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and Health Care Task Force (HCTF). The lack of thorough process resulted in both inaccurate and inconsistent information being distributed about UC Care. For example, the specific features of UC Care have changed since the announcement in October and even after the beginning of Open Enrollment.

UC Care offers limited access to local medical facilities, and many services are not available at the UC Select level of coverage (which provides reduced fees). Specifically, UC Select physicians are limited in both number and specialty in Davis, requiring travel in most cases to the UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento. In addition, UC no longer offers an HMO that includes Sutter Davis. As a result, many employees will have to find new physicians or enroll in UC Care where Sutter Davis is part of the Blue Shield Preferred Network. Because UC Care is a PPO plan when using the Blue Shield Network, there will be a significant cost increase to retain access to Sutter Davis physicians and facilities.

UC Davis staff and faculty have been adversely affected by these health care changes, without appropriate consultation, vetting, and concern for local medical access. We urge you to consult with the other Chancellors, who have been hearing similar concerns from their campuses, and to address the issues with UC Care with the UC Office of the President as soon as possible.

Submitted on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Welfare by Lori Lubin, Chair

Enclosure
RALPH J. HEXTER  
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor 
Offices of the Chancellor and Provost 

RE: Intercampus Faculty Salary Disparities 

The Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) would like to bring to your attention the recent “Faculty Salary Analysis” by the UC Santa Cruz (UCSC) Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), which has been monitoring faculty salaries at UCSC compared to other UC campuses. To gauge disparities between campuses, the UCSC CFW examined the two major factors that affect salary: the rate at which individuals advance in rank and step and the effective salary scale for each rank and step. While the CFW found that rate of advancement was similar between campuses, the effective salary scale, as measured by the average off-scale component for faculty on the regular scale, varied significantly.

Because these data indicated that UCSC had the lowest salaries among UC campuses for many years, their administration, in cooperation with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), initiated a “Merit Boost Plan” in 2008-2009. The goal of this plan was to increase the median faculty salary at UCSC to the UC-wide (9-campus) median by creating new categories of “boosted” merit increases with additional off-scale components. This proactive initiative was extremely successful, achieving the stated goal of equalizing the median UCSC salary with the UC-wide median by July 1, 2011.

Based on the calculations in the latest UCSC report, UC Davis now has the lowest faculty salaries of all campuses as measured by the average off-scale component. The FWC is extremely concerned about these intercampus salary disparities and its effect on the campus’ ability to attract and retain the best faculty, especially considering recent developments. First, the Academic Council has again formally requested reconsideration of APM-510, Inter-campus transfers, that limits salary and step for faculty recruited to other UC campuses. If these artificial limits are eliminated, UC Davis becomes even more vulnerable both to other UC campuses and to our peer institutions. Second, the restarted contributions to UCRP and the reduced benefits of the 2013 Tier mean that UC’s benefits plan can no longer compensate for the low salaries at UC in general and UC Davis in particular. This troubling fact is expected to be confirmed by the 2014 Ladder Rank Faculty Compensation and Benefit Study currently being conducted by UC Office of the President. Finally, the increased use of off-scale for recent junior hires because of market necessity significantly undermines the step system on campus by creating and/or reinforcing existing salary inequities within departments or fields.

The illaudable distinction of having the lowest UC-wide faculty salaries is not commensurate with UC Davis’ significantly increasing status, rankings, and level of extramural funding. The committee stresses that these concerns are independent of the UC Davis Joint Administration-Academic Senate Task Force on Analysis of Faculty Salary Equity, which is evaluating internal salary discrepancies, and cannot be mitigated by the proposed Step Plus merit and promotion system, which is specifically stated to be cost-neutral in the APSIW report.
The FWC strongly encourages you to review the UCSC “Faculty Salary Analysis” report, evaluate the magnitude of the issue and its adverse consequences to our campus, and report back by the Fall Quarter 2014 to the committee with a specific plan to address these serious salary disparities.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lori M. Lubin, Chair
Faculty Welfare Committee

Enclosure: “Faculty Salary Analysis” by the UC Santa Cruz Committee on Faculty Welfare
cc: Divisional Chair Nachtergaele (w/enclosure)
    Executive Director Anderson (w/enclosure)
LINDA P.B. KATEHI, CHANCELLOR  
Offices of the Chancellor and Provost  

Re: Proposed 2014-2015 Parking Rate Increases  

The Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) would like to express concern about the continued increase in parking rates, in particular those of the lower cost L permit. The campus continues to successfully encourage faculty, staff, and students to choose more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. As a result, the demand for and revenue from parking declines. It is, therefore, vital that the administration ensures that the operating costs of the Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) decrease accordingly. Otherwise, the few, including those who may have no alternative, will bear an increasing financial burden. This trend is evident in the fact that the largest percent increases are consistently assigned to the lowest cost L permit, including a substantial 17.4% proposed increase for the coming fiscal year.

I encourage you, and the appropriate University committees, to ensure that TAPS does their part to sufficiently reduce costs, just as our community has clearly done with their embrace of alternate transportation.

Sincerely,

Lori M. Lubin

Lori M. Lubin, Chair  
Faculty Welfare Committee

cc: Divisional Chair Nachtergaele  
    Executive Director Anderson
LINDA P.B. KATEHI, CHANCELLOR  
Offices of the Chancellor and Provost  

RE: UC Care  

Dear Chancellor Katehi,  

The Faculty Welfare Committee is contacting you again about serious issues associated with the new medical plans offered by UC, in particular UC Care. Our committee and our Health Care Facilitator Guerren Solbach have received numerous complaints during the year concerning UC Care. Specifically, UC Care offers limited access to local medical facilities, and many services are not available at the UC Select level of coverage (which provides reduced fees). Specifically, UC Select physicians are limited in both number and specialty in Davis, requiring travel in most cases to the UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento. In addition, UC no longer offers an HMO that includes our only local, full-service hospital Sutter Davis. As a result, employees must now pay significantly more to retain access to Sutter Davis physicians and facilities as part of the Blue Shield Preferred Network in UC Care (the PPO portion of the program). The travel and cost burden is especially pronounced for families with young children. In addition, the limited access to local, affordable health care makes our campus less competitive and welcoming to new faculty and staff.  

The committee has forwarded our concerns to Lori Taylor, Executive Director of Self-Insured Health Plans at UCOP, and we have specifically asked her to look into adding Sutter Davis to the UC Select Tier to alleviate the problems listed above. Although she says that there is “not an opportunity for us to do that,” I encourage you to discuss our campus issues directly with her and Michael Baptista, Executive Director of Benefits Programs & Strategy, as it will take high-level advocacy to achieve real improvement. Because UCOP is currently working on modifying UC Care for 2015, now is the crucial time to ensure that our campus needs are adequately met.  

Thank you for your attention to this important matter for our campus community.  

Sincerely,  

Lori M. Lubin, Chair  
Faculty Welfare Committee  
Professor, Physics  

cc: Divisional Chair Nachtergaele  
Executive Director Anderson  
Associate Vice Chancellor Gilbert  

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—(Letterhead for Interdepartmental use)
RE: Proposal by the Faculty Welfare Committee for a Half-Day Workshop in Association with our 2014-2015 Provost’s Forum

Forum and Workshop Title: Creating a Culture of Excellence and Trustworthiness in Higher Education

UC Davis, like most large research universities, encounters a broad array of ethics lapses in its research endeavors. Major lapses almost always beget statements of concern, public pronouncements promising reforms, and often investigations to assess responsibility and recommend changes. Episodes that do not rise to the level of public scandal, however, are sometimes unacknowledged, inconsistently addressed, and/or poorly resolved. These episodes can exact an ongoing toll on those involved and can undermine confidence among many that high ethical standards are a central value of the institution.

Some recent events on campus have called into question the institution’s capacity to adequately protect research participant welfare and support legitimate exercise of academic freedom. While multiple review processes are in place to address such episodes after the fact, they are not capable of preventing similarly injurious future episodes. Apart from simply investing in research regulatory compliance activities, many benefits would accrue from learning to effectively break out of this cycle. Specifically, concerted and thoughtful actions are required to create a culture that promotes excellence and trustworthiness and, thus, also naturally and routinely prevents subsequent harmful episodes.
As a result, the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) has proposed and been approved for a 2014-2015 Provost’s Forum on this topic, to be scheduled in November. Because of the timeliness, relevance, and complexity of the subject matter, the committee is proposing an associated half-day workshop, with additional expert participants where these topics can be explored in depth. The purpose of our forum and its associated activities is to explore how UC Davis can become more proactive in identifying and addressing the contributors to ethical lapses that hinder our efforts to be innovators. Specifically, through the keynote speech, a panel discussion, and an associated half-day workshop, we seek to identify what changes in our research environment are needed and what are the barriers to implementing those changes.

**Keynote Speaker:** Haavi Morreim, JD, PhD, Professor, University of Tennessee Health Science Center

Dr. Morreim is an academician, attorney, and an active mediator for both civil and family matters. For over thirty years, she has been a medical school professor focusing on health law and bioethics. Dr. Morreim’s was chosen because of her dynamic lecture style and her extensive experience in the clinical setting where faculty and physicians-in-training discuss patients, make medical decisions, and explore broader issues. As such, she can discuss directly her first-hand view of the day-to-day challenges, conflicts and nuances that arise for patients, families, physicians, nurses, and others in the health care setting. Dr. Morreim has authored two books and over one hundred forty articles in journals of law, medicine, and bioethics. She has also presented hundreds of invited lectures nationally and internationally, to such groups as the American Health Lawyers Association, the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, the National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys, and the Tennessee Bar Association, alongside numerous medical organizations such as the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians, and many state and local medical societies.

**Additional Workshop Participants:** Because of the significance of the proposed topic, the FWC would like the Forum’s activities to result in specific recommendations, which could be further explored by the Academic Senate, regarding core values and best practices that improve accountability and guide the discovery and public engagement missions of the University. As a result, we have identified and contacted, in addition to Dr. Morreim, several other well-known and highly-qualified academicians who are willing to participate in our Forum’s associated workshop. These participants include:

- Larry Churchill, PhD, Ann Geddes Stahlman Chair in Medical Ethics, Vanderbilt University
- Gail Geller, ScD, Professor, Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University
- Elizabeth Popp Berman, PhD, Associate Professor of Sociology, University at Albany, SUNY

**Proposed Workshop:** The FWC is working closely with Mark Yarborough, PhD, Dean’s Professor of Bioethics and Director of the Clinical Research Ethics Program. Together, we are acting as the organizing committee for the associated Forum activities, including the panel discussion and workshop. To engage the broadest audience, we plan to hold the Keynote Speech on campus, with the remainder of the activities at the UC Davis Medical Center. For the panel discussion in particular, we will seek participation of our campus leadership, as they have the responsibility to assure the success of the institution and, thus, need to be involved in both translational science and public engagement. The workshop will involve multiple presenters and sustained discussion that ideally culminates in developing recommendations for joint consideration by the Chancellor and the
Academic Senate. The ultimate goal will be stronger consensus regarding core values and best practices that improve accountability for assuring that those core values animate the discovery and public engagement missions of the University.

The expenses of the keynote speaker and on-campus forum will be covered by funds from the Provost’s Forum. The FWC is seeking funding for the associated workshop at the Medical Center. Because we understand that there are no facilities costs at the Medical Center, we are seeking co-sponsorship for modest funding of $10,000 to cover travel costs and small honoraria for our outside expert participants and event catering.

I look forward to working with you on this timely and important Forum and its associated activities.

Sincerely,

Lori M. Lubin, Chair
Faculty Welfare Committee
Professor, Physics