

INSIDE

UCLA regents' meeting protest, 5

Behind UC's furlough plan, 5

True budget solutions that don't damage UC, 6-7

The real cost of undergrad education, 8

Fighting library closures, 9

Mobilizing to save public higher education



BOB SAMUELS, UC-AFT PRESIDENT

Not a budget crisis, but a crisis of priorities

On my blog, "Changing Universities" (changinguniversities.blogspot.com), I have posted several articles that outline the UC-AFT's response to the current UC budget situation. One of my central arguments is that there is no reason to raise the fees or cut the classes of undergraduate students since undergrads are already subsidizing other parts of the university.

In fact, due to the university's heavy reliance on lecturers to teach half of the undergraduate student credit hours, the instructional cost of educating undergrads for a year is about \$6,000, but the university claims it costs over \$20,000. Even though students will probably pay \$10,000 next year and the state will fund each student at \$10,000, the university still claims it is losing money and will have to continue to raise fees, limit enrollments, and cut courses.

We say that the university should increase enrollments, decrease fees, increase course offerings, and hire more lecturers. We have also endorsed AFSCME's alternative budget solutions, which are detailed on page 7 of this issue of the *Perspective*.

Unfortunately, the university has already responded to our demands by defending its right to pay star administrators and faculty whatever the market dictates. In fact, I have been quite critical of President Yudof's endorsement of the star system and the continual shifting of wealth to the highest earners in the UC system. I have also written several critiques of Yudof's false claims concerning the UC budget and his argument that there are no reserves or unrestricted funds.

UC-AFT has shown that the university is protecting the money-generating sectors, while it is cutting the non-profit oriented areas, like undergraduate edu-

cation and the libraries. It has become clear that while some employees are being eliminated and others are being furloughed, UC continues to feed money to the highest earners. In other words, like a Wall Street investment bank, money is being redirected to increase the compensation of the highest earners. Moreover, in order to protect the salaries of the top people, UC is planning to restructure and undermine the quality of undergraduate education.

Our central claim then is that UC does not have a budget crisis; it has a crisis in priorities. The only solution is for students, faculty, and workers to band together and take back our university.

UC-AFT launches new website

UC-AFT has launched a new system-wide website (www.ucaft.org) as part of our effort to improve outreach and communications with our members around the state. The site is designed to provide easy access to information about UC-AFT, but also to deliver recent news and commentary on issues affecting our members.

The "About UC-AFT" page contains a lot of information about our organization and the work we do. On the "Organizing" page, you will find a union builder's toolkit with downloadable membership forms and other outreach and organizing materials. The "Legislative" page has links to state legislators' offices and to bills that UC-AFT is supporting or considering. Under "Governance," you'll find our constitution and bylaws, and schedules, agendas and minutes for our quarterly council meetings.

We have pages dedicated to news and issues specific to librarians and lecturers, links to our contracts, and archives of this newsletter. One main fea-

ture within the site is a section devoted to information and analysis of the current budget shortfall.

Many thanks to UC Berkeley librarian Harrison Dekker for his technological expertise and hard work developing the new site.

Please take a few minutes to navigate through the site and familiarize yourself with the resources available there. If you have suggestions for content, stories, or other resources to post to the site, please contact Bill Quirk at bquirk@ucaft.org.



UC-AFT PERSPECTIVE
VOL 22, NO. 1 • FALL 2009

The University Council-AFT represents faculty and librarians at the University of California.

President	Bob Samuels, UCLA
VP for Legislation	Ben Harder, UCR
VP for Organizing	Mike Rotkin, UCSC
VP for Grievances	Alan Karras, UCB
Secretary-Treasurer	Miki Goral, UCLA

For contract administration issues contact:

UCB	Michelle Squitieri	510/384-6727
UCD	Jeff Narten	530/361-6130
UCSF	Michelle Squitieri	510/384-6727
UCI	Mary Coomes	559/433-7095
UCLA	Maria Elena Cortez	310/330-6906
UCM	Jeff Narten	209/382-6295
UCR	Sandra Baringer	951/827-1966
UCSD	Maria Tillmanns	858/449-8429
UCSB	Bill Quirk	805/689-0645
UCSC	Allison Guevara	831/239-2898
Exec. Director	Karen Sawislak	510/740-0145

UC-AFT Perspective is published by the University Council-AFT and the California Federation of Teachers, AFT/AFL-CIO. It is a member publication of the WLCA, AFTCA, and ILCA.

Editor Vanessa Tait

UC-AFT/California Federation of Teachers

1201 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 115
Alameda, CA 94501

- phone: 510/523-5238
- email: ksawislak@ucaft.org
- website: www.ucaft.org

On the cover: UC Berkeley students, staff and faculty conduct a sit-in at the intersection of Bancroft and Telegraph avenues during the September 24 walkout (Lisa Kermish, photo).

September 24 was a day that will go down in UC history, as thousands of students, staff and faculty on every campus walked out to send a message that they were willing to fight to save the university from unwise and unwarranted cuts.

In response to UC administrators' plans for fee hikes and furloughs, a broad spectrum of the UC community said, "Enough!" Initiated by a faculty-led call for a walkout, unions, student groups and community supporters turned out to make their voices heard. While every UC campus held a demonstration, the biggest crowd was at Berkeley, where an estimated 5,000 gathered in Sproul Plaza.

With most of UC's budget reductions planned or in place, the remaining budget balancing mechanism proposed is an additional 30% fee increase that would be phased in over the coming year. These fee increases would generate \$117 million for 09/10 and \$292 million for 10/11.

UC President Mark Yudof began cam-

Students, staff and faculty raise a "save our university" sign on Sproul Plaza at a noon rally on the day of the system-wide walkout, September 24. The day of activism included teach-ins, picketlines and impromptu meetings to decide future actions.

Lisa Kemish, photo



THE STRUGGLE TO SAVE UC by Bill Quirk

paigning for the fee increases in the media in early September and he's focusing his message directly at the students. In an essay published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* on September 29, Yudof uses the good fight against mediocrity as a rallying cry to justify huge fee increases.

Yudof's main thrust is that students must pick up the tab where the state left off, or else. Failure to pay their own way will result in a laundry list of painful things, including having to face demoralized staff and receiving devalued degrees. Many of the potential conditions Yudof describes are already happening. The first day of classes this year was chaotic, not because faculty and students walked out, but rather because so many students were crashing classes due to significantly curtailed course schedules. We know that there are over 200 fewer lecturers teaching at UC this year. This number doesn't include dozens of reductions in time, and layoff notices for continuing appointees.

UC has been citing the decline in per-

pupil funding from the state to justify a proposal to increase student fees by a total of 40% over one year. There is significant evidence that the actual per-pupil cost of delivering an undergraduate education is far less than UC claims. In fact, by some estimates, the \$9560 paid by the state per pupil easily covers the cost of delivering the courses taken by the student plus administrative overhead (see changinguniversities.blogspot.com/2009/09/real-cost-of-undergraduate-education_21.html and socrates.berkeley.edu/~schwartz/recost.html).

So why the increase in student fees? Here are a few theories. First, UC is still cheaper than comparable public universities around the country. Also, CSU just increased its fees by 30%; and finally, any additional income generated through the fees can be invested in the short-term investment pool, with interest going to supposedly restricted accounts.

UCSC Professor Robert Meister wrote a paper outlining the connection between the

proposed fee increases and UC's recent sale of \$1.6 billion in bonds. According to Meister, UC has planned all along to use fee increases, or the unfettered ability to raise fees, as collateral against bond debt, and even to actually make interest payments with tuition dollars (saveuc.org/docs/They_Pledged_Your_Tuition.pdf).

Fee increases are arguably the most permanent of any of the changes currently being implemented by Yudof and the regents. UC can stop the furlough program, rehire staff and lecturers, and increase enrollments, but rolling back fee increases will be next to impossible. These fee increases are based on UC's estimate of the cost of providing an undergraduate education. UC's calculation is unlikely to change in favor of a reduction in fees.

If we dispute UC's estimate of the cost of providing an undergraduate education, and if we are opposed to a downsized and more expensive UC that is funded mostly by student fees and other private sources,

(continued on p. 10)

UC's heavy reliance on lecturers

by Bob Samuels

Using the most comprehensive and recent data on courses taught in the UC system (www.ucop.edu/planning/fia/documents/fia_annlrpt2007.pdf), we can gain a better understanding of how dependent UC is on non-tenured faculty for undergraduate education. According to the standard UC course counting method, which has since been revised, we find four main groups of faculty: 1) regular rank, 2) visitors and adjuncts, 3) lecturers, and 4) Senate lecturers.

Looking at the number of Senate faculty in 2004-05, there were 6,161 FTE teaching an average of 4.9 primary courses a year (semester campuses are adjusted to fit this structure). In the 30,088 Senate classes, there was a total of 1,126,183 students, and if you multiply the number of students by the number of credit hours, you get 4,253,811, which translates into 690 credit units per faculty FTE.

If we now look at the lecturers, we find that during the same time period, there were 1,439 FTE, who taught a total of 13,335 primary courses with 543,371 enrollments. The average number of classes taught per lecturer FTE was 9.3 (which is above the contractual limit). Lecturers taught 2,050,570 credit hours for an average of 1,425 credit hours per lecturer FTE. This final number is shocking when you figure that the Senate average is less than half, which means lecturers teach on average much larger classes with higher unit credits.

The other two categories of faculty are much smaller. For instance, there were only 105 FTE Senate lecturers and 298 visiting and adjunct FTE. The lecturers with security of employment taught 860 courses, and the adjuncts and visitors combined taught 1,216 courses.

The first thing we should notice is that graduate students are not listed in these groupings, which is amazing since graduate students teach thousands of classes in the UC system. Either the university is just not reporting on the classes graduate student teach, or UC is giv-

ing credit to other people for the courses taught by graduate students. In fact, we know that Senate faculty are often listed as the teachers of record for courses that are taught by graduate students, and this says nothing about the thousands of course sections taught by graduate students. It is also unclear who falls under the category of "visitors and adjuncts," because non-tenure-track faculty who are primarily instructors are supposed to be in the lecturer's unit. While there are some true visiting faculty, in the past we found that many visiting faculty were visiting from nowhere and that they should actually be called lecturers.

According to this same report, Senate faculty teach 48% of the undergraduate courses, while lecturers teach 28%. However, a more important statistic should be the number of students multiplied by the number of credit units. We do not have these figures, but we can determine that, since half of the courses taught by Senate faculty are graduate courses, and only 7% of the courses

taught by lecturers are graduate courses, lecturers are teaching more than 50% of the total undergraduate student credit hours, and this statistic does not take into account all of the graduate courses that are being credited to Senate faculty.

The use of lecturers and graduate student instructors in the UC system is a secret that needs to be exposed. Essentially, by not accounting for graduate student instructors, UC has been misreporting its classroom activity to the state and the federal government. Unfortunately, things have only gotten worse because, in an effort to give credit for non-primary classes, UC has decided to include in the new course-counting method all of the individual and independent studies that were not considered courses in the past. While faculty should get credit for this work, the new way of counting these courses distorts all of the UC statistics.

Bob Samuels is UC-AFT's president and a lecturer in Writing Programs at UCLA.

Karen MacLeod, Jason Schultz, Michelle Squitieri and David Eifler of UC-AFT's Berkeley-San Francisco local at the September 24 walkout.



Vanessa Tait, photo

Setting the record straight: Unit 18 and furloughs

by Karen Sawislak

On several campuses, chairs and deans have been telling faculty that layoffs of lecturers are necessary because UC-AFT refused to accept furloughs for its membership in Unit 18.

This is not true. UC-AFT did not reject furloughs for Unit 18 non-Senate faculty.

Negotiations chronology

Here is what actually occurred. On July 17, the university made its request that UC-AFT participate in the furlough plan or propose a way to realize alternative, equivalent savings. Soon after, UC-AFT leadership met informally with UCOP. The union heard more details about the furlough plan and asked questions about implementation for lecturers. The parties agreed that UC-AFT would submit an information request, which was presented to the university on July 23. There the matter sat for about a month.

On August 21, university provost Lawrence Pitts determined that furlough days could not be taken during instructional time. Since Unit 18 members are paid only for instructional time, this decision meant that UCOP did not see any feasible means for non-Senate faculty to participate in the furlough program. In other words, Unit 18 lecturers could not be furloughed, because Provost Pitt's decision mandated that non-Senate faculty could not be released from any of their duties.

On August 31, UCOP's designated negotiator for Unit 18, Peter Chester, formally notified UC-AFT that the university would not seek to bargain furloughs and instead would realize budgetary savings from Unit 18 via the methods already available to the university in the UC-AFT contract; namely, non-reappointments, reductions in time, and layoffs.

It therefore is entirely wrong to say that UC-AFT refused to accept furloughs, and, further, that this alleged refusal is the "cause" of lecturer layoffs.

For a full chronology of UC-AFT's furlough-related discussions with UC

for Unit 18, including relevant documentation, please see ucaft.org/content/unit-18-furlough-chronology.

Furloughs unnecessary, damaging to education

In addition, UC's cuts to Unit 18 already far exceed any potential savings from furloughs.

Across the campuses, Unit 18 already has been reduced by more than 10% of FTE compared to one year ago. Further, we have already lost over 250 lecturers, as compared to our ranks in October 2008. These cuts to the lecturer ranks means that the university has already realized far more savings than it would have achieved from our unit's participation in the furlough plan.

To date, most of these reductions have been non-reappointments of pre-six lecturers. And there is no sign that cuts are abating – well over 100 long-time continuing lecturers now face full layoff at the end of this academic year, and more and more of our people are being notified that they will not be reappointed or that they can expect reductions in time.

All of this is devastating to the university's educational mission. Thousands of courses taught by hundreds of UC's best

instructors have gone or are set to go away. Required foundational courses are scheduled to disappear. Academic programs have no plans for the delivery of this crucial instruction. Students do not know how they are going to complete their degrees.

None of this has been caused by UC-AFT or UC's lecturers. In truth, our lecturers (and UC's students) are bearing the brunt of UC's misplaced budget

priorities and its abject failure to protect the educational mission. From our point of view, as we witness the dismantling of crucial teaching programs that serve thousands of UC students, it is absolutely impossible to believe President Mark Yudof's pledge that he is unwilling to allow UC to "slide into mediocrity and devalue the degrees" that students "work so hard to earn" (UCSB *Daily Nexus*, October 20, 2009).

Let's be entirely clear: cuts to Unit 18 non-Senate faculty are solely the result of UCOP's choices as to how to handle the state budget shortfall. The UC administration has failed to prioritize the educational mission of the university, thereby damaging the quality and availability of instruction for UC students.

It is divisive and dishonest to blame this set of decisions on UC-AFT or UC's lecturers.

Please let us know immediately if administrators at your campus are circu-

COME TO THE REGENTS MEETING AT UCLA, NOVEMBER 17-19

From November 17 to 19, the regents will meet at UCLA to vote on raising student fees 32% in the next year. Students, faculty, and workers will be coming from all over the state to protest against the fee increases, furloughs, layoffs, and reductions of service. UC-AFT is planning a major rally in coalition with other unions, students and faculty at UCLA on November 19 at noon, and many other activities are planned. Please come and join us for this important event.

lating any false information about UC-AFT, Unit 18 lecturers, the furlough program, or the cause of cuts to instruction. We will contact these people directly to make sure they understand the actual history of these issues.

Karen Sawislak is UC-AFT's executive director.

UC-AFT's demands to UC administration

Our first demand is to stop the fee hikes.

We believe that President Yudof should have made a deal with the governor with a trigger that if the state does not fund UC at a certain level, student fees would go up. But Yudof has already pushed for drastic fee increases, so the state has no reason to increase our funding.

Undergraduates are now subsidizing everyone else, yet the administration continues to cut undergrad courses and programs. Moreover, due to the reliance on non-Senate faculty to teach over 50% of the student credit units, and to the increases in class sizes, the cost of undergraduate education has gone down significantly. We say increase enrollments and stop fee increases. In other words, protect access, diversity, affordability and quality.

Our second demand is to reverse the layoffs, protect vital services, and stop pay cuts for the lowest-paid workers.

We are seeing layoffs, furloughs, increased workloads, increased class size, the closing of libraries, and decreased services, and we don't think it has to be this way. Pay cuts to the lowest-paid workers have created safety and health issues for students, faculty, and staff.

Moreover, at UCLA, the administration has laid off most of the long-term lecturers in the College of Letters and Science, and they are talking about suspending all writing and language requirements. This loss of essential courses will hurt UCLA's reputation for years and threaten its accreditation.

Our third demand is to consider progressive budget solutions.

The unions have suggested alternative budget proposals, like borrowing money from the medical centers, sharing profits between units, and reducing administrative units. In fact, UCSD is lending itself \$40 million, and other campuses could do the same. Also, UC recently lent the state \$200 million. We ask, why didn't they lend \$200 million to the core fund?

Our fourth demand is budget transparency.

The UC budget is \$20 billion, and because the state contribution represents about 16%, only 3% of the total budget was cut. We think this reduction should be shared equally between units. Medical centers bring in hundreds of millions in profits every year, and parking, housing, and services, all turn a profit.

Taxing all units 5% would resolve the budget crisis. Moreover, according to its own legal financial statements, only 35% of the UC budget is legally restricted. In fact, courts have ruled that the UC budget is only restricted by its priorities.

Our final demand is to stop the union busting and bargain in good faith.

UC administrators are claiming that the unions refused to discuss the furloughs, while in UC-AFT's case, the librarians did accept the furloughs, and the lecturers were removed by the Office of the President from consideration.

Other unions have had temporary layoffs forced on them, and their contracts have not been honored. We are also seeing outsourcing of union jobs and increased work with less time and for less money. UC should be a leader in fair and equitable employment practices.

It is too easy to blame the state for all of UC's problems. While we need to fight for increased state funding, we have to look at UC's own budget structures.

WHERE THE IN THE UC

Drawing from Jeffrey Bergamini's excellent s following:

In 2006, there were 2,464 employees earning \$680 million and a total base pay of \$331 million earning over \$200,000, with a total gross pay of \$331 million. This means that in 2 years, UC added 1,200 employees. These increases cost over \$300 million. Also, if you add pay and base pay, you will see that a lot of the savings are reduced by the furlough plan.

Looking up the salary scale, the story of UC employees to the wealthiest becomes clearer. In 2006, there were 293 high earners earning over \$300,000, with a total gross pay of \$240 million. Ten years later, in 2008, there were 977 employees earning over \$300,000, with a total gross pay of \$390 million and base pay of \$195 million. This is an increase of 30%, and if these increases had been offset by the money that the furlough plan will save.

Now let's look at some of the highest earners. In 2006, there were 293 high earners earning over \$400,000, with a total gross pay of \$90 million. Then, in 2008, there were 293 high earners earning over \$400,000, with a total gross pay of \$160 million and total base pay of \$67 million. This is an increase of about 30%, and the increase in gross pay during this period, many of the lowest-paid workers. The main story here is that the poorest workers s

UC Davis students bare all in a September 24



AFSCME's alternative budget solutions

salary data (<ucpay.globl.org>), we find the

g over \$200,000, with a total gross pay of million. By 2008, we find 3,643 employees y of \$1 billion and base pay of \$640 million. employees to the over-\$200,000 club, and if you look at the difference between gross these people will only have part of their sala-

transferring wealth from the poorest employ- 06, there were 609 employees making over on and a base pay of \$87 million. Then, two es making over \$300,000, with a total gross lation. Once again, this group of high earners d not occurred, we would have roughly all of

s. In 2006, there were 190 individuals mak- 08 million and a total base pay of \$28 million. making over \$400,000, with a total gross pay ion. Once again, the top group increased almost doubled. We should remember that orkers received no salary increases, so the ubsidize the wealth of the richest employees.

protest over UC's lack of budget transparency.



These may be difficult times for state institutions, but it is still possible to meet budget shortfalls without destroying affordable education or sacrificing experienced faculty and staff who provide that education. AFSCME, which represents service and patient care technical employees at UC, has developed budget solutions that save \$685 million while preserving UC's academic integrity, and we reprint their proposals below.

Reduce the top 2% of earners = \$220 million

Applying sensible reductions to the university's top earners will free over \$220 million to use for essential services. The alternative – levying reductions on UC's employees, including low-wage service workers whose families are one step from poverty – will ultimately cost more in public dollars.

Use short-term borrowing as a stop-gap = \$200 million

If UC can borrow \$200 million to lend to the state for continued construction, it surely can borrow \$200 million to maintain essential services at campuses and medical centers. Prioritizing core services is a smart budget move that saves money by averting the liability and costs of unsafe campus

conditions. UC can afford this extraordinary stop-gap measure during unprecedented times.

Utilize medical center profits = \$100 million

UC's five medical centers made significant profit gains in 2009. According to UCSF CEO Mark Laret, in FY 2009 that single campus "exceeded [the] outstanding level goal... with a bottom line that

may exceed \$100 million this year." Other campuses reported similar gains, averaging a 5.2% operating margin for the first three quarters of FY 2009. (California hospitals have averaged less than 1% over the last five years reported). If UC borrowed medical center profits above a 3% operating margin, this would free roughly \$100 million for UC's general operations.

Restructure debt = \$75 million

AFSCME supports the university's efforts to restructure a portion of its bond debt service, and believes UC should continue with its plans to save \$75 million through such means.

Utilize unrestricted investments = \$50 million

The university holds a massive \$8.5 billion investment portfolio, most of which is highly liquid, unrestricted funds. Although UC earmarks these funds for programs, some fraction is discretionary and is designated at the will of the regents. In FY 1993, UC and the state of California tapped into the university's investments to fund \$43 million of a shortfall in UC's operating budget. Borrowing less than 1% of UC's unrestricted investments would free \$50 million to deal with critical operational needs in this unprecedented state budget situation.

Cut wasteful spending = \$40 million

UC must continue to cut non-essential spending – including, but not limited to, renovations of UC mansions, executive rentals of non-UC property, non-essential travel, and consultants' contracts – before any consideration of cutting vital services. UC's receipt of American Reinvestment and Recovery Act funds necessitates an especially judicious approach to reining in excessive non-core spending.

Pressure must also be put on President Yudof to negotiate immediately with the governor to ensure UC funding for next year and the future. AFSCME also stands with UC students and rejects the possibility of the regents' approving a student fee hike of 15% for this January.

The real cost of undergraduate instruction

by Bob Samuels

The UC administration has announced its plan to decrease undergraduate enrollment and increase undergraduate fees 42% over a one-year period. This strategy makes no sense for the UC system and will actually add to our budget woes. The analysis below shows what it really costs to educate a UC undergraduate student for a year.

If we examine the salaries of the people teaching undergraduate courses at UC and the average course load of UC students, we find that while UCOP claims that it costs over \$20,000 to educate an undergraduate student for a year, the basic instructional cost per student is closer to \$5,000. So while the state currently gives \$9,650 per student and the students will next year be likely paying over \$10,000, the real cost of instruction is about a quarter of the reported price.

To determine the real cost of instruction, we start with a few basic statistics. The average UC undergrad takes 45 credit hours per year, and we know that students usually take eight large courses (averaging 200 students) and two small courses (averaging 20 students) on campuses using the quarter system.

We also know that tenure-line faculty teach half of the undergraduate credit hours and that lecturers and grad students teach the other half. In fact, tenure-line faculty generate 690 student credit hours per FTE, while lecturers produce 1,490 student credit hours per FTE. This statistic is very important because the current plan to reduce or eliminate lecturers would undermine the “efficiency” of the system. Keep in mind that, in 2008, the average lecturer salary was \$56,000, while the average tenure-line faculty member earned \$106,000.

To determine the per-student cost of a small course taught by a tenure-line faculty member, we take the average salary (\$106,000), divide it by the average course load (5.1), and divide this total by the number of students (20). We get \$1,039, but, if we only count the part of the professor’s salary that goes to instruction (50%), the real cost is \$520. If we perform this same calculation with lecturers, the aver-

age per-student cost is \$308. In the case of large courses holding 200 students, we can simply divide the cost of small courses by 10, and we get the per-student cost for large courses taught by tenure-line faculty as \$52 and the cost for lecturers as \$30.

If we now take the average course load of a student who takes eight large courses and two small courses during an average year, with half of the courses taught by professors and half taught by lecturers, we get \$878 ($\$208 + 120 + 520 + 30$). If we include the full cost of a professor (research + instruction), we get \$1,606.

How about the cost of graduate students who teach small discussion sections accompanying the large lecture courses that undergrads take? To calculate this, we need to look at the average pay per course and the average course load and tuition remission of graduate student instructors.

While we do not have exact figures here, we have been told that the cost per section at UCLA for a graduate student averages \$6,000 (please let us know if this is wrong), and we know that many large classes do not have sections, so we can only estimate that if a class of 200 has 10 sections of 20 students, the per-student cost for each section is \$300 (this does not include the cost of the tuition remission for graduate students). If a student takes 8 large classes during a year, and each class has a section taught by a graduate student, we have to add \$2,400 to the total instructional cost, and we now get \$3,278.

However, none of these calculations include health benefits, which add an extra 20% to our calculations. If we include health benefits, we get \$3,932 (this number is high because more than half of the lecturers are not eligible for benefits).

Discrepancies in UC’s cost figures

So why does UCOP claim that it costs over \$20,000 for one year’s education of an undergraduate student? UCOP will argue that we have not accounted for the cost of classrooms, utilities, administration, libraries, and staff. Our first response is that we want to focus on just the direct instructional cost. Moreover, economies of scale operate here; it is clear that when you

add a new student, you do not add a new classroom or add a new administrator.

In fact, there have been very few new classrooms added in the UC system, and class sizes have recently gone up. Furthermore, it is impossible to tell what part of an administrator’s salary should go to supporting the instructional mission of UC, and it is unclear why an undergraduate should pay for the raises of administrators and researchers.

While I recognize that students and the state should pay for some part of the indirect or associated costs of UC operations, it strikes me as completely unjustifiable to have less than 25% of the undergraduate revenue go to direct instructional expenses.

What is abundantly clear is that undergraduates are subsidizing research, graduate students, and administrators, while their fees are being increased and their educational opportunities are being decreased. It is also clear that the state alone cannot be blamed for the escalating costs of student fees and tuition. The solution to UC’s budget issues is thus to increase undergraduate enrollment, retain lecturers, and rely more on small, interactive classes that save money and enhance the quality of undergraduate education.

Sources: The average student credit hours can be found at: <https://sisds.ucdavis.edu/aboutinstruction.htm>. The average course load and credit hours for Senate faculty and lecturers comes from the annual “Faculty Instructional Activities” report: www.ucop.edu/planning/fia/documents/fia_annlrrpt2007.pdf (pp. 13-14). Average salaries for professors and lecturers: ucpay.globl.org. The reason why we should only count half of the professor’s salary to calculate the instructional cost: socrates.berkeley.edu/~schwartz/UndergradCost.html. For a study of the cost for graduate students: www.ucop.edu/sas/sfs/docs/gradsurvey_2007.pdf. For the average cost of benefits for faculty serving the core missions, see “The University of California 2008-09 Budget For Current Operations Summary of the Budget Request.”

UC libraries face cuts, but faculty and student activism pays off

by Bill Quirk

At the same time that UCOP's Vice Provost of Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, Daniel Greenstein, is suggesting that in the future libraries will be consolidated, outsourced and electronic, UC libraries are already fulfilling the prophecy through a combination of temporary and permanent closures and reorganizations. In the past few months, libraries across the system have announced night, weekend, finals week, and holiday closures, as well as potentially permanent closures of entire libraries.

These closures and proposed closures have prompted a significant response from faculty and students, and apparently from donors. In at least a few cases, campus and library administrators have cancelled or postponed closures after protests from library users. In each of these cases, UC claims donors have stepped in to backfill the budget.

In order to meet a \$1.8 million deficit, UCLA announced in early August that it was investigating the possibility of closing the Arts and Chemistry libraries.

The UCLA community responded immediately and forcefully, not only to the proposed closure, but to the lack of consultation with faculty and to the fact that the possibility of closure was obscurely announced through the university librarian's blog. Faculty quickly established a Facebook page, began writing letters, and circulated a petition entitled, "Save UCLA Arts Library." By the end of August, UL Gary Strong sent out a letter clarifying that the libraries would not be closing during 09/10. Strong's letter mentions talks with a donor to temporarily keep the libraries open.

UC Davis libraries have seen a dramatic decrease in funding over the last several years. As a cost-saving measure,

Davis administrators have now proposed to repurpose the Physical Sciences Library building and to consolidate its collections in Shields Library, Carlson Health and Sciences Library, and Blaisdell Medical Library in Sacramento. There is concern that the remaining

representatives made a solidarity appearance during the lunch hour of our meeting.

Student occupation of the Anthropology Library, and plans to continue to occupy other subject specialty libraries on campus, led administrators to allocate funds from unrestricted donations



Students conducting a 24-hour "study-in" at UCB's Anthropology Library listen to UC-AFT president Kathryn Klar give a talk, while below, students hang banners from the library's balconies.

buildings, particularly Carlson Library, do not have sufficient space for the collections and staff, and that the distance from campus will be a barrier for faculty and students who need to access library materials. As at UCLA, the library administration seems to have presented the restructuring proposal after little consultation with the faculty.

Before the semester began, the UC Berkeley library administration announced the blanket closure of all campus libraries on Saturdays due to budget cuts. In an impressive campaign to keep UC Berkeley's libraries open on weekends, students organized a hybrid sleep-in/teach-in event at the Anthropology Library. Some librarians participated in the event, and UC-AFT Council repre-

to keep the subject specialty libraries open on weekends. sBerkeley library administrators had also decided to curtail hours during finals week. Student activism around the finals week closure brought about an awareness of the issue that led to a private donation to keep the libraries open during finals week.

While reliance on private donations to maintain library services is not the ideal solution to our funding crisis, it does hint at non-state funding sources that administrators may be able to utilize in the short term.

In every case where core instructional services are slated to be cut, we must insist that the university explore all available options first. In the Berkeley library example, it took the threat of repeated building occupations for the administration to prioritize the students' needs. In the end, discretionary funds materialized.

Bill Quirk is UC-AFT's director of education, as well as an organizer at UCSB.



The struggle to save UC

(continued from p. 3)

then we must do everything we can to stop these fee increases before the regents' meeting on November 17 (universityprobe.org/2009/09/follow-the-student-fee-mon-ey).

So, where do we go from here? How do we stop this seemingly unstoppable action by the regents? Fortunately, the September 24th actions activated a large number of UC stakeholders. The only way we can stop the increase is by working in coalition with students, other faculty, and anyone else we can reach who cares about UC.

Here are some ideas:

- ❖ In the short-term, focus all organizing around the state on stopping or delaying

the fee increase.

- ❖ Find an alternative and nearly equivalent funding source within UC.

- ❖ Punch holes in the justification for the \$400 million by planning based on the real cost of providing undergraduate education.

- ❖ Demand that tuition be used for education, not construction.

- ❖ Lobby the regents and local administrators heavily with alternative options.

- ❖ Lobby state legislators, focusing on higher ed committees, with information about fees and funding.

- ❖ Start a media campaign highlighting the benefits of an affordable UC.

- ❖ Across-the-board resistance to the increase, right up to the regents' meeting in Los Angeles, unless the proposal is pulled from the meeting agenda.

Layoff grievance meeting

(continued from p. 12)

plans in the spring. We told them that our fear is that they will do nothing until the spring, and then realize they need to save a whole lot of money, and layoffs will proceed in a chaotic manner. They assured us that they have all of the information they need, and they do not have to ask the departments for the information.

When we argued that the college's problems started a long time ago, noting a letter last year discussing the internal budget deficit and the need to cut lecturers, Reem said that the college has never had a deficit, and that the humanities' budget is fixed and has no relation to enrollment. We asked whether the budget is tied to Senate FTE and not student FTE. Reem said that this is not true, and she would be willing to meet with us at a later date to discuss how the budget works. We plan to take her up on her offer.

Reem also rejected our claim that the college has no money left for lecturers because it has spent all of its temporary funds on off-scale salary increases for Senate faculty. We would like her to explain her denial in more depth, and we will provide another update on this when we hear something new. We mentioned in the meeting that we had sent the chancellor a plan to fund the writing and language courses out of the chancellor's office. No one seemed to know what we were talking about.

We walked away thinking that they do not have a plan, that they are waiting to get more budget news, and that they basically have no idea what they are doing and have not even collected the relevant information needed in order to follow our contract. We will get a grievance decision in fifteen days, and the next step is to ask for an expedited arbitration, which means after a hearing, a third-party arbitrator will decide whether the layoffs were arbitrary and capricious, and whether the layoff notices should be rescinded. We believe the arbitrator will understand UC's contractual obligations with greater clarity than the college's representatives apparently do.

Librarians vote to accept furloughs

In mid-September, with the assistance of a state mediator, the Unit 17 negotiating team tentatively agreed to a furlough plan for the unit. In the negotiation session, UC clearly outlined its plans to implement temporary layoffs and/or reductions in time should the unit reject furloughs. At the end of September, the entire unit voted overwhelmingly to ratify this agreement.

From October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2010, depending on their salary, librarians will take between 13 and 21 furlough days. The corresponding pay cuts for librarians will range between 5% and 8% for the year. During this time, librarians will retain their full level of benefits, including pension credit. Some of these furlough days will be used to cover expanded campus closures during December and January winter breaks.

A side letter to the furlough agreement guarantees that librarians will have flexibility in the use of furlough days and can use furlough days as sick time. The side letter also provides that all reviews must take into account the work time lost to furloughs. Finally, UC-AFT has negotiated an extension of recall and reemployment rights (from one year to two years) for any librarians who face layoff during the period of the furlough program.

Librarians also can use existing contract language to petition for a one-time expansion of their accrued vacation if furlough days make it impossible for them to remain below the vacation cap.

UC-AFT encourages unit members to ask for revised statements of responsibility, if there is any disagreement or lack of clarity as to what duties can be dropped in order for the librarian to be on furlough.

Status of negotiations

Librarians still remain at impasse with the university over two issues: salaries and funding for professional development. We remain hopeful that there is some possibility of resolving these issues if the university is willing to make some accommodation for librarians in affiliated libraries who are threatened by layoffs in the current budget environment.

We are waiting for information about current layoff units, and we plan to reconvene with UC and the state mediator when we have this information in hand. — Karen Sawislak, UC-AFT executive director

“I consider it important, indeed, urgently necessary, for intellectual workers to get together, both to protect their own economic status and, also, generally speaking, to secure their influence in the political field.”

Please print clearly!!

[Home](#)

Street	City	Zip code
--------	------	----------

Address:

Department	Campus	Mail code (if any)
------------	--------	--------------------

Telephone: _____

	Home	Work	Email
1. I have been able to get things done more quickly than before.	0.78	0.69	0.65
2. I have been able to do more work in less time.	0.75	0.67	0.63
3. I have been able to finish my work faster.	0.76	0.68	0.64
4. I have been able to complete my tasks more efficiently.	0.77	0.69	0.65
5. I have been able to get things done more effectively.	0.79	0.70	0.66
6. I have been able to do more work in less time.	0.75	0.67	0.63
7. I have been able to finish my work faster.	0.76	0.68	0.64
8. I have been able to complete my tasks more efficiently.	0.77	0.69	0.65
9. I have been able to get things done more effectively.	0.79	0.70	0.66
10. I have been able to do more work in less time.	0.75	0.67	0.63
11. I have been able to finish my work faster.	0.76	0.68	0.64
12. I have been able to complete my tasks more efficiently.	0.77	0.69	0.65
13. I have been able to get things done more effectively.	0.79	0.70	0.66
14. I have been able to do more work in less time.	0.75	0.67	0.63
15. I have been able to finish my work faster.	0.76	0.68	0.64
16. I have been able to complete my tasks more efficiently.	0.77	0.69	0.65
17. I have been able to get things done more effectively.	0.79	0.70	0.66
18. I have been able to do more work in less time.	0.75	0.67	0.63
19. I have been able to finish my work faster.	0.76	0.68	0.64
20. I have been able to complete my tasks more efficiently.	0.77	0.69	0.65
21. I have been able to get things done more effectively.	0.79	0.70	0.66
22. I have been able to do more work in less time.	0.75	0.67	0.63
23. I have been able to finish my work faster.	0.76	0.68	0.64
24. I have been able to complete my tasks more efficiently.	0.77	0.69	0.65
25. I have been able to get things done more effectively.	0.79	0.70	0.66


UC-AFT dues are 1.35% of gross monthly salary for librarians and non-Senate faculty who do have exclusive representation. Dues are .996% of gross monthly salary for Academic Senate faculty and academic researchers who do not have exclusive representation. In either case, dues are capped at \$65.00 per month. Dues will be deducted each month from your payroll check. Dues paid to UC-AFT may not be tax-deductible for federal tax purposes; however, under limited circumstances, dues may qualify as a business deduction. Check with your tax consultant.



EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP PAYROLL DEDUCTION AUTHORIZATION

UPAY 669 (10/80)

PLEASE
PRINT
OR
TYPE

 <div>EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP PAYROLL DEDUCTION AUTHORIZATION</div> <div>UPAY 669 (10/80)</div>	PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE	CAMPUS	LOC	EMPLOYEE I.D.	DATE
		ACTION ON THIS FORM TO BECOME EFFECTIVE THE PAY PERIOD BEGINNING			
		MONTHLY DEDUCTION			
		LAST NAME,	FIRST,	MIDDLE INITIAL	ENROLL
DEPARTMENT EMPLOYED AT U.C.		DUES	✓		
TITLE AT U.C.		INITIATION FEES			
ORGANIZATIONAL NAME (INCLUDE LOCAL NAME AND NUMBER)		GENERAL ASSESMENT			
AFT LOCAL				TOTAL	

I authorize The Regents of the University of California to withhold monthly or cease withholding from my earnings as an employee, membership dues, initiation fees and general assessments as indicated above.

I understand and agree to the arrangement whereby one total monthly deduction will be made buy the University based upon the current rate of dues, initiation fees, and general assessments. I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT CHANGES IN THE RATE OF DUES, INITIATION FEES AND GENERAL ASSESSMENTS MAY BE MADE AFTER NOTICE TO THAT EFFECT IS GIVEN TO THE UNIVERSITY BY THE ORGANIZATION TO WHICH SUCH AUTHORIZED DEDUCTIONS ARE ASSIGNED AND I HEREBY EXPRESSLY AGREE THAT PURSUANT TO SUCH NOTICE THE UNIVERSITY MAY WITHHOLD FROM MY EARNINGS AMOUNTS EITHER GREATER THAN OR LESS THAN THOSE SHOWN ABOVE WITHOUT OBLIGATION TO INFORM ME BEFORE DOING SO OR TO SEEK ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FROM ME FOR SUCH WITHHOLDINGS.

The University will remit the amount deducted to the official designated by the organization.

This authorization shall remain in effect until revoked by me-allowing up to 30 days time to change the payroll records in order to make effective this assignment or revocation thereof – or until another employee organization becomes my exclusive representative.

It is understood that this authorization shall become void in the event the employee or organization's eligibility for payroll deduction terminates for any reason. Upon termination of my employment with the University, this authorization will no longer be in effect.

This authorization does not include dues, initiation fees and general assessments to cover any time prior to the payroll period in which the initial deduction is made. Payroll deductions, including those legally required and those authorized by an employee are assigned priorities. In the event there are insufficient earnings to cover all required and authorized deductions, it is understood that deductions will be taken in the order assigned by the University and no adjustment will be made in a subsequent pay period for membership dues, initiation fees and general assessments.

EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE

DATE _____

FOR UNIVERSITY USE ONLY

TRAN CODE	EMPLOYEE ID NO.	DATE	ELEMENT NO.	BAL CD	AMOUNT
1	2 4	13 18	19 22	23	24
X1		MO DY YR .	6	G	.
X1		MO DY YR .	6	G	.
X1		MO DY YR .	6	G	.

RETENTION: 1 YEAR AFTER INACTIVE . ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Return form to Treasurer, UC-AFT, 11728 Wilshire Blvd., #B1007, Los Angeles, CA 90025

UCLA lecturers' layoff grievance

By Bob Samuels

For our grievance meeting concerning the layoff notices of 67 continuing appointment lecturers at UCLA's College of Letters and Science, we brought with us ten lecturers and a student observer. The following is a brief summary of the meeting.

The union's central argument was that the mass layoffs of continuing appointment lecturers were capricious, arbitrary, and unreasonable, in violation of our contract's Article 17 language. Our requested remedy is to rescind the layoff notices immediately.

During our meeting, we demanded answers to specific questions about the layoffs. The administration stated that they did not consider alternatives to layoffs or develop a layoff order because they did not yet know what they were going to do. We asked them to tell us where the contract allows them to lay off people because they do not know what they are doing; we did not get a response to this question.

We asked why the department chairs were not consulted about the layoffs, and Reem Harwell-Hanna, the

college's assistant dean, said the dean's office is fully aware of each department's budget, and it wasn't necessary to consult with them. We then asked if they really meant to write in our layoff notices that all undergraduate requirements might be suspended, and Reem said, yes, that is what the letters are supposed to say.

We asked what process would be used to suspend the requirements, and the assistant dean said she believed they could go through the executive committee and that she did not know whether the Academic Senate would have to be consulted. Reem also said that the task force has recently met twice, and it is looking at how writing programs and foreign languages are currently funded and at using a different funding model.

Their basic response to our questions was that they followed the contract by issuing the layoff notices, and they have not begun the actual process of laying off



Lisa Kermish, photo

Protestors at the systemwide walkout to save public education on September 24.

people because they still do not know their budget. Reem added that she does not know of any effort to disestablish the writing programs, and it is possible that other people or departments could teach the writing courses. She also argued that the contract forced them to do the one-year layoff notices, and the contract does not really fit with their budgeting process.

The administration argued that it is unrealistic for us to think that they know who will be teaching next year and what the instructional need will be. They hope to know about teaching

(continued on p. 10)

12



UC-AFT PERSPECTIVE
VOL 22, NO. 1 • FALL 2009

California Federation of Teachers
1201 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 115
Alameda, CA 94501
<http://www.ucaft.org>

NON-PROFIT
ORGANIZATION
U.S. Postage PAID
Oakland, CA
Permit No. 1765