



UC SANTA CRUZ FACULTY ASSOCIATION
Council of University of California Faculty Associations
<http://ucscfa.org/> - scfa.assist@gmail.com
Phone: (888) 826-3623 Fax: (206) 424-1607

Sent Via Electronic Mail

August 3, 2017

Jennifer Schiffner, Esq.
Manager, Employee & Labor Relations
University of California, Santa Cruz

Dear Jennifer,

At our July 19 meeting, the SCFA expressed our appreciation to the university for providing the financial information we requested (primarily the May 15 report). This, along with the documents provided earlier, contributed a great deal to our understanding of summer session finances. We also want to emphasize, at the outset, the central point in common we share with the administration: a commitment to a high quality summer session. Summer session has become more and more integral to undergraduate education at UCSC. Many of our students depend on summer session for access to impacted courses and completing their majors. Summer session has delivered. Moreover, we have been very impressed with Monica Parikh's leadership of the Summer Session, and admire her commitment to academic quality, student success, and fiscal probity.

Nonetheless, we are disappointed with the University's response to our position on salary cuts for those whose summer 1/9 salary exceeds \$10,375. Our position is that this cap should not be instituted and that the 1/9 salary formula should remain in place. We have many reasons for this position, among them:

- Equal treatment. Because summer session is increasingly integral to the university's educational mission, standards for faculty compensation should be consistent with Academic Human Resources policy: there should be no adverse treatment for faculty who participate in summer session.

- Educational quality. The participation of faculty across ranks is an important component of summer session educational quality. A substantial number of ladder-rank faculty whose summer salaries exceed the proposed \$10,375 cap have indicated that they will not teach in summer session were the cap to be instituted.
- Fairness. The summer ninth is a deeply established principle, and should not be tampered with. Santa Cruz is an expensive place to live. Many faculty depend on summer session to meet living expenses, and they should not receive pay cuts. Those faculty receiving summer salary from research grants—mostly in the STEM fields—are compensated according to the 3/9 principle (adjusted to the proportion of summer worked). The same principles should apply to teaching in summer session.
- Budget logic. The university has never specified its criteria for setting the summer session budget, and we were provided no justification for treating the current budget as inviolable. According to the Management Advisory Service Report (p. 9), for example, we note that the 2016 budget for instructional salaries was lower than the 2013 budget, even though more credit hours were offered in 2016. After deducting for expenses, summer session revenues provide several million dollars per year to the university's general fund. Given that summer session can be considered in deficit only in relation to the budget provided by the central administration, rather than with respect to its actual total revenues, we see no justification for reducing faculty salaries rather than adjusting the budget or the amount accruing to the university, when and if this becomes necessary.

The SCFA hopes that our discussion on this issue can proceed according to logic and principle. We asked for, and have not yet been given, any justification for this drastic step, especially with respect to our points above. Yet, the administration's response to our position of no adjustment to faculty salary was that it is a "non-starter." We urge the university to abandon the proposal to cap salaries. We agree to revisit this issue in three years if, after other efforts to further strengthen Summer Session's fiscal position have been implemented, the university holds that salary restrictions are necessary for Summer Session operations.

We also bargained about the proposed adjustment to the pro-rating formula for courses under 5 units. Several of our members have pointed out that pro-rating of summer units would be based on contact hours only, which does not always reflect preparation time (many 2 unit classes require as much prep time as 5 unit ones). Even so, the university's pro-rating proposal has its inherent logic, and, more importantly, accords with general academic-year practice for those employees compensated on a per-course basis. We are willing to accept this proposed adjustment with the following condition: the summer session director be authorized to offer a higher pro-rated salary if the instructor makes a convincing case, based on preparation time.

At our July 19 meeting, Monica Parikh also mentioned a number of measures (course size, re-charge policy, etc.) that, along with the adjusted pro-rating formula, could improve the revenue

picture for summer session. We encourage her to take these steps. By contrast, the proposed salary cap will do a lot of damage to Summer Session, and we hope that the university sees the wisdom of not imposing the cap. If the university is willing to shelve this proposal for now, SCFA can accept the rest of the package and we do not need further bargaining sessions.

Sincerely,
Christopher Connery and Deborah Gould
Co-Chairs of the SCFA Board