UCR Faculty Comments on Faculty Survey

1. YES, but only if the "regular instructional calendar" refers to "instructional days during the quarter." The faculty at both UCSC and UCI are supporting faculty furlough days only if they occur during the instructional quarter.

2. NO! The faculty furlough days should occur during the instructional quarter. Finding alternatives for students does not inconvenience them; thus, fostering the perception that "business as usual" takes place despite the salary cuts and furloughs taking place in the university. The objective should be to communicate to students, parents, and the community that "business as usual" is not taking place in the university.

3. YES, I have heard that this is happening, but I don’t know specific cases.

---

1. YES given that faculty workload will not decrease in meaningful ways otherwise, we must make it obvious to the community that the furloughs are happening.

2. NO, I don’t think this is a good idea, furlough days should not involve instructional time.

   This is a tough call, but I think the impact of furloughs needs to be felt by the students and the community, and I am skeptical that the volunteer option would be visible enough to have the same impact.

3. I’m not aware of this occurring.

---

Hello, Tony and Sellyna,

Happy to respond--see below--though I would gently remind that we at CHASS are only employed for a nine month year, even though we do our own work and answer students queries all year 'round.

Thanks for taking on this important task.

---

1) I don't agree that furlough days should be taken during instruction. I do not think our students should be harmed by the actions of the State. I understand why some faculty might come to a different conclusion.

2) I don't think that the highly visible action will have any impact on legislators. But it is fine as a good will gesture.

3) I have heard two esteemed faculty members (not in my academic department) say that they plan to pursue job offers this year. Two years of 8% cuts will, I predict, lead many faculty members to try to leave the university. Of course, one does not know how successful these efforts will be. Hiring will be limited for the next two to three years.
Usually when faculty start looking around for other positions, they do not advertise their intentions to even their close colleagues until late in the process. The reality of faculty furloughs is only a few months old. Also this is not the season for recruiting, and the tough economic times that other institutions are facing may delay the process. I think it is too early to assess this. Let's see what happens next year if there is talk of an extension.

I do not follow the initiative as stated. If you mean would I teach on furlough day during a quarter I am already scheduled to teach, then yes.

**IMPORTANT:** IF THE NUMBER OF DAYS WERE REDUCED FROM 6 TO 3, I WOULD BE MORE INCLINED TO AGREE WITH THE FIRST AND ONLY CHOOSE THE THIRD ALTERNATIVE FOR THE SECOND. IT WOULD BE TERRIBLE PR TO SHORTEN CLASS TIME WHEN THERE IS A SUBSTANTIAL FEE INCREASE FOR THE STUDENTS AND THE NEAR CERTAINTY OF ANOTHER, POSSIBLY EVEN MIDYEAR.

I AM VERY CLOSE TO RETIRING NOW, BUT MY PLANS WERE TO CONTINUE FOR ANOTHER COUPLE OF YEARS. IF THE SALARY CUTS ARE CONTINUED PAST THEIR CURRENT DEADLINE OR WORKING CONDITIONS ARE DOWNGRADED FURTHER IN SOME OTHER WAY, I WOULD BE A FOOL NOT TO RETIRE BEFORE THE STATE'S HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IS TURNED INTO THE SORT OF BAD JOKE THAT ITS ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS HAVE BECOME.

For Question 2

NB: I do not understand why our council is out of step with system-wide and the other UCs that have weighed in on this, including Irvine and Santa Cruz, which have voted to have the furloughs impact some instructional days, and Davis, which is polling faculty with the proposal that 6-9 furlough days be taken on instructional days (thus 2-3 per quarter). I think it is a bad idea to act as if furloughs don't or shouldn't impact instruction, and that includes the notion that students can read things on their own to make up for lost class time, which suggests distance learning might suffice for an education and will no doubt result in our having to address such texts in class anyway--how will we know students have read and understood them otherwise? I would also point out we are already sharing the pain with students in that we are accepting mandatory furloughs, which impact our pay, so they are not alone in feeling a hit to their wallets. We must make it clear that the university cannot provide world-class education and research without money. Offering to teach extra classes is not the way to do it. That said, I do not think all the furlough days should impact instruction: some should impact research and service, as the two other components of our job, and the Chancellor's proposal structures some required furloughs on what might be research days (it is also implicit in the system-wide plan). I don't know how we will take into account the impact of the furloughs on conference presentations and publications, but I hope we do develop some sort of plan to address that, as it is likely to be an issue with some merit files in the next 2-3 years (a merit cycle).

For Question 3

NB: Overall, I think it is too soon for us to know anything in my field, where jobs are not advertised until the autumn. I expect some people will look for new jobs, but I also know that this is a national problem and that even some of the Ivies are impacted by the current economic
downturn (Brown is not planning on doing much hiring in my two fields next year, for instance). That said, a new hire at the senior level did query his chair here about whether he should return to his former campus, from which he took a leave in this his first year at UCR, so he was clearly concerned about his future at UCR, if not a career in the UC.

1. YES, if NOT 6, then 9 in 9 months (remove 3 hours of instruction per quarter).

2. Comments: I think making a public display of the faculty who DON'T volunteer to teach is bound to create mistrust and anxiety among the faculty and create internal disharmony. Faculty who don't help the Chancellor create the proper media event will be blamed for the failure of the gesture. I don't think the legislators will care nor will students. Our budget will be restored when and if there's more money in the system.

Question: I'm on sabbatical this academic year. So what does the furlough mean in that scenario? Can I forward my furlough days to the next year when I come back?

Question 2: I don't think the students should have to bare the brunt of these cutbacks, but cuts in funding must generate corresponding cuts in service, otherwise there is no political will to solve the problem.

Question 3: As current Chair of a dept I have had multiple faculty tell me that they will sacrifice for this year to help out, but that if pay cuts and workload increases continue then they will leave. These faculty carry multiple extramural grants that bring in 8x their annual salary and are very moveable.

Question 1. No. However, if we are asked to do this again next year, I would certainly support such an action. Next year is time to dig our heels in.

Question 2. No, furlough days should not involve instructional time.

Question 3. Yes, I am considering retiring. I think I am still capable of generating extramural grant funds, and thus may continue to do research here or transfer my funding to another university. I have been receiving "feelers."

I have also heard that one of our senior faculty members may be contacted about his interest in a position at a university on back East. But I do not know any of the details.
If the State is not going to fund UC at a substantive level, as it has in the past, then if we are to maintain quality, I don't think we have any choice other than to raise fees substantially and cut enrollments.

I'm sure this counts, but I accepted an offer from out of state, starting 2010, partly because I anticipated these cuts, and saw a general withdrawal of support from UC looming.

Question 1: It seems rather arbitrary. Two days a quarter? One from MWF and one from TR, perhaps? There's no real way to distribute this except arbitrarily, really, and I consequently don't think it would have much impact.

Question 2: This makes rather more sense: name some days, but then have us teach anyway. That way, courses get taught, but students are aware we're volunteering that day.

Question 3: Anyone considering outside offers (which our administration's policy over the past few years has [insanely] actively encouraged) will be all the more interested this year, though opportunities are likely to be slim.

Multiple junior (untenured) faculty that I know are considering applying for other jobs this fall, due to the perceived instability of employment in the UC system for the foreseeable future and the inevitable impact that lowered salaries and potential increased teaching loads will have on research productivity.

Hi Tony,

Being on vacation in Provence at the moment, it is not possible for me to give as full a response as the questions you've posed warrant.

One issue of great importance to me is the ability to consider a sabbatical at partial pay as the equivalent of a furlough. My message to the chair of FW cmtte is attached, and Helen has been CC'd on a number of exchanges dealing with that issue.

With regard to the specific question of teaching while on furlough, my intention is to teach my classes regardless of whether a furlough has been called on a given day. SO the first option represents my response.

I AM NOT AWARE OF THIS OCCURRING (NOTE: Although I do not know of anyone pursuing other employment at this time, I know of several people who have expressed a plan to seek new job opportunities during the next few years in response to the crisis in the UC system.)

Question 1: Cannot answer: depends on implementation. I do support having furlough days affect teaching in some small demonstrative way.
Question 2: Additional clarification: I would not continue to volunteer to teach on furlough days if the furlough situation continues past the 09/10 academic year.

I know of two faculty who are so frustrated by budget mess and resulting cuts in salary that they will be in the market for positions in fall 2010.

THANK YOU, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, FOR YOUR IMPORTANT WORK ON THESE ISSUES AND FOR SUGGESTING A THOUGHTFUL STRATEGY FOR MOVING FORWARD IN THE COMING YEAR. I AGREE THAT IT IS SMART TO PROCEED IN A WAY THAT IS PERHAPS SELF-SACRIFICIAL BUT ALSO DESIGNED TO SEND A MESSAGE ABOUT OUR COMMITMENT TO STUDENTS AND OUR VERY REAL CONCERNS ABOUT THE STRESS BEING PLACED ON THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY.

Tony,

I think my response requires at least a short elaboration. I have checked one of the boxes that most closely reflects my opinion, but it doesn't quite capture my thoughts on the proposal.

I think the teach on our own time proposal represents an admirable public spiritedness and concern for our students, but has implications far beyond the volunteer time of any group of faculty members.

I am concerned that classes offered on days the university is closed will suffer from lacking the full support of the university (e.g., a lack of availability of the library, the student center, and other aspects of the university supported by staff members we could not possibly expect to join in this volunteer program). I also don't know that we can expect students to attend classes held on our private time and thus I don't think we can hold students accountable for the lectures we give on a volunteer basis, except for in student-faculty relationships with more informal pedagogical engagement. Consequently, I think the proposal is better scaled for graduate programs, professional schools, and the operation of research laboratories, than for large introductory lecture classes.

Further, there are liability and facility issues associated with using campus property on days when the campus is closed.

Rather than volunteer teaching, my alternative suggestion would perhaps be to encourage other forms of coordinated volunteerism and community service. In other words, I think it would be great for UCR faculty to use some portion of the furlough days to do some publicly valuable activity that would demonstrate our collective commitment to the community even as the state has made teaching our students on furlough days impracticable.

This doesn't solve the problem of serving students and I don't have a good answer on this.
Dear Faculty Senate,

We shut down the University last year over the winter holiday break, so there will be no savings from this. Furloughs should not be over the winter break - they should be during periods when the university is normally in operation, just like the DMV, courts and other state offices shutting down. All furlough days should count! UC budget cuts should result in visible reductions, in my opinion.

Best regards,

Here are comments I sent on July 20, somewhat edited:

(1) I think there should be flexibility in the application of furlough days. Some faculty would like to have blocks of time for research, to do consulting to make up some of their lost salaries, and to work on new research proposals, for example. Some staff may be able to find part-time employment.

(2) Those who are paid partially from state funds and partly from non-state external research grants should have furloughs applied only to the state-funded portion of their salaries. Their externally funded research, or support for externally funded research, should not be compromised. Reduction in effort on federally funded research could lead to future reduction of research grants, with reduced indirects to the university.

(3) Furloughs should NOT be only on days that the university is not in session, such as the days between Christmas and New Years. The cuts should be VISIBLE - otherwise, why shouldn't the state cut us more? NOTE ADDED: UCR was closed during the Winter holidays last year, so there will be no savings as compared with last year. These days are also not optimal for consulting or part-time employment.

(4) Furloughs should also apply to classroom teaching - again, these cuts should be visible, in the same way that the DMV and the courts are closed some days.

(5) The furloughs should definitely not be inequitably applied to research time. We are a UC campus, and research is a priority on UC campuses. We are a research university, not Cal State Riverside or a community college. We should do everything possible to preserve, and possibly even to improve, our research capabilities. In principle, all UCR faculty should have research grants, preferably from a federal agency. We are probably too dependent on state-funded research, and those who have state-funded research grants should be encouraged to obtain federally funded research grants. The federal government is supposed to be stimulating and enhancing scientific research, but the State of California is doing the opposite.

Many of my faculty colleagues have similar concerns, as I have found from private discussions.
Here are my responses to the questions for faculty. However, "visible" we may feel that the "UCR Faculty teach on their own time" might be in our eyes, I think it will be hardly noticed elsewhere and will swiftly become an assumed part of what we do. Most importantly, it will mean that any potential new hires will see UCR as having higher teaching loads than other institutions and will damage both UCR and the UC system.

Question 2: ***Explanation: In my view, a 10-week quarter is already short, and I don't want the students to bear the brunt of the budget crisis. But the legislature should KNOW that lessened university support necessarily yields lessened learning opportunities. If it endures, the shortfall harms the whole university, prominently including but not restricted to teaching.

NOTE: I answered two times to this question; I oppose using instructional days as furlough days (see question 1) so I marked the 5th option to question 2. However, if instruction days are to become part of the furlough, then I support the first option in question 2.

Question 2: I have mixed feelings about this proposal. I am willing to teach, because our students deserve to be taught regardless of the budget problems. But, I'm concerned about the message that it sends - that it could be interpreted that we will still work for less pay and that the pay cuts don't matter to us.

Question 3: Not quite, though - the case that I know of is someone who was already going to be looking elsewhere, and the budget cuts are making him even more determined to do so. Also, I've talked with several people who feel that it is manageable for a year, but if things get more extreme, or if these patterns continue, that they would want to look for other positions.

If all furlough days are taken during quarter breaks and other periods without impacting instruction, then the State Legislature will interpret the action as evidence that they can permanently cut that many paid days and still have a fully calendar of University instruction. Sending such a message would be a serious error and is the reason that I favored a straight percentage salary cut rather than furlough days. If all furlough days are taken during breaks, many faculty will work those days anyway to complete the preparation, grading, etc. for their classes. We should not pretend otherwise and should not lead the State Legislature to believe otherwise.

Dear Tony (if I may),

I am forwarding you John Baez's and my original letter under my own name, to emphasize that this letter reflects the views of two faculty members.

May I add that I am deeply disturbed by ongoing proposals that UCR distance itself from other UC campuses by "voluntary" teaching, if the UC senate votes to take furlough time from teaching days (as I think it should). I think Chancellor White is deeply mistaken in this approach, which hurts all of us, but especially junior faculty, who would inevitably be under particular pressure to "volunteer."

I am writing to Chancellor White and EVC Rabenstein under separate cover, as to faculty
colleagues through other lists.
All best,

While in principle volunteering to teach on furlough days sounds like a great idea, the problem is not that the UCR faculty are abandoning our students, but that the State Legislature has abandoned them. And while we have a commitment to our students, we also have a commitment to do research. This is a research university. If I volunteer my furloughs for teaching, then I should also volunteer my furloughs for research. And then, suddenly, in the eyes of our funders (the State Legislature), nothing has happened except that they have made an 8% savings. And our furlough has effectively become a pay-cut, which is what we didn't want to happen. So, while I can see the merits of such a voluntary system, it sets us on a slippery slope. We should make it abundantly clear that it is the State Legislature that has short-changed our students, and not the UCR faculty. It should also be made clear that the furlough days have been spread out so that it is not *just* teaching that has taken a hit, but that all aspects of the university program have been impacted. Nothing is spared, but nothing is sacred, either.

One further thought: there are several members of my department who are totally unique in their research areas and instructional skills. It would not surprise me if other colleges and universities "exploited" the situation and actively recruited these individuals, given the way UC faculty have been treated. I would gladly write colleagues letters of recommendation. We were never listened to in an unbiased forum, given a vote, and have been treated as if we don't matter. I am not into law suits, but I'm considering hiring someone to investigate this matter to see if our tenure contracts have been violated. I am, in short, disgusted: this is the biggest rip-off I've seen in my life time.

I think it's important to let the salary cuts have a negative effect. If there is no negative effect, why shouldn't they cut salaries--and why shouldn't they do it even more? I also think that it should be explicit: if there is an 8 per cent salary cut, there should be an 8 per cent less expectation of publications and service.

Not exactly, but we are losing one valued colleague in our department and the loss is tied to the budget situation. He received an attractive outside offer (involving an endowed chair) at the beginning of calendar 2009 (before salary cuts were announced). He would have preferred to remain at UCR, but essentially because of impending budget constraints, we were not able to come close enough to matching the offer.

1. The reason I opposed the furlough program and voted for a straight salary reduction is that furloughs for teaching faculty make no sense. Am I really going to cancel classes and take a furlough day on a Tuesday or Thursday when I am scheduled to teach a class? I can not see any responsible faculty member doing such a thing. I had understood the nature of furloughs for faculty to be like most things in the scheduled life of a faculty member--I declare my own furlough days, as long as they add up to a total per month that is required. I do not see any need for someone to mandate which days I choose to furlough, just like I do not allow anyone, dean, chair, or chancellor, to say when I do my research or when I see my students--this is part of the
autonomy we have earned as faculty at a research university. So I do not support anyone, faculty senate or otherwise, telling me when to furlough and when not to.

2. If someone who has the authority to make me take a furlough on a day I am scheduled to teach, I will teach regardless, but I see little point in making a useless gesture that no one outside the university will appreciate or understand. The Legislature and the Governor care little about useless demonstrations of commitment. The UC administration has missed an opportunity to really send a message about commitment to all concerned—we should have raised the fees sufficiently to avoid layoffs and furloughs—this would show our commitment to excellence, and would send a financial message to voters and the politicians—the only message anyone is likely to respond to. Anyone who thinks this is a temporary problem and next year we will be back to the old system needs to think again. The University of Michigan model—becoming essentially a private, state affiliated university—is where we are headed if we wish to maintain the quality of the UC system. The faster we recognize this, and start acting on it, the less damage we will suffer in the meantime. I think such an effort would be useless and counterproductive, and create administrative headaches no one needs in the current situation.

3. Yes, I know a prominent faculty couple, two of our most distinguished faculty at UCR, who were planning to retire in 3 to 5 years, who announced with a few weeks after the major budget cuts and salary reduction plans being announced that they were retiring immediately, as of June 30. They were explicit that reason was the hassles, lack of support by the state and the people, that caused them to make this decision.

I never like questionnaires since I always choose "other", anyhow - - that's why I am a philosopher. But here are some thoughts about projected details of the furlough program.

1. I have an Academic Year contract, which covers 165 days over 33 weeks. It does not include any times when the university is not in session. So, if I am to be furloughed 14 days this year, those days must come from these 33 weeks, and no other days.

The other day I was talking with a lawyer who works in nonprofits. He was telling me that his firm had considered furloughs as well as pay cuts. As they considered the laws governing fair-employment practices, he learned that furloughs had to be consistently applied to all members of the same group. This, in turn, required set days for furloughing particular groups of employees.

So, in light of this conversation and the apparent laws on such matters, it seems that law and fairness require that the Academic Calendar be changed to remove 14 days from the instructional calendar. (Those with more furlough days presumably will have their furloughs extended into other months of their 12 month contract. But I wouldn't know about that.)

2. The other day I noted that with this furlough I now will earn, in real dollars, almost exactly the same salary I earned as a beginning assistant professor at Occidental College, in 1971. Of course, I could have become more diligent about my career, but as a Step V Professor I haven't been a slouch, either. In any case, I am not inclined to work for free --that would be too Soviet, certainly.

I am quite concerned about educating our students on the unfairness of capitalism and political interest groups. I would be happy to participate in teach-ins and rallies, during furlough days, but given the self-centered apathy of most UCR students, I am dubious about the effectiveness of such a tactic. Indeed, I would much rather have the student body shrink, removing the slackers
who don't do their homework, who spend more time on Facebook than on Academics, thereby wasting millions of taxpayer dollars. So, if the faculty are furloughed, perhaps all UCR students on Academic Probation for two terms or more should be immediately expelled and told to attend Community Colleges, returning to our welcoming arms with A.A. degrees and a better attitude toward learning. That would ease the crunch in the classroom, certainly, and improve the quality of instruction, too.

3. Yes, I feel that retirement is soon going to be a better option. The Regents have only dropped one shoe of two. Our salary reductions (8% in my case) reduce the differential between being on campus and being retired. But soon the second shoe will be dropped, lowering our income by another 4% or so, as we all must start contributing to our pension plan, again. Once that happens, more faculty will retire, but they won't be able to be replaced, either. Right now I am on 12 dissertation committees (mostly as 2nd reader, but never as 3rd reader) on two campuses and in three departments. What will happen to those 12 careers if I must abruptly retire, since I really don't believe it is right to work professionally for free, as opposed to my on-going charitable activities.

So, Tony, such are my thoughts about structuring the furlough program.

best wishes as always,

I'M NOT SURE; I DO NOT WANT TO SEE OUR STUDENTS DISADVANTAGED, BUT I ALSO AM OF THE OPINION THAT IF WE OFFER THIS, THE PAIN INFLECTED ON US--AND THEREFORE TO OUR STUDENTS--IS NOT EVIDENT TO THE LEGISLATURE. CUTS TO UC/R MUST BE SEEN TO HURT THE PUBLIC, AT LEAST IN PART.

YES. I AM AWARE OF A SITUATION WHEREIN ANOTHER INSTITUTION, KNOWING ABOUT PAY CUTS IN THE UC SYSTEM, IS ACTIVELY COURTING A SENIOR FACULTY MEMBER. THE FACULTY MEMBER, TO MY KNOWLEDGE, HAS NOT FOUND OUTSIDE OVERTURES (WHICH HAVE BEEN MADE ON THREE OCCASIONS) ATTRACTIVE ENOUGH TO EVEN BRING AN OFFER TO THE RELEVANT DEAN; HOWEVER, THE FACULTY MEMBER HAS ENTERED INTO TALKS WITH THE DEAN OF ANOTHER INSTITUTION. INFORMAL AT THIS POINT BUT INDICATIVE OF A DECISION TO BE OPEN TO LEAVING.

May I also suggest that if it is decided that six of our required faculty furlough days be taken from the regular instructional calendar, the six days will not all fall on the same week day (such as Fridays or Mondays), but would be distributed more evenly throughout the week (i.e., also from Tuesday to Thur.)? (In other words, they could be at the beginning or the end of the quarter, thereby shortening the instructional calendar somewhat.)

May I also suggest that if it is decided that six of our required faculty furlough days be taken from the regular instructional calendar, the six days will not all fall on the same week day (such as
Fridays or Mondays), but would be distributed more evenly throughout the week (i.e., also from Tuesday to Thur.)? (In other words, they could be at the beginning or the end of the quarter, thereby shortening the instructional calendar somewhat.)

I know of two professors whose decision to take early retirement was heavily influenced by the UC Budget situation. One was close to retirement anyway; the other probably sped up her retirement by 5-6 years. I spoke with several others who are still pondering their options to retire early.

_X_ Yes, and I would volunteer to teach classes -- BUT ONLY IF IT IS INDEED "HIGHLY VISIBLE" -- MOST OF THE PRESS COVERAGE HAS FOCUSED ON STUDENT FEES -- 7% IS A SIGNIFICANT PAY CUT THAT I FEEL AS IF I AM BEARING NEARLY INVISIBLY OUTSIDE THE UC SYSTEM. I AM NOT WILLING TO PERSONALLY SUBSIDIZE THE STATE BUDGET AND MY NEIGHBORS' TAXES AND THEN CONTINUE TO TEACH "ON MY OWN TIME" BECAUSE I AM WHAT THE LEGISLATURE EXPECTS: SOMEONE MORE COMMITTED TO HER STUDENTS THAN TO HER OWN FINANCIAL WELFARE.

Several colleagues, including myself, are considering retiring sooner than they normally would -- two distinguished senior colleagues have already done so, quickly rethinking their plans and retiring last month. Many others (who are not yet at retirement age) are searching for positions elsewhere -- two strong junior colleagues have already left; many others are actively in the market, too many to detail. Other institutions are becoming bolder in their approaches to entice UC faculty to jump ship. Another damaging effect is top people will be less likely to consider an academic position at UC, even if we were hiring.

I fear that the reverberations of these factors will be felt across UC far into the future, as the reputation is quickly spreading throughout the profession that UC and UCR are not secure places from which to build an academic career.

Note: My personal opinion is as follows: We cannot sacrifice instruction because the state budget happens to be in a crisis. Many of our courses are structured for covering a certain amount of material in 10 weeks. We do accommodate for some university holidays, which are in the academic calendar every year. But taking out extra days off will be difficult. What am I supposed to do if those days are taken out: send the students off to the next course in the sequence not having covered all of the material that needs to be covered? I will either have to squeeze all of the material into the days I have or I will have to schedule "extra sessions". Also: The idea that there may not be teaching due to furloughs should be communicated to the students as an anomaly not as the norm. These are not university "holidays" but extreme measures. I do not need any appreciation for "teaching on my own time," I see it as my responsibility, but I don't want students complaining "The instructor of so and so course canceled the lecture, why do we have to go to lecture today?" I trust that the University will involve all
relevant parties (students, TAs, faculty including lecturers), and have them very well informed about whatever the final decision may be.

See my responses below. As well I am pasting in below my response to the Provost in reaction to his sentiment that we not disrupt normal university processes.

"While there are many complex issues with selecting furloughs as a fiscal strategy, I want to comment on one aspect of the Provost's plan, if I understand what has been proposed. There is an important principle here that has long term consequences. This has to do with the state's financial support for public higher education, which means the public's support. If the state's withdrawal of support does not lead to adverse consequences (especially mission area consequences, such as student learning, knowledge production, or service to our communities and the state and nation), then we prove that our institution does not need the withdrawn financial support. This would certainly set up a rationale for permanent reductions from the state.

If there is a withdrawal of finances for our work, then we must show that there are consequences. I am suggesting that loss of financial support must be evident to the public and our students, the community, and the consumers of our research. We need to consider the withdrawal of our labor in instruction, research, and service (as well as administration). For example, we could delete one class in each course each quarter (less instruction; less learning). We could cancel a meeting on campus and not have a make-up meeting. We could close down services for a day during the quarter, every quarter, as long as this is not in areas where there is a safety issue involved.

Unless there are tangible outcomes that affect more than our personal finances then we are simply demonstrating that we are paid at too high a level and that the university is over-funded for what it does. The public will not care then and we will lose any political clout we have in this state."

This furlough brings me BELOW my HIRING Salary and puts me back at around $56K a year. Before this reduction, with two kids in childcare-- my credit card debt had already doubled since I took this job (highest it's ever been in my life).
I've heard other jr. faculty families with the same story and worse debt.
Why wouldn't I/they go on the market???

We hired a Senior Professor at the Associate level to begin working in the Fall 2009. He had accepted our offer by signing the initial non binding letter sent by the Dean. In April 2009, the position was frozen by the Chancellor and the offer to the candidate was withdrawn. Some of the lecturers in our department have been laid off. We have also been unable to fund incoming graduate students who had been promised TAships.

__X Yes. Please describe the case(s) you personally know about (without names). Yes I know three cases of excellent junior and senior faculty who are seeking new jobs outside UC because of the salary cuts, which violate the published salary scales, and because there is little indication that the administration will respond effectively to additional budget cuts next year. I might add that I think Yudof and the regents should be taking much more drastic action, such as threatening to sell off parts of the UCLA, UCSD and UCSB campuses, slashing freshman admissions to Berkeley and UCLA, and placing initiatives on the California ballot.
I think the idea of "volunteering" our instructional time is insane and completely counterproductive. It is not up to us to make things right or shield our students from the consequences of the budget cuts. Our students and their parents need to see the cuts reflected in the academic schedule or there will be absolutely no political pressure from them to reverse the cuts and restore UC's funding.

---

Dear Tony,

I believe in the strongest possible terms that we should not teach for free.

Anyone who thinks that any section of the State government will give the UC browny points for teaching for free, is deluding him/herself. The Governor will be out in a short time, and so will the legislators - due to term limits. They are mostly interested in getting out of this with as little egg on their faces as possible, and not at all in fixing the dysfunctional budgetary system of the State. Giving them money (which is precisely what “UCR Faculty Teach On Our Time” program purports) is aiding and abetting their incompetence.

Teaching for free would also make us accomplices in deluding the public that paying less will provide the same services. It will also provide an incentive for making further cuts, or making the current ones permanent. Threatening the legislature with an "OK, but only THIS time", and believing it will have any effect is frighteningly naive.

Since the “UCR Faculty Teach On Our Time” is presented as a recommendation, I vote it NOT be adopted (based on the above arguments).

There are other questions I would like addressed:

a) If a faculty member cancels lectures, can (s)he require the students to be responsible for the material that was not covered?

b) If a TA takes furlough days during discussion sessions, who is supposed to cover these? Similar questions arise for the staff in charge of the instructional laboratories.

c) If a faculty takes furlough days, to whom should (s)he direct student complaints (if any)?

---

I fear that if we agree to "teach for free" for a week in 2009-10, then the legislature and the voting public will interpret this to mean that we agree that we are overpaid. Then both the legislature and the public will REQUIRE us to teach for free for far more than one week in the years ahead.

This is what watching the State Legislature and the voters for 25 years has taught me.

---

hi-
First I am retired but seem to be still on call-back this fall. So my statements aren't much good, but..
It seems to me that a way should be worked out to do a "free call back" for emeritus. For me a small class in my area wouldn't be a major problem and helping teach a larger class would be even fun. "Helping" would be lecturing for x number of days when the actual head of class was out of town. It would not be, for a large class, grading tests or hearing student complain about their grade. Obviously we all want to be paid but perhaps a thank you dinner by the Dean or Chancellor would be enough for us who still like students.

My basic take is that faculty care about different things from students and the public. Which means that we might want to think a bit differently about the kinds of things we do or publicize in order to persuade the public.

For example, I honestly don't think students care terribly much about having fewer classes. I know that students who commute get annoyed when a class is cancelled at the last minute, but most students see fewer classes as a chance to put in more hours at work/avoid a commute etc. Similarly, while faculty care about faculty moving to other institutions I don't think students and parents do. There are exceptions, if we could point to a med lab moving or a hotbed lab of hi tech spinoffs then the loss is seen. But generally speaking faculty turnover is pretty low profile to undergrads and their parents.

What I do think however is that if we start cancelling classes then we come across as less-than-committed educators. A quick glance at "letters to the editor" section shows that some Californians already see us in a poor light (lumping us with the UCOP administrators). I'm not sure it is a good plan to try and shorten our teaching year and help confirm that opinion.

Could I suggest that instead we begin with something simple when the campus writes to students?

e.g. "Thanks for requesting a transcript. As you know the UC system is the best public university in the world and we are committed to that standard. However, state budget cuts to higher ed now mean we have to charge you $10 for a transcript. We apologize for the fee increase but need to provide funds"

or.. when students register "Thank you for registering. Unfortunately state budget cuts have meant a series of staff layoffs in our administration. Processing your request may be delayed in consequence"

OK, maybe not those words exactly. But we communicate with thousands of students and families each quarter. Perhaps we can begin by reminding them that we are a leading institution and that service cuts/cost increases will affect them? Then go on to show that school rankings suffer and so on...