



# UCLA Faculty Association Newsletter

An Independent Membership Organization of Faculty at the University of California, Los Angeles  
P.O. Box 33336 Granada Hills, CA 91394-3336 Phone and FAX 818 341-8664 [ucfa@msn.com](mailto:ucfa@msn.com)  
For more information, see the FA at UCLA Website at <http://www.uclafacultyassociation.info>

Nonprofit  
US Postage Paid  
Granada Hills, CA  
PERMIT No. 138

## SUMMER SESSION OR 4<sup>TH</sup> QUARTER: YEAR-ROUND CURRICULUM EMERGES AGAIN

About 35 years ago state legislators and UC administrators proposed year-round classes at Berkeley and UCLA, and students and faculty responded. Students complained loudly because many worked full time during the summer to help support themselves during the academic year. Faculty informed legislators that resources were not being underutilized at UCLA and Berkeley during the summer and that imposing a year-round structure on the University would upset the research output of faculty as well as the loosely knit but important committee structure that held together the fabric of shared University governance. With one quarter of the UCLA faculty away during any quarter or one third of the Berkeley faculty during any semester, it would be difficult to imagine committees functioning efficiently and effectively. Altering the 9-month salary year or the service responsibilities during a faculty member's "off" quarter or semester to accommodate a summer term would result in even bigger policy changes. The level of protest blocked the year-round proposal in the sixties.

Now the approach is different: UC is introducing the concept of a summer term more gradually, on a campus-by-campus basis. The first push is taking place at UCLA, UCSB, and UCB, with other campuses targeted to expand their for-credit summer classes later on. Summer-term enrollment surges and access have gotten attention, but so far there has been very little Senate consultation about the long-term consequences for curriculum design, admissions standards, governance, and research. *Cont. on p. 2*

## POLICY CHANGE: CASUAL TO CAREER

See page 4

## UC MEDICAL SCHOOLS: RETIREMENT ISSUES

Check out the survey UC conducted to determine if the physician retirement benefits at UC are competitive. See <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/taskforce.html>.

## COLA DELAY

This issue is now on the 2001-2 UC FWC agenda as a result of Faculty Association efforts.

**CONTACT the FA about FACULTY ISSUES**  
[ucfa@msn.com](mailto:ucfa@msn.com)

## UC CARE at UCLA: FOR UC EMPLOYEES OR NOT?

Slowly but surely UC faculty and employees are finding out that they cannot access UC Care health benefits at UCLA very easily. A little over a year ago, several medical practices located in the areas surrounding the campus broke their affiliation with UCLA. In June 2001 UC Care enrollees received a letter from Michael Karpf, Director of UCLA Healthcare, notifying them that many specialty care referrals will be directed to UCLA specialists based in Santa Monica. The family practices are scheduled to make the move soon. Also, patients requiring hospitalization for primary and secondary care will be treated at Santa Monica-UCLA Medical Center.

Trouble is also brewing in mental health care at UCLA. On Oct. 1 of this year, the contract between UCLA mental health providers and United Behavioral Health was terminated, which means that UC employees can no longer see UCLA mental health providers as part of their medical insurance. Further negotiations are pending.

*Cont. on p. 4*

## FA EXECUTIVE BOARD FOR 2001-2

The FA welcomes Professors Susan Downey, art history, ([downey@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:downey@humnet.ucla.edu)), Dwight Read, anthro., ([dread@anthro.ucla.edu](mailto:dread@anthro.ucla.edu)), and Olga Yokoyama, Slav. Lang. & Lit. ([olga@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:olga@humnet.ucla.edu)) to the Executive Board. We also thank Professors Robert Stockwell and Joyce Appleby for their service. Professor Gary Schwartz from the Law School died this summer. He had served on the Board for 6 years, and we will miss him. Continuing Board members are Professors Karen Orren, Chair, poli. sci. ([orren@ucla.edu](mailto:orren@ucla.edu)), Stephen Cederbaum, psychia. ([scederbaum@mednet.ucla.edu](mailto:scederbaum@mednet.ucla.edu)), Sheila Greibach, comp. sci. ([greibach@cs.ucla.edu](mailto:greibach@cs.ucla.edu)), Gordon Kipling, English ([kipling@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:kipling@humnet.ucla.edu)), Thomas Liggett, math ([tml@math.ucla.edu](mailto:tml@math.ucla.edu)), John Merriam, mol. cell & devlmt bio ([jmerriam@biology.ucla.edu](mailto:jmerriam@biology.ucla.edu)), Richard Olsen, mol. & medl pharm. ([rolsen@mednet.ucla.edu](mailto:rolsen@mednet.ucla.edu)), Carole Pateman, poli. sci. ([patemen@ucla.edu](mailto:patemen@ucla.edu)).

## ARE YOU AN FA MEMBER?

Please look at your mailing label. If it says "NM" for NONMEMBER, then this issue of the FA newsletter is being mailed to you courtesy of your colleagues. Please join them and support us all. An application is included on the back sheet.

#### **4<sup>TH</sup> QUARTER Continued from page 1**

##### **TEN YEAR ENROLLMENT GROWTH:**

###### **Tidal Wave II means 33% overall growth for UC**

The Master Plan mandates that UC accept all UC-eligible students from the top 12.5% of the high school graduation class. UC has given each campus a target number of new students to absorb over the next decade, with implementation left up to the campus. For example, UCLA has to increase by 4000 students. By 2005 UC Merced will be ready to take 5000 new students. In addition, more students will be coming to UC via community college transfer programs. Aside from UC's tenth campus, the intent of the legislature and the UC administration is not to look to new construction to accommodate student enrollment growth, but to expand summer sessions as the first step to offering a full academic year-round program.

Summer enrollments have been increasing nationwide and in California over the past few summers. Overall, the number of UC students taking summer sessions in 2001 increased more than 20% over summer 2000-- at Berkeley 23.5%. San Diego State, which also received some state funding to compensate for lower fees, saw enrollment surge 184% (Chron. of Higher Ed, 7/27/01). Lower fees and the difficulty of finding summer jobs and internships have contributed to the summer enrollment increase.

##### **LEGISLATIVE MANDATE:**

###### **UC and the California State Colleges will move to year-round schedules**

For the past few years the state has expressed through legislation and partnership agreements its intention that UC expand summer classes on all UC campuses to allow current students to graduate more quickly, to improve access for minority students, and to accommodate some of that new pool of about 60,000 students who will be eligible to enter UC in the next ten years. In 2000, the legislature passed Assembly Bill 2409, sponsored by Carole Migden, D-San Francisco, that requires UC to offer the same number of courses during the summer as during the regular school sessions. This bill also prohibited UC from charging students more in summer than in fall, winter or spring.

###### **The state will provide funding for UC credit courses**

A state funding agreement for year round is built into UC's 4-year partnership with the state, entered into in 1999-00 and continuing through 2002-03 (<http://budget.ucop.edu/NP.html>): "Reach agreement with the Administration and the Legislature on a plan for phasing in implementation of a state-supported summer term on a campus-by-campus basis beginning in Summer 2001. The phasing plan should be based on the assumption that fees, financial aid, and the quality of programs should be similar to that offered during the regular academic year."

The state began implementing the transition to year-round by paying the difference between the traditionally higher summer fees and the fees for regular quarters (or

semesters) in 2001 (\$13.8M to UC). Probably next year it will progress to paying the full FTE for each additional UC student who signs up for summer classes and end up (UC expects) paying the full FTE amount for every UC student enrolled in for-credit summer classes.

Historically, the state has not funded summer school instruction at UC or the state colleges, except for approximately 250 summer education credential students. The level of state funding will be a significant incentive to increase the size of these campus programs. In summer 2000, an estimated 42,877 UC students typically took one or two courses, which is roughly equivalent to 6,939 regular year FTE students. In summer 2001, the numbers would have risen about 20% to around 8,327 FTE. The 2000-01 FTE funding per student is about \$9,158 (the full marginal cost figure per FTE student for UC). If we estimate 8,327 FTE students in summer 2001, the full state contribution for all UC FTE students would be about \$76M at summer 2001 enrollment levels ([www.lao.ca.gov/analysis\\_2001](http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2001) and [www.ucop.edu/planning](http://www.ucop.edu/planning)).

##### **State funding raises workload issues**

The 4-year partnership also calls for summer-term enrollment to be 40% of the average workload during fall, winter, spring enrollment. One condition of increasing the number of summer term courses and improving access to undergrad courses will be an increase in faculty teaching loads of 6.7%. The workload issue--the number of full-time equivalent students taught by a professor--may end up being an even more contentious issue than year round. A decade ago the ratio was 17.6:1. The 2001-02 budgeted teaching load ratio is 18.6:1, and the actual ratio including both budgeted and unbudgeted students is 19.4:1.

Campus and departmental autonomy on setting the teaching load further complicate an already complex issue. The formula to calculate teaching load is also controversial. In order to receive compensation for a full student FTE, 120 student contact hours have to be generated. The legislature's calculations ignore the number of students in the classroom, lab. hours, office hours, and grad. & undergrad advising.

##### **SUMMER SESSIONS at UCLA:**

Although full state funding for all UC FTE students enrolled in a summer term would provide a powerful financial lure for campuses to beef up their for-credit summer offerings, some campuses have other sources of summer income. Right now UCLA does not want to convert to the fourth quarter if it means giving up a sizeable part of its current summer-session income. During the summer months the campus is teeming with conferences that use dormitory facilities, assorted camps, outreach and professional development programs for K-12, Extension courses, research programs, as well as summer classes carrying UC credit. Current admission policies allow any student who wants to enroll to be admitted, an important factor in the current popularity of summer sessions at UCLA. Overseas programs entice students to study in a variety of locations like Stratford-upon-Avon, Florence, Paris, and Rome.

Until now, summer programs at UCLA have been entirely self supporting, more and more attractive to a wide range of students, and increasingly profitable. In the last few years, UCLA summer sessions has met over 65% of the ten-year targeted increase in enrollment assigned to summer sessions. Moreover this non-state summer income is discretionary and can be used to enhance a wide range of campus resources. These activities also help to fulfill Chancellor Carnesale's goal of increasing the involvement of UCLA in LA by opening the doors a bit wider to the community in the summer.

### **LACK OF SENATE CONSULTATION RAISES MANY QUESTIONS:**

#### **Who will teach these new courses?**

The stated goal at UC is to make summer sessions voluntary. Administrators want to attract students with lower fees, financial aid, flexible class scheduling and easy access to housing. They may offer professors extra incentives to teach summer school, like a quarter off during the school year in addition to credit for teaching a quarter in summer school, and higher salary for summer teaching.

Some UC faculty are worried that there will come a time when the number of faculty volunteering to teach in the summer will not be sufficient to meet the legislative requirement that the same number of courses be offered in the summer as in other quarters or semesters. Some are afraid that specialized courses may have to be added in the summer to complete major requirements or even introductory courses so that students can begin their college studies in the summer. These changes would require more UC faculty to teach who ordinarily do their own research in the summer. UCOP expects a 50% increase in the fraction of courses taught by ladder faculty during the summer to justify state funding of summer sessions. The alternative for the University is to rely increasingly on part-time or adjunct professors to cover UC credit courses taught in the summer. Have departments been involved in discussions about hiring new FTEs? Changing the teaching schedules of current professors? or hiring more temporary faculty?

#### **How much will funding decisions influence curriculum?**

Since summer-school compensation is based on a percentage of salary at UCLA, departments have had an incentive to hire assistant professors rather than more senior professors in order to save departmental funds. Some chairs manage summer teaching expenses by offsetting a large lecture class taught by a senior faculty member with a smaller seminar. Financial management of summer teaching will become increasingly complex as more and more students enroll. What is being done in terms of refinancing the summer sessions so that departments can make educational decisions about which courses are to be taught in the summer without the threat of losing departmental funds?

#### **What should be the mix of summer session courses?**

Since summer sessions will not just be a carbon copy of a

regular quarter or semester, but may well look very different, there are significant educational issues to be considered: should the focus be on lower division courses since these get large enrollments, hence can service more students with fewer faculty? Are there laboratory facilities available for summer courses in the hard sciences that are not being used for research or already being used for current levels of summer enrollment?

#### **How will increased summer session teaching affect retirement benefit calculations?**

In November 2000, the Regents approved a provision that 7% of eligible summer salary will be contributed to an employee's DCP pretax account (3.5% from the employer and 3.5% from employee). But summer school teaching still falls in the category of supplemental income because compensation for summer session teaching or research is not currently considered "covered compensation" and therefore not included in HAPC (highest average plan compensation) for retirement. If summer session income were included, the University would be afraid that older faculty contemplating retirement would try to top off their highest three years of HAPC with summer session teaching salary. However, until summer teaching/research income is included in HAPC, there can be no real year-round schedule at UC. When this change occurs, it will signal an important step in the final conversion to the year-round schedule because it will carry with it restrictions on the maximum number of quarters or semesters that count in calculating retirement benefits.

#### **CAMPUS-BY-CAMPUS STRATEGY:**

##### **Phase 1: Enhance programs at UCB, UCLA, UCSB**

These campuses cannot expand much to take in more students during the regular year because of their significant physical space constraints.

Reduce per unit fees to level of other quarters.

Expand # of faculty teaching summer sessions

Increase # of regular courses taught in summer

##### **Phases 2 and 3: remaining UC campuses will also expand their summer instruction plans**

Some UC campuses, like UCR, can increase student enrollment in fall, winter, and spring. Others, like UCSC, might not be so lucky; it has extremely limited student accommodation and may have to increase summer sessions to meet needed enrollment growth without building more university housing. (See "FACTS about UC, Office of Strategic Communications, March 2001, UC Newswire at [www.ucnewswire.org](http://www.ucnewswire.org).)

#### **BOTTOM LINE:**

Faculty should be aware of the transition that is slowly taking place in UC summer sessions and the implications year-round education has for all areas of university life--research, faculty governance, teaching schedules, workload, retirement benefits, curriculum design, and admission standards. Talk to colleagues and department chairs about your concerns. Contact the FA at UCLA. Everyone should be aware that these gradual changes in campus infrastructure will eventually result in major changes in university teaching.

**UC CARE at UCLA Continued from page 1**

UCLA is not alone in distancing employees from campus medical centers. In May 2001, the Stanford U Hospital announced that it would no longer accept capitation payments for HMO care (capitation is a payment method in which health plans pay medical groups a fixed fee per month per member regardless of usage).

Over 6,500 Stanford employees are affected by this decision. At UC about 85% of UC Care enrollees access their care at the HMO level, 10-12% use Tier 2 and 2- 3% Tier 3. Instead of banning HMOs from UCLA Medical Center, UC has moved primary and much secondary care off campus. The strategy for both campus medical centers is the same: eliminate or marginalize primary and secondary care and concentrate on highly specialized procedures, high-risk surgery, and intensive care. In LA, this move is partly driven by the economics of building two new hospitals--at UCLA and in Santa Monica.

Faculty who have tried to negotiate primary care at SM-UCLA have found it a frustrating experience and not only because they can't find a parking space. It takes weeks to schedule a PCP appointment, and then the PCP may refer you to a doctor who seems more like a specialized primary than a Board Certified specialist. Furthermore, there are very few if any referrals back to the specialists at the UCLA Medical Center. Tier 2 is beginning to look like the only way into UCLA as well as a lot less hassle.

To address rising medical costs, some universities price their health plans according to salary level. For example, Harvard adjusts premiums according to three salary levels: under \$45K; between \$45K and \$70K; and over \$70K. Yale creates five salary categories: up to \$58K, up to \$63.3K, up to \$68.6K, up to \$73.9K, and anything over \$73.9. The Harvard Univ. Group Health Program (HUGHP) uses Harvard Med. School physicians and

physicians affiliated with Harvard teaching hospitals. The HMO is separated out from the POS (in-network and out-of-network), thereby simplifying billing and referrals. In the table below we can see the effect on premiums.

**Table 1: 2001 Health Premiums Harvard & UC Care**

Salary	>\$45K	\$45-\$70K	+\$70K
Harvard U Group Health Program: HMO			
Indiv.	\$33	\$44	\$56
Family	\$89	\$119	\$149
Harvard U. Group Health Program: POS			
Indiv.	\$44	\$56	\$67
Family	\$119	\$149	\$179
-----			
UC Care: POS Note: Premiums are not adjustment by salary level			
Indiv.	\$22.50	2-party \$47.14	Family \$60.60

Benefit levels in HUGHP and UC Care are different as well as the employer contribution, all of which affect price. But the important point is that some academic med. centers are experimenting with plan design and price in order to retain access for faculty.

In the coming months, UC faculty need to consider carefully what they want in a health plan and how much they are willing to pay for access. Those preferences have to be weighed against usage patterns and revenue for the UCLA medical providers. Plan preferences that result in insufficient income for the UCLA providers will not remedy underlying problems or ease access issues.

The systemwide UC FWC has created a Task Force on the Future of UC health plans to explore options that could positively influence the results of UC's next bidding process for health care contracts in 2002-03. The FA at UCLA would like to provide input to this taskforce about plan features most desired by faculty and the importance of access to UCLA providers at UCLA facilities. We will be sending out email questionnaires to faculty on these matters, and we urge faculty to respond.

**CASUAL TO CAREER: A Change in UC Policy**

Last spring, the FA at UCLA sent out a questionnaire to faculty to get feedback on the change in policy concerning casual employees. As of Jan. 1, 2001 casual employees (no students or academics are in this group) automatically converted to career after 1000 hours of employment. This change had many good effects like ensuring that career employees receive full medical benefits and earn retirement credit. But a few results have upset many faculty, especially those in research laboratories who often hire post doctoral and post baccalaureate students to do high level research: the costs have gone up and the flexibility down. This new policy change has also resulted in more employment paperwork and fewer post doc and post bac research positions available. Short-term positions benefit both former students because they offer research experience at the highest level early on in their careers and faculty who need to hire people with expertise and training.

The use of casual appointments varied widely at UC campuses in 1999. UC had about \$149,720 employees, of whom about 30% were academic, 17% students, 40% career, and 9% casual. Table 2 shows the number of casuals and careers by campus.

**TABLE 2: Casual and Career Appointments at UC Campuses in 1999**

	#of career	# of casual	Total	%
B	6,614	1,455	8,069	18%
D	11,089	1,242	12,331	10
I	5,388	936	6,324	15
LA	15,484	4,988	20,472	24
R	1,840	498	2,338	21
SD	8,976	1,631	10,607	15
SF	6,223	1,445	7,668	19
SB	2,311	565	2,876	17
SC	1,968	352	2,320	15
<b>Totals</b>	59,893	13,112	73,005	18%

(Table taken from the the CA State Auditor's Report on UC employment practices, April 2001, Table 5, page 23 and available online bsa.ca.gov/bsa/index.html. The figures do not break out post-docs and post-bacs from the total number of casuals.)

Many faculty responded to our questionnaire and voiced similar concerns about the policy change:

**Lack of flexibility in hiring:**

I have worked with researchers in other countries who are saddled with career employees whose skills and inclinations may have little relevance to the research projects being undertaken or considered... The example points out that flexibility in hiring is critical to the conduct of research.

**Increased costs:**

The new policy of rapid conversion of temporary employees to career status has been an unmitigated disaster for me and my colleagues at our research center. We no longer can find funds to fill positions that are and have always been temporary because the funds dry up with having to pay full benefits.

**Fewer opportunities for post-grads seeking early career experience**

Of no less importance is the need to provide opportunities for early-career scientists and research workers, particularly those with technical skills, including many who are in the U.S. on a temporary basis.

My policy for 30+ years has been to hire recent BAs for one to three years before they head off to graduate school—this has been of enormous benefit to me and to them.

**Increased administration duties:**

We must spend hundreds of hours trying to deal with ... complications of personnel who were clearly hired for the tenure of a grant but because they now have career status, must be helped to find another job or, as has happened, be paid out of faculty pockets because no jobs can be found for them.

Some faculty supported the change, mainly to ensure an adequate benefit level for bone fide long-term employees:

There is no doubt that the “casual” designation has been badly abused in the past. Although the stated intent of the casual/full-time position has been to provide the options you mention, it has frequently been used as a long-term probationary period for staff employees. From my perspective, I think this is a good move that helps protect the benefits of UC employees. It’s overdue and should be supported by the FA.

There is no question that casual employees should receive adequate medical benefits. The issue of exemption applies more to retirement benefits that are significantly different in the career and casual categories and the tenure of employment. Career employees are enrolled in UCRP and vest in this program after 5 years; if they leave UC before 5 years, which most post-docs and post-bacs do as they find full-time jobs in other universities or go on to graduate school, UCRP benefits are lost. Since the early nineties, neither employer nor employee at UC has had to contribute to UCRP; instead the amount that one normally would have contributed is deducted from one’s monthly salary and diverted into an individual pretax DCP retirement account (Defined Contribution Plan) that is portable with no vesting restrictions. Furthermore, if casual employees contribute 7.5% of their salary into a DCP account, neither employer nor employee has to contribute to Social Security.

**Table 3a: Retirement Costs for Casuials**

	Employer Contribution	Trainee Contrib.
DCP	0	7.50%
Social Security	0	0
Medicare	1.45%	1.45%
<b>Total % of salary</b>	<b>+1.45%</b>	<b>+8.95% salary</b>

**Table 3b: Retirement Costs for Careers**

	Employer Contrib.	Career Contrib.
	0	2% *
	6.2%	6.2%
	1.45%	1.45%
	<b>+7.65%</b>	<b>+9.65%</b>

The contribution rate for members with SS is 2% of annual earnings up to the SS wage base and 4% on annual earnings that exceed the SS wage base.

**A Proposal:** The FA would like to explore the feasibility of proposing a new trainee position that would offer the medical benefits of career employees and the retirement benefits of casuals. Such a trainee position fits the needs of post-docs and post-bacs who plan to work for UC for under 5 years. For this special group of former students, the disadvantages to the career category center on more limited retirement benefits: 1) UCRP retirement benefits are not portable before vesting; 2) DCP savings accounts are much smaller; and 3) the percentage of benefits deducted from the career employee’s salary each month are higher, 4) employer costs are higher resulting in fewer available positions. One advantage of the career position is earlier participation in Soc. Security, a benefit that may be offset by the larger DCP retirement account of casual employees.

If post-docs and post-bacs could be exempted from the career category and placed in a special short-term trainee category with career medical and casual retirement benefits, faculty would have the flexibility to make short-term employment decisions with short term funding. Researchers could also help more former students further their careers as well as benefit from their expertise and training. The FA at UCLA will continue to pursue this topic and solicit faculty, union, and administration feedback.

