The CHASS Executive Committee’s discussion included the following points. This memo would have been longer if it had been able to address specific details about the curtailment, but such details are absent in the proposal we reviewed. It is very difficult to give full feedback with limited information.

“Curtailment” as described in the proposed program sounds very much like “furlough” in earlier times when the UC system faced financial difficulties. Moreover, “The proposed curtailment program . . . intended for consideration and discussion. A final decision will come after a 30-day period of consultation with internal UC stakeholders.” This 30-day period seems rather short, and we feel that to know possible options considered in these already near-final decisions would have made our deliberations more meaningful.

Important details not clarified or specified include:

1. The minimum curtailment period is set at 5 days, but what is the maximum? For how long would this longer curtailment be in effect? Will this be a system-wide decision, or one for each campus to determine? Will this curtailment affect time in service, which ultimately affects retirement?

2. The curtailment program would be progressive based on income level, based on a tier-plan. What are the tiered cut-off points? Since this is an important aspect of the program, the impact of the progressive approach needs to be defined for employees.

3. Curtailment is explained as a period of leave, typically unpaid, instituted in connection with the suspension of certain operations for defined periods of time. What are the targeted areas of shutdown? How does this include those in a remote status? How does this affect campus operations? Does curtailment refer to a block of time or two days a month (effectively a furlough)? Will curtailment periods occur each quarter?

   “Depending on the curtailment periods, changes to the academic calendar may be required.” Please clarify.
4. The full curtailment plan must clarify the short-term and long-term effects for UC employees. For instance, just one sentence in the proposal addresses retirement, but it is very vague and unclear as to how the employee’s retirement would be protected.

5. “We will take a measured approach. We will only move forward with a curtailment expansion [oxymoron?] after implementing other prudent financial savings measures.” What are these?

   --“Reference to salary” and “pay” below are intended to refer to base pay and similar forms of regular pay and stipends. . .” What about both before- and after-tax deductions and employer-paid benefits? How will these be affected by the curtailment?

6. The staff and faculty will be affected differently by any proposed “curtailment,” but these differences are not clearly stated in the proposal.

   --Employees will be required to take a minimum of 5 curtailment/furlough days, with the number of required days increasing according to pay scale. Without any draft of what that rubric might look like, we have no idea as to the maximum number of days some employees would be required to take. Many staff would be vulnerable to unadjusted expectations about their responsibilities, and their curtailment days might well be spent working to meet those responsibilities.

   --Faculty would be subject to pay cuts that would be based on pay-per-day in accordance with salary tiers that have not been clearly defined. Moreover, given the complex time requirements of faculty teaching, research, and service (as in “shared governance”) responsibilities, reduction in pay would not be commensurate with any reduction of expectations for faculty work. Thus, the sentence “It will be challenging for some employees to take full advantage of the curtailment days due to the nature of their work obligations” states the obvious with a dollop of obfuscation.

   --Faculty members have been encouraged to proceed with going up for merits, promotions, and other personnel actions, which require much effort and time compiling their e-Files. How will the curtailment affect these Personnel actions?

7. Finally, brutal honesty compels us to point out, yet again, that while the proposal implies that the curtailment measures would be spread out evenly across all UC’s, this further exacerbates the vast differences among the ten campuses. UCR is far more deeply understaffed and under-resourced than UCLA, UC Davis, or UC Irvine. Asking UCR to make the same cuts or the same percentage of cuts would put even more strains on a strained institution.