

CSSSB

76

"An Act making a supplemental appropriation to the University of Alaska; and providing for an effective date."

5/6/75

COMMITTEE REPORT

FINANCE

HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:

Date 5/14/75

The Committee ^{To} on UNSS has had CS SB 76

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

recommends it DO PASS

recommends it DO NOT PASS

recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

recommends it BE REPLACED WITH ^HCS FOR CS SB 76 AND THAT

^HCS FOR CS SB 76 DO PASS

"and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE _____

COMMITTEE

reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

"other"

Members signing the Majority report:

Susan Sullivan _____
[Signature] _____
[Signature] _____
[Signature] _____

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

Susan Sullivan Chairman



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature House

HESS COMMITTEE MEETING

May 14, 1975

Members Present:

Davis	Sullivan
Hackney	Swanson
Osterback	
Ostrosky	

Chairman Sullivan called the meeting to order at 3:45pm. The Committee met only briefly before going back into the budget caucus.

~~CSND 76~~ CSND 76

Ostrosky: Motion to move bill out of Committee

Chairman: Hearing no objection, so ordered.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55pm.

I am David Hoke, a mathematics instructor at Anchorage Community College and thus a member of the bargaining unit. I am also Chairman of the University Assembly and am speaking in that capacity today. SB 76

The University Assembly is a policy-making body within the University structure and Assembly actions are subject to Presidential approval or veto. The Assembly membership consists of administrators, students, an alumnus and faculty members in the areas of instruction, research and public service with representatives from each of the three regions of the University. As Chairman of this body, it is my responsibility to represent as best I can the entire University community rather than any particular unit or group within the University.

In the November 11, 1974 Union newsletter I was severely criticized for representing views other than those of the Union. The criticism was primarily that since I was elected to the Assembly by the community college faculty of the Southcentral Region and since a majority of those faculty had voted to be represented at the bargaining table by the Union, I should represent ONLY UNION VIEWS in my role as Assembly Chairman. It was suggested that since I was not doing that I should either resign or be removed from office. I was particularly criticized for suggesting that the Assembly take a stand on the impropriety of an agency shop within a University, spending of State dollars for strictly Union activities and facilities, and opposing any negotiating on academic policies.

I understand fully the major reasons for the organization of this Union and I appreciate the many hours spent by some Union members in sincerely working to improve salaries and working conditions, but all that seems somewhat irrelevant now. The Union has gone well beyond the bounds of propriety, certainly within a University.

At an Assembly meeting on the Anchorage campus March 22, 1974, the Union President made the following remark:

"I think that one of the important points which people of this campus have gradually come to understand as they have read the newsletters that have been put out and have discussed the Union with people who are in the Union is that a Union is really a reflection of the people that are its members, especially those members who bother to work to make the Union go. It's quite possible that a Union could become strong enough and be composed of people cynical enough to bargain for things which would ultimately lead to the detriment of quality education. It's my firm belief and I think that we have demonstrated it by our actions on this campus that the people in this particular Union are interested in quality education."

Unfortunately for the University and for Alaska, the Union has by now exceeded even its wildest dreams in arriving at that level of cynicism mentioned above. I agree that the Union is a reflection of its members and that the newsletters referred to indeed indicate where the Union was headed. Copies of several of those newsletters are attached for your perusal.

In the newsletter printed two days after the one-day strike in October, the following statements appear:

"Additionally, student support for community college faculty was tremendous. We wish to extend our heartfelt THANK YOU to the thousands of students who supported the strike in many different

ways. Without you, we couldn't have accomplished our immediate objectives with a strike this brief. We're happy to be back in class with you. We encourage everyone involved in the Union's talks with the University - students, faculty, administration, and indeed all Alaskans - to remember the reasons for the strike and the forcefulness which allowed for its prompt conclusion. We also encourage all of those involved to be mentally prepared for another strike. We are returning to our classes as a gesture of good faith."

What happened to that good faith when the second strike was called in spite of the fact that the negotiators were in a marathon session which saw several agreements reached? And what happened to that gratitude for student support after the strike when Union teachers returned to the classrooms announcing that no work would be made up if they were not paid for doing so? What happened to the great concern for students when Union teachers refused to give any credit for work done by students under substitute teachers during the strike?

And what kind of concern for students is expressed when students are threatened by instructors that they had better not make statements against the Union or testify here today? I personally was approached by a student yesterday who was indeed a very frightened individual because he had been told not to make statements against the Union. A second individual whom I requested be referred to me because of tactful remarks made regarding students testifying here today refused to see me because he was afraid somebody would hear about it.

Presently 35 faculty members of the bargaining unit are in the position of possible termination for refusing to authorize a payroll deduction of a fee of \$35 per month in order to keep their jobs. These teachers taught during the strike and are opposed for different reasons to many activities of the Union. Paying this fee would amount to supporting to the same extent as Union members all those Union activities which the non-Union faculty members deplore.

The entire University will suffer from this. The Union has requested the firing of twenty-some faculty members from the Anchorage campus, four of the eleven faculty at Kuskokwim, both faculty members at Palmer, one of the four faculty members at Kodiak and the entire staff of the secretarial program at Juneau-Douglas.

Without addressing the amount of the fee, I must address the requirement of any fee regardless of its size. An agency shop - and certainly anything more severe - is entirely out of place in an academic setting. It requires a faculty member's first allegiance to be to the Union in order to even be a faculty member.

If ever there was a situation where, in a collective bargaining process, the bargaining agent should epitomize fairness to all, recognition of basic rights of individuals, responsibility for one's own actions and debts, and the long-term effects of their actions on others as well as themselves, it is in a University where the bargaining is actually done by the faculty members themselves..

And certainly in such a situation, the Union should be able on its own merits and actions to gain the support of the bargaining unit members without having to force the non-Union members to support their efforts.

3
if the Union was, indeed, working for the good of the faculty, the improvement of the University's ability to serve the students and the State, and the guarantee of academic excellence, the Union would have the support of all or nearly all of its constituency which it supposedly, but at presently questionably represents. The fact that the Union was not guaranteed forced support by all faculty members would serve to continually make the Union more conscientious in its activities.

There are some highly competent instructors who would come to the University and from whose talents the State could benefit, but who will not or cannot support a Union on campus and would therefore refuse to accept an appointment. Can you imagine any faculty or potential faculty member with integrity even considering working here knowing that the Union has forced the firing of even one, let alone 20 or so faculty members solely for refusing to support the Union? The Union will be denying the students and the State the benefit of such instructors. But is it an absolute right of any student to be exposed to instructors who have anti-Union views.

How representative of all its constituents can a Union be when its President informs one of the faculty members that he can join the Union if he "make a moral commitment to work for ACCFT--and most particularly never to work actively against this union for the duration of your membership." That letter was addressed to me and I am providing you with a copy.

And what conscientious faculty member or Union leader would stoop so low as to even suggest that someone with opposing views would agree to commit himself to cease immediately the utterance of inflammatory remarks regarding the Union or the agency fee in exchange for being allowed to finish the semester, but still pay his/her agency fees? That was an option presented to faculty members opposing the agency shop and no apology can ever erase the fact that the statement was made.

To address Senate Bill 76, I begin by stating that there are many inequities in salary within the bargaining unit - some small and some quite gross. These inequities must indeed be corrected immediately. And a substantial raise for all faculty members may be in order, but the raise of roughly 26% over the past 18 months is not to be scoffed at. We received that raise thanks to the efforts in bargaining of the Alaska Public Employees but they have never attempted to assess us a fee for their efforts from which we benefitted. But the 26% raise is not an acceptable answer since it was an across-the-board raise which simply further compounded the inequities.

This University has not really seriously made an effort to correct these inequities or they would not continue to exist. But the Union salary scale and placement criteria - even though they may be an improvement - have one great lack. The only criteria for salary determination are hours spent in class as a student, years standing in a classroom as a teacher or years on a job related to the area of one's present teaching assignment. No weight is given to competence or quality of performance. All one has to do to assure himself of a 5% pay raise each year is to keep his heart beating.

The contract has eliminated tenure academic rank and merit pay from the bargaining unit. This is important for two reasons. First these are the only rewards a university can give for quality performance.

By removing these from the bargaining unit, the Union has denied the University the capability to reward faculty for the very thing which the Union claimed was their primary concern - quality teaching. Secondly the reviews of faculty performance which normally occur when one is eligible for tenure, promotion in rank or is being considered for merit pay have now been eliminated so that there is no evaluation - at least no meaningful evaluation of the performance of any faculty member in the bargaining unit.

Now for the major thrust of my statement today. I am not going to suggest either passage or defeat of Senate Bill 76. What I wish you to strongly consider is this. The University exists primarily if not exclusively for the students and the citizens of Alaska - not for any group of faculty nor for the faculty or staff in its entirety. Our students and our public are in no way comparable to potential customers of General Motors who have no input into bargaining for the workers who put together the cars. The students are affected at least as much as the faculty by what the Union has done or will do in the University.

These hearings today are not only the last opportunity for any public input into the bargaining, but more importantly it is, in fact, the first opportunity for any such input. The public is paying the costs of the contract and a large share of the costs of the actual negotiations. You as representatives of this public now have the opportunity and responsibility to see that the public is heard and their interests come first.

Thus I urge that you listen very carefully to the statements today and make your own judgement as to whether the individuals most affected by this contract will be served by the bargaining unit members working under this contract as it presently stands. There is a lot more at stake than a few or a lot of dollars.

Union demands and Union activities indicate quite strongly that the Union's primary concern is protecting the reputation and power of the Union. It is a sad day for education when a University is staffed by faculty members who consider Union security to outweigh in importance human dignity, honesty and individual rights. In no way can such a faculty serve the State when their primary concern is to serve the Union.

I urge that before you approve passage of this bill and by such action imply approval of all that the Union has done this past year, you insist that the Union find solutions to the very serious problems of the present which they have created.

One honorable solution would be for the Union to accept the responsibility for the agency shop clause and the furor it has created, agree with the University to an amendment to the contract eliminating the agency shop clause for the life of the contract and inviting non-Union members to contribute to the Union a fair share of the costs of negotiations based on salary and other benefits received by each individual. This would be an ideal solution, but it is not necessarily feasible. Whatever compromise may be reached, the Union must recognize that they have not earned the right to determine how any amount of a non-Union faculty member's salary is to be spent.

Finally I urge that you Senators use your influence to demand of the

higher echelons of University administration that they begin exercising their management rights and obligations as granted and provided for in the contract.

SB 76

April 3, 1975

Members of the Alaska Legislature:

The enclosed statements were given by me in testimony to the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Committee for Public Hearing on Senate Bill 76. I wrote these two statements based on my observation of the events surrounding the formation of the Union on the Anchorage Community College campus, Union activities prior to and during the strike, and Union activities since the strike. I have been greatly dismayed at the Union's lack of concern for students and for faculty members who do not approve of Union activities and disagree with Union policies. I request that you read these two statements which have very little overlap and consider my thoughts prior to forming any final opinions regarding passage or defeat of Senate Bill 76. Senate Bill 76, if passed, would fund the financial aspects of the contract between the University of Alaska and the Community College Teachers.

I further urge that you read carefully the statement from the Anchorage Senior College Faculty Association which carefully outlines the possible demise in quality of the education the University can offer as a result of some aspects of the contract, particularly the agency shop provision. I understand that the authors of that statement have sent a copy to each legislator.

I would hope that you give careful thought as to the reasons for the Legislature allowing for agency shops or Union shops for public employees and consider whether the intention was to fire a large number of employees who could not in good conscience support financially the activities of a Union. I hope that you also consider very carefully the difference between a University and industry and the jobs done by the employees. An agency shop or Union shop in a University seems most inappropriate. Likewise the firing of 35 faculty members simply because they cannot in good conscience support the activities of the present Union seems hardly in the public interest.

I urge that you give a great deal of thought to the possibility of amending the Public Employees collective bargaining statute to exclude agency shop and Union shop from higher education or all educational institutions. A Union in education should be conscientious enough and concerned enough to gain support of bargaining unit members based on its actions and its own merits rather than forcing all members of the bargaining unit to support that Union regardless of what it does.

Sincerely,

David Hoke

David Hoke

Susan Sullivan

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

7330 MARGE COURT
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99504
333-6412



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

POUCH V
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801
465-3797
RESIDENCE 586-6159

CSSB 76

May 19, 1975

David Hanrahan, Welding Department
Anchorage Community College
P.O. Box 1505
Anchorage, Alaska 99507

Dear Mr. Hanrahan:

I am writing in response to your telegram of May 10 regarding Senate Bill 76.

As you probably know, the original Senate Bill was cut by a Finance Committee Substitute, which included reduction in both the salary increase and cost-of-living items. Our committee has drawn up a House Substitute for this bill which would appropriate the following amounts:

Placement and salary increase	\$659,000
Cost-of-living increases	256,000
Area cost-of-living differential	<u>111,600</u>
	1,026,700

As this House Substitute requests an amount larger than either of the Senate versions, a special conference committee will most likely adapt the bill so as to satisfy both Houses. Hopefully, this will result in provision of the full salary request.

Yours truly,

Susan Sullivan

Susan Sullivan, Chairwoman
House HESS Committee

SS:la

TELEGRAM

MCA ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
PHONE: 586-6440
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

SB 76

1975 MAY 10 PM 10 14

02040 NL ANCHORAGE ALASKA 50 05-10 0750P ADT

PMS REP SUSAN SULLIVAN

906

JUN

PLEASE RESTORE SB76 TO ITS FULL SALARY APPROPRIATION
REQUEST OF 624,000 DOLLARS BOTH UNION AND NON-UNION
COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS WHOM I KNOW SUPPORT THIS
MEASURE

DAVID HANRAHAN ACC WELDING DEPARTMENT

SRA POX 1505 ANCHORAGE 99507

Anchorage, Alaska
February 5, 1975

Susan Sullivan, Chairman
Health, Education and Social Services
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Susan:

Congratulations on your becoming chairman of the H, E & S S committee. It is indeed an honor and will require one heck of a lot of work.

Now as you are learning by now that very few very write unless they want something. After all what are you down there for-what a dirty dig.

My wife Cleone is a school teacher and so we are going to be interested in any legislation that deals with education in any way. More particularly we are interested in legislation relating to retirement.


Senate Bill No. 46 is a bill dealing with early retirement for teachers. We are in favor of this bill for we feel that it would be good both for the teaching profession and the education system as well. It will permit older teachers who desire to retire at an earlier age if they desire. This will permit hiring of younger teachers for less money. This will result in a saving of money for teachers and give young people an opportunity to get jobs.

I am sure that this bill will be thoroughly studied in all the committees and it is my hope that all findings will be favorable and the bill will be approved by both houses.

It has been rather quiet around here since the election and our legislators departure for Juneau. I haven't seen your Dad for some time. I am sure that he is busy.

Here is wishing you a very successful session. If I can help you in anyway, please feel free to call on me. Sorry about my typing for it is not my best talent.

Sincerely yours


Albert C. Hambright
4807 Kent St. Anchorage
99503

Susan Sullivan

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE



7330 MARGE COURT
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99504
333-6412

POUCH V
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801
465-3797
RESIDENCE 586-6159

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SB 76

May 19, 1975

Ruth Schmidt
1040 C Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Dear Ms. Schmidt:

Thank you for your telegram regarding Senate Bill 776.

The original Senate Bill was cut in the Senate Finance Committee, with reductions in both the salary increase and cost-of-living items. Our committee, in recognition of the need for the full salary appropriation, drew up a House Substitute, requesting the following amounts:

Placement and salary increase	\$ 659,000
Cost-of-living increases	256,000
Area cost-of-living differential	111,000
	<u>\$1,026,700</u>

As this House Substitute requests an amount larger than does either of the Senate versions, a special conference committee will most likely adapt the bill so as to satisfy both Houses. Hopefully, this will result in provision of the full salary request.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan Sullivan".

Susan Sullivan, Chairwoman
House HESS Committee

SS:la

SB 76

TELEGRAM

NCA ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

PHONE: 586-6440

PIINEAU, ALASKA 99801

02032 POM ANCHORAGE ALASKA 15 05-10 1128A ADT

PMS REP SUSAN SULLIVAN

JUN

897

REQUEST FUNDING FOR CSD76 SALARY INEQUITIES COL TRAVEL

LEAVE BE RESTORED

RUTH SCHMIDT 1040 C STREET 99501



Alaska State Legislature
House

JUNEAU ALASKA

Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99801
May 26, 1975

Rick Goodfellow
206 Bunnell Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99509

Dear Rick:

Thank you for your letter on Senate Bill 76 concerning a supplemental appropriation to the University of Alaska for a community college teachers' pay raise.

I agree that the whole University of Alaska needs close scrutiny, especially salary levels. Senate Bill 76, as it was amended in our committee, is something of a compromise between the original version and the Senate version. One of its best virtues, I think, is that it realigns salary and experience levels of the faculty, thus making a more sensible system of pay rates.

The bill is presently in the House Finance Committee. Since there are several widely divergent versions of it, it seems likely that it will go to a conference committee.

Please write again in the future on issues that concern you.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan Sullivan".

Susan Sullivan, Chairwoman
House HESS Committee

SS:la



JUNEAU ALASKA

SB 76

Alaska State Legislature
House

Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Diana Berkowitz
3332 Perdue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Dear Jason's Mom:

Thank you for your letter regarding Senate Bill 76.

The original Senate Bill was cut in the Senate Finance Committee, with reductions in both the salary increase and cost-of-living items. Our committee, in recognition of the need for the full salary appropriation, drew up a House Substitute, requesting the following amounts:

Placement and salary increase	\$ 659,000
Cost-of-living increases	256,000
Area cost-of-living differential	111,000
	<u>\$1,026,700</u>

As this House Substitute requests an amount larger than does either of the Senate versions, a special conference committee will most likely adapt the bill so as to satisfy both Houses. Hopefully, this will result in provision of the full salary request.

Yours truly,

Susan Sullivan

Susan Sullivan, Chairwoman
House HESS Committee

SS:la

May 8, 1975 SB 76

Rep. Susan Sullivan
P.O. Box 4
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Rep. Sullivan:

I never thought that I would write a letter against money for education, but I feel very strongly that the proposed raise for the community college faculty is not in the best interests of the university as education.

The U of A system is in need of a thorough shake out. After the blackwood and ruff sawt have shifted on we should talk about salaries that will attract the best people.

Dr. Whitt is off to a fine start and I have confidence in him. I'm afraid that I don't have much confidence in the current community college faculty.

The senate's retraction of the fringe benefits seems appropriate to me and deserves your support.

Phil Herpell

Dear Susan,

April 19, 1975

Remember me from Busy Bee days? The school has moved to a great big church on Tudor + McGinnis, an ideal location and the kids seem really happy.

I'm writing to request your support for SB 76 to fund the Community College teachers' contract.

I think it is still in the Finance Committee, but I understand the University budget is in the House.

As you probably know, studies show Alaska's community college teachers are paid way below the national norm. If our negotiated contract is fully funded the situation will be remedied.

Senate Bill 76 will fund the contract retroactively for '74-'75 and the University Budget must then be built to include the future negotiated raises.

Because I am a two-income family the situation is not critical for me, but most of my fellow teachers are living from check to check and working at unskilled labor jobs in the summer.

I hope you will do your best to see that our contract is fully funded.

Hope to see you back in Anchorage this summer

Sincerely,

Diana Berkowitz
(Jason's mom)

TO: GOVERNOR JAY HAMMOND AND THE ALASKA LEGISLATURE

FROM: STUDENT LIASON FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

SBTB

We implore your attention to the ~~current~~ labor strife on the community college campuses throughout the state. Valued faculty members are being threatened with termination because of their objection to the agency fee of \$35.00 per month being imposed by the ACC/AFT, Local 2404, AFL-CIO.

A student group, delegated to attempt a compromise between the two factions last Friday has met with cooperation from the objecting faculty members, however, the AFT has within the past hour refused this group's entry into a meeting between the two sides. As always, students who are most affected by these problems are given no opportunity for representation.

Student feeling on campus is very high and we greatly fear violent student action if this matter is not resolved. Furthermore, such an atmosphere is definitely not conducive to learning, and that is the goal of every student in an educational institution.

This only emphasizes our concern that students should be involved in present and any future negotiations between unions and administration on college campuses statewide. We would like your support, in concept, of our proposal to alter the Alaska State Public Employees Act to include students, by law, in collective bargaining.

STUDENT LIASON FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Kathy Burgess
KATHY BURGESS, CHAIRMAN

Dan Cocklin
DAN COCKLIN

Jay Brown
JAY BROWN, CO-CHAIRMAN

Robert Heasley
ROBERT HEASLEY

Richard J. Williams
Steven E. Clark

Audrey A. Brown, Vice-President Anchorage Student Govt (USUAA)

Steve Dyak

James H. Smith, Reg USUAA
Gary M. Olsen

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED AS
A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL FILE.

325 - Union } in arbitration, was \$100 / ~~month~~ year.
315 - Non Union }

Why couldn't non-union vote an agency fee.

AFT Alaska Community Colleges Proposed Budget

Attach to SB 76
amendment

~~file~~ SB 76

3 Major Grievances @ \$5,000 each	\$ 15,000.
15 Minor Grievances @ \$750 each	11,250.
President's Release (one course, two semesters)	5,000.
Transportation @ \$600/mo.	7,200.
Per Capita	6,000.
Paper and Publicity @ \$100/mo.	1,200.
Communications and Social @ \$100/mo.	1,200.
Debt Amortization	16,500.

U. has not taken stand re-termination date
Termination April 1

TOTAL

\$63,350.

March 14, 1975

ALASKA COMMUNITY COLLEGES FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

LOCAL 2404 AFFILIATED WITH AFL-CIO

2533 PROVIDENCE DRIVE ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503

Senate Members
Alaska Senate Finance Committee
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99301

Dear Senators:

Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers wish to thank you for this opportunity to present our suggestions for revisions to Senate Bill No. 76. We feel that our calculations are more broadly based in fact than those of the University administration (Hullinger report: Supporting Detail, Feb. 28), and we hope that our figures because they are fairly well refined, will be useful to you in computing actual dollar appropriations. In our attached report each contract cost is itemized adjacent to the University projected cost so that differentials can easily be identified.

We have attempted to present both the data bases from which our figures were abstracted, and an outline of the computations themselves, in an effort to assist you in understanding the motivation behind our proposals. Copies of supportive data are enclosed.

Because of financial problems which have occurred within the University in the past, we suggest that funds appropriated in this bill be earmarked strictly for expenditure within the Alaska community college bargaining unit. Any transferability provisions should be limited, and preferably limited explicitly to a particular community college.

We would be happy to make ourselves available in Juneau to present this information and explain it to the Finance Committee, if you would so desire. As much advance notice as possible would be greatly appreciated, but we can probably be present on 48 hour notice. Please feel free to call any of us at any time to provide any explanations which would be helpful to you.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to present our suggestions. We hope you find them helpful.

Edie Lynch, President, ACCFT Local 2404

Clark Corbridge, ACCFT Chief Negotiator

Joe Connors, Vice President, ACCFT

Ralph Mc Grath, ACCFT Negotiator

Attached:

Office Need Survey (Pond Report)
Summer Session Study (Connors Report)

SENATE BILL NO. 76

ALASKA COMMUNITY COLLEGES' FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

COST ANALYSIS

<u>COST ITEMS</u>	<u>UNION</u> <u>FY 75</u>	<u>UNIV.</u> <u>FY 75</u>	<u>UNION</u> <u>FY 76</u>	<u>UNIV.</u> <u>FY 76</u>
Cost of negotiations	0.0	14.9	11.6	14.9
Formal Grievance Procedures	9.0	70.0	18.0	105.0
Travel	2.4	1.7	7.2	5.1
Relocation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Site Visitation	5.7	5.7	103.0	17.1
Offices	233.1	35.0	68.8	35.0
Clerical Support	0.0	0.0	43.2	0.0
Substitutes	54.6	54.6	125.3	136.5
Overloads	64.4	56.7	450.5	125.0
Summer Employment	472.0	0.0	1,486.7	56.7
Less than Full Time Employed	8.5	8.5	0.0	17.0
Retraining	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Placement & Salary Increase	624.1	566.4	4,978.2 ††	682.1
Area Cost of Living	111.6	109.2	135.5	109.2
Fringe Benefits	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Parking	0.0	8.0	0.0	12.0
Lounge	3.5	3.5	1.0	1.0
Continuing Education	0.0	12.9	0.0	33.5
Professional Leave	0.0	0.0	101.4	98.7
Annual Leave	325.4	66.1	414.8	150.0
Checkoff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Union President Release	2.1	2.3	6.5	4.6
FY 76 Univ. Salary Adjustment				251.4
Cost of Living Escalater	292.9	*	995.7	*
TOTALS	2,209.3	1,015.5 *	8,947.4 ††	1,854.8 *
	<u>UNION</u> <u>FY 75</u>	<u>UNIV.</u> <u>FY 75</u>	<u>UNION</u> <u>FY 76</u>	<u>UNIV.</u> <u>FY 76</u>

* The University made no projection for the Cost of Living Escalater and the Union estimate is based on a 7 1/2 % for FY 75 and 20 % for FY 76.

†† The Union figure cited here is the TOTAL COST for bargaining unit member salaries for FY 76. (or is included in the final totals for FY 76.)

Cost of Negotiations UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: The Union does not feel the University projected cost of 14,900 is accurate or justified. Since 80% of the bargaining unit members are from Anchorage and the contract calls for negotiations to be held in Anchorage it seems inappropriate that "3 persons traveling from outside Anchorage have to fly in 30 times". Selection of Anchorage negotiators and negotiation sessions of a longer duration would alleviate much of this administrative cost. The costs cited are purely administrative.

UNION PROPOSAL:

That 2 of the 3 University negotiators be from the Anchorage area and that no more than 10 trips are needed for outside travel. Therefore:

FY 75--No cost, negotiations are over with.

FY 76--One University negotiator	FY 75 TOTAL	0
outside Anchorage making		
10 trips @ average cost \$110 per trip	\$	1,100
Lodging and meals in Anchorage \$50 per day X 30 days		1,500
Cost for 3 Union negotiators substitute teacher (Provided for in the contract)		
3 (negotiators) X 100 (sub. pay) X 30 (days)		9,000
Cost for 3 University negotiators should be absorbed as part of their contractual agreement. We calculate that this would be in excess of 13,800.		
	FY 76 TOTAL	11,600

Grievance and Complaint Procedure UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: The contract states that the University-Union objective is "to encourage the prompt and informal resolution of complaints . . ." and thus we find University costs to be excessive--their costs suggest that grievances always go to the final remedy of arbitration. Interestingly, the University's projected cost of \$70,000 is in excess of the total monies that will be collected by the Union for its entire operating costs during the life of the contract!

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--One major grievance @ \$5,000	\$	5,000
Five minor grievances @ \$750		3,750
Travel \$250		250
	FY 75 TOTAL	9,000
FY 76--Two major grievances @ \$5,000	\$	10,000
10 minor grievances @ 750		7,500
Travel \$500		500
	FY 76 TOTAL	18,000

REACTION: The University management will control this cost by their assignment of bargaining unit members to travel. However, traveling 25 times is unrealistic in view of the 15 week semester with classes meeting 2 Xs a week. Correct figure should be at least 30 trips per bargaining unit members.

The majority of travel will be done in Anchorage and between ACC and the military base campuses at Ft. Richardson and Elmendorf. Thus the average round trip is between 20-30 miles. We use 25 as the realistic average miles and not 8. Also we note that the University is currently paying 16 cents a mile and not 14 as they cite.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--20 unit members traveling 30 times at an estimated distance of 25 miles X 16 cents	2,400
FY 75 TOTAL	2,400
FY 76--60 unit members traveling 30 times at an estimated distance of 25 miles X 16 cents	7,200
FY 76 TOTAL	7,200

16 6.5 Relocation UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: Union supports the University analysis

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--no cost	FY 75 TOTAL	0
FY 76--no cost	FY 76 TOTAL	0

REACTION: Again the University management will control this cost by their assignment of bargaining unit members to site visitation. To adequately service the needs of outlying communities we recommend 48 such courses (average of one for every four unit members).

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--Union accepts the University cost	<u>5,670</u>
FY 75 TOTAL	5,670
FY 76--Estimate 48 courses @ 3 credits each = 144 credit hours. 144 X 1/30 X 21,454 (ave. salary) =	<u>102,960</u>
FY 76 TOTAL	102,980

* note: Union average salary figure is set at 21,454 not 18,900 as the University projects. Our figures are based on Salary Placement report and are precise.

17 6.3 Faculty Offices--UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: Contract language provides that "where space and building design permit, the University will provide every bargaining unit member with a secure office. . . . The University agrees to request and spend funds as provided by the legislature for the provision of additional secure offices for all bargaining unit members". Based on the Union's study of office needs (see attached Bond Report) the following costs are projected:

FY 75--Union cost is an additional \$233,100 above the University already spent \$35,000.	<u>233,100</u>
FY 75 TOTAL	233,100
FY 76--Cost of an additional 39 offices based on University projected increase of 39 new faculty hires. (39 X \$1,764 estm.)	<u>68,796</u>
FY 76 TOTAL	68,796

18 6.9 Clerical Support UNION PROPOSAL

REACTION: Based on the University statement we assume that the University does not need additional funds for clerical support and is adhering to the contract language " providing clerical support at the rate of approximately one for every ten unit members". However for FY 76 an increase of 39 faculty means an additional 4 clerical support staff to maintain 10-1.

FY 75--Union accepts University no cost position	0
FY 75 TOTAL	0
FY 76--Add 4 clerical staff @ 10,000 plus 8% fringe benefits.	<u>43,200</u>
FY 76 TOTAL	43,200

REACTION: Current University policy allows for accrual of 1 1/2 days per month per faculty member or 13 1/2 days per academic year (9mo.) The University cost is inadequate as it assumes that the average bargaining unit member will not use more than 74% of his/her accrued sick leave (ie 10 days divided by 13 1/2 = 74%) Union also feels that \$25.00 per hour paid to substitute is insufficient based on hours spent in preparation for teaching. Therefore we recommend \$35.00.

UNION RESPONSE:

FY 75--Union accepts University cost analysis but suggest it be audited at end of this fiscal year. FY 75 TOTAL 54,600

FY 76--221 unit members (includes anticipated increase of 39 faculty as University has projected) X 12 credit hours per week
 X 35 (dollar cost of substitute)
 X 5.25 (1/2 of 13 1/2 days accrued)
 X 5 (5 days) FY 76 TOTAL 325,307

REACTION: The University statement of 30 courses for FY 75 is totally inconsistent with the prior practice clause of the negotiated contract and is inconsistent with past offerings of overloads. Since most academic faculty are on 9 month contracts, this would greatly affect the community colleges' summer sessions since they are offered on the overload basis. Funding of this is critical in both 75 and 76. Univ. error in cost.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--30 courses X 3 credit hours X 1/30 (negotiated contract rate) X 21,465 (FY 75 average salary) FY 75 TOTAL 64,363

FY 76--Union projects a more realistic need for 200 courses per year (an end to self-support student rifeoff)
 200 courses X 3 cr. hrs. X 1/30 (negotiated contract rate) X 22,526 (FY 76 average salary) FY 76 TOTAL 450,534

Summer Employment UNION PROPOSAL

REACTION: In an apparent retaliatory move 1975 Summer Session offerings have been intentionally cut back excessively (see attached Union findings) from the 1974 level. We propose that a maintenance level of offerings be provided for summer of 1975. At ACC in summer 1974 alone there were 192 courses offered. The Union proposes 220 courses statewide in both FY 75 and FY 76 Summer session. Cost as follows:

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--220 (courses) X 1 month (only June 75 would be charged to the 75 budget) X 3 credit hours
X 1/30 X 21,454 (ave. salary FY 75).

FY 75 TOTAL 471,988

FY 76--220 (courses X 2 months (July and August 75 would be charged to the 76 budget) X 3 credit hours
X 1/30 X 22,526 (ave. salary FY 76). Total 991,144

and

220 (courses) X 1 month (only June 76 would be charged to the 76 budget) X 3 credit hours
X 1/30 X 22,526 (ave. Salary FY 76). Total 495,572

FY 76 TOTAL 1486,716

Less than Full-Time Employment

REACTION: Union accepts for the FY 75 the University cost of 8,520. We suggest that for FY 76 it is more appropriate to budget for these positions as new hires at the full bargaining unit members salary and therefore find it unnecessary to appropriate any funds for FY 76 in this category.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--Accept University cost projection

FY 75 TOTAL 8,520

FY 76--No cost as this should be absorbed
in new hires.

FY 76 TOTAL 0

REACTION: The University position is inaccurate and unclear. The Labor-Management Committee (provided for in the contract) has to date received at least 14 notices of "University intent not to rehire for FY 76". Retraining of these individuals as provided for in the contract is apparently viewed by the University as a no-cost item.

UNION PROPOSAL: Assuming that the University intends to fulfill its contractual obligations regarding retraining of faculty sent notices of "intent not to rehire" the Union raises no objection at this time.

REACTION: Union agrees with sentence one. However, cost analysis is erroneous. Our basis is taken from the calculated figures of the Union-University Salary Placement Committee.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--Sept. 1, 1974--June 30, 1975 (and includes the 16% fringe benefit cost)

FY 75 TOTAL \$624,042 *

FY 76--July 1, 1975--June 30, 1976 (and includes the 16% fringe benefit cost) *

FY 76 TOTAL \$4,978,246 *

*note: The FY 76 figures includes the estimated 39 new hires projected by the University.

* Figures worked up from the Union-University Salary Placement Committee study indicate that salary increases from Sept. 1, 1974 through Dec. 31, 1974 total \$125,924. Increases from January 1, 1975 through June 30, 1975 total \$412,044. These figures are added, and then increased by 16% to reflect the cost of fringe benefits. Thus the total salary INCREASE for FY 1975 is \$624,042.

** Assuming one vertical increment and no horizontal movement per bargaining unit member, the average projected salary for a unit member in FY 1976, including fringe benefits, is \$22,526. Mullinger's University figures project 221 unit members for FY 1976. Multiplying these two we get \$22,526 X 221=\$4,978,246 as the total cost for bargaining unit member salaries for FY 1976.

REACTION: In calculating Cost of Living the Union used the exact data provided by the Union-University Salary Placement Committee. Figures are included for only those campuses that are entitled to cost-of-living differential

UNION PROPOSAL:

<u>FY 75</u>	<u>TOTAL SALARIES</u>	<u>AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>COMMUNITY COLLEGE</u>	<u>AT 1-1-75</u>	<u>FACTOR</u>	
Kodiak	73,540	.142	10,300
Kuskokwim	149,732	.428	64,420
Ketchikan	138,096	.006	828
Sitka	56,484	.100	5,648
Juneau	211,320	.071	<u>15,003</u>
		Total	96,199
Plus 16 % fringe benefits			
		FY 75 TOTAL	111,590 (9 MONTH)*

* The Union is investigating with the chief arbitrator (Tom Mannix) responsible for the contract award to find out if the Cost of Living Differential is effective for 9 or 5 months. We will report on that at the time of the hearings on Senate Bill 76. We are also including the cost based on a 5 month application

Figures based on a 5 month period:

Total 61,994

Plus 16% 9,994

FY 75 TOTAL 71,913 (5 MONTH)

FY 76

111,590 x $\frac{222 \text{ (unit members incl. 39 new hires)}}{182 \text{ (unit members previous year)}}$

FY 76 TOTAL 135,502 (9 MONTH)

Fringe Benefits UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: Union accepts the University cost for FY 75. However, the contract does provide for the possibility of a study committee to make recommendations regarding changes in the fringe benefits. This could become a cost item.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--No cost anticipated	FY 75 TOTAL	0
FY 76--No cost anticipated	FY 76 TOTAL	0



Parking UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: We question the necessity of this expenditure (unless the University intends to install winter electrical outlet plug ins) and note that no provision is made for the income the University derives from the \$30.00 per semester faculty use fee. We suggest a legislative audit of this item to assure that the funds have been appropriately disbursed.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--Cost of installing parking gates, fence and maintenance might necessitate an initial cost of University estimated 8,000? After that any additional costs should be absorbed in parking fees collected from faculty.	FY 75 TOTAL	0
FY76--Any additional costs should be absorbed in monies collected from faculty parking fee.		0



Faculty Lounge UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: Union agrees with the University estimate and expects to see the funds allocated for that purpose.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--Cost of furnishing and equipping faculty lounge	FY 75 TOTAL	3,500
FY 76--Additional furnishings	FY 76 TOTAL	1,000

33 8.6d Continuing Education UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: The Union does not feel that there is any expense to the University in the continuing education provision. The contract specifically states "without tuition cost".

UNION PROPOSAL

FY 75	No cost to the University	FY 75 TOTAL	0
FY 76	No cost to the University	FY 76 TOTAL	0

33 9.1 Professional Development Leave UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: The Union agrees that there should be no added cost for FY 75. However, there will be a cost in FY 76.

UNION PROPOSAL

FY 75	No additional cost	FY 75 TOTAL	0
FY 76	9 bargaining unit members Xs \$22,526 (ave. salary) Xs 1/2 (receive up to 1/2 salary) =	FY 76 TOTAL	101,367

37 9.3 Annual Leave UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: The negotiated contract states that:
" bargaining unit members shall be permitted . . . to accrue . . . paid leave. Maximum accumulation: is 30 working days. A maximum of 30 days . . . unused accrued leave shall be paid off at the termination of employment.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75	182 bargaining unit members X \$21,454 (ave. salary) X <u>15 (days of leave)</u> 180 (Work days per contract)	FY 75 TOTAL	325,386
FY 76	221 bargaining unit members X \$22,526 (ave. salary) X <u>15 (days of leave)</u> 180 (work days per contract)	FY 76 TOTAL	414,854

Union assumes 100% funding for all annual leave which possibly could be accrued in FY 75 and FY 76.

38 10.3 Checkoff UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: Union agrees with University position.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--Cost absorbed in payroll office	FY 75 TOTAL	0
FY 76--Cost absorbed in payroll office	FY 76 TOTAL	0

39 10.6 Released Time UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: Union costs are based on actual figures for FY 75. FY 76 figure is based on projected cost as the candidates for President are already nominated.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--Union President 1/5 annual salary and benefits 2,015 (mo. salary) X 4 1/2 (months) X 1.16 (fringe benefits) X 1/5 (release)	FY 75 TOTAL	2,104
FY 76--Union President 1/5 annual salary and benefits 3,114 (mo. salary) X 9 (months) X 1.16 (fringe benefits) X 1/5 (release)	FY 76 TOTAL	6,502

31 8.3 Cost of Living Escalator UNION ESTIMATE

REACTION: The University made no projection cost for this item. The Union made its projection on a 7 1/2 % for FY 75 and a 20 % for FY 76. We emphasize that this IS A PROJECTED COST. When data from the Bureau of Labor is made available we will update this information.

UNION PROPOSAL:

FY 75--7 1/2 (estm. % increase) X 9 (9 mo. academic year) X \$2,384 (ave. no. salary includes fringe benefits) X 182 (no. of bargaining unit members).	FY 75 TOTAL	292,874
--	-------------	---------

FY 76--20 % (estm. % increase) X 9 (9 mo. academic year) X \$2,503 (ave. no. salary includes fringe benefits) X 221 (no. of bargaining unit members, includes Univ. projected increase of 39 faculty).	FY 76 TOTAL	995,693
--	-------------	---------



2/21/75

TO: Labor-Management Committee

FROM: Bargaining Unit Members Office Survey Committee

Roberta Pond, Chairperson
Paula Guetschow
Bill Mackey
Amy Bollenbach
Doug Veltre

The attached survey of offices of Bargaining Unit Members is complete to our knowledge. A copy of the survey was sent to Broderick, O'Mahoney, Irany, and directors of all outlying community colleges requesting that they verify the information listed for their people. Responses have been received from Ketchikan, Kuskokwin and Sitka to date.

Consistent with the contract all faculty members must be provided with offices that are lockable and secure.

Here are our recommendations regarding office size and placement:

I. Recommended Size and Equipment:

- A. Single Person: a standard private office must be 150 sq. ft., have floor to ceiling walls and exterior window. When an exterior window is not possible, the office must have an interior window of at least 20 sq. ft.
- B. Two people: an office for 2 people must provide 150 sq. ft. per person and a visual barrier to provide simulance of privacy within office. Walls and windows will be the same as in individual office.
- C. We cannot recommend offices for more than 2 people because all privacy and security would be forfeited in such an office.
- D. Each Bargaining Unit Member must be provided with the following equipment: desk, executive chair, 4 drawer lockable file cabinet, telephone, approximately 30 ft. of book shelves, 2 extra chairs.

II. We realize that before all Bargaining Unit Members can be provided standard offices, an interim period will elapse during which it will be necessary to have faculty in substandard offices. The following recommendations apply to these facilities:

- A. Size
 - 1 person - private 100 sq.ft.
 - 2 people - 225 sq.ft.
 - 3 people - 350 sq.ft.
 - 4 people - 475 sq.ft.
- B. Equipment - same as for standard offices.

We recognize that faculty having offices which do not meet these recommendations may prefer to wait for the new offices rather than move to another substandard office which meets the recommended size requirements. However, the University should make every effort to move faculty who do not wish to remain in offices below the recommended square footage.

III. Placement

- A. No faculty member shall be moved from a locked^{able} office to an unlocked office.
- B. Faculty currently in standard offices which are acceptable to them shall remain in those offices.
- C. The committee will assemble a list of faculty in substandard offices in order of seniority. As offices are made ready for occupancy they will be offered to list of faculty in order. Faculty members may decline an office without prejudice; faculty members' names remain on the list at the same place.
- D. No faculty shall be either assigned an office or moved without consultation.
- E. Half-time and part-time faculty members should be provided office space after all full-time faculty have acceptable offices.

OFFICES TO BE CONSTRUCTED

Criteria for temporary adequate office: 1 person (private) - 100 sq. ft.; 2 people - 222 sq. ft.
3 people - 350 sq. ft.; 4 people - 475 sq. ft.; 5 people - 600 sq. ft.

Criteria for standard office: 1 person - 150 sq. ft.; 2 people - 300 sq. ft.

Number of People
to be Relocated for:

Number of People to
be Relocated for:

<u>Office Location</u>		<u>Adequate Office</u>	<u>Standard Office</u>	<u>Office Location</u>		<u>Adequate Office</u>	<u>Standard Office</u>
C108	(90 sq. ft.)	OK	1	C212		1	2
C103	(99 sq. ft.)	OK	1	E	Main? Modular	1	2
C206	(99 sq. ft.)	OK	1	A104		2	2
K204	(modular)	1	1	F ?	Dopperfied & Eid	1	2
K204	(modular)	1	1		Merrill Field		
K214		OK	1	A	between 204 & 206	1	2
K204	(modular)	1	1	A	between 206 & 208	1	1
K204	(modular)	1	1	A209		1	2
K204	(modular)	1	1		J Previts/Neilsen	1	1
B-SW	(storage)	1	1	G	Pearson/Pannone	2	2
B-NE	(storage)	1	1	D104		2	3
C108		1	1	C213		2	2
C	(between 201 & 203)	1	1	E	Miller, Robinson, Lohman	2	3
K215A		1	1		K140A modular	OK	4
K202C		OK	1	D101		4	4
B102		2	2	C210		3	4
*K206A	(will be faculty lounge)	1	1	C214		3	4
K104A		OK	2	A207	Knisley	OK	1
C106		2	3	A207	Gripne	OK	1
K111		OK	2	H ?	Hotchkiss	1	1
K140B		1	2	A207	Congdon/Miller	1	2
A211	(Appel? BUM?)	OK	1	J. Bldg.		3	3
A211	(Medley)	1	1				
A211	(Bohner - BUM?)	OK	1				
C211		1	1				
C210	(private)	OK	1				

<u>Office Location</u>	<u>Adequate Office</u>	<u>Standard Office</u>
A.B.E. Downtown	3	3
Ft. Rich	4	4
<u>Ketchikan</u>		
Library	OK	2
Other	3	3
<u>Kodiak</u>		
	4	4
<u>Kuskokwim</u>		
	11	11
<u>Sitka</u>		
	3	3
<u>Juneau</u>		
Campus	1	5
Downtown	3	3
A.B.E.	3	3
<u>Kenai</u>		
	5	5
<u>Mat-Su</u>		
	1	2

SUMMARY OF NUMBER OF OFFICES NEEDED:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Number of adequate</u>		<u>Number of Standard</u>	
	<u>Offices</u>	100 sq. feet B.U.M.	<u>Offices</u>	150 sq. feet. B.U.M.
<u>A.C.C.</u>				
A. Building	7		14	
B. Building	4		4	
C. Building	13		22	
D. Building	6		7	
E. Building	3		5	
F. Building	1		2	
G. Building	2		2	
H. Building	1		1	
J. Building	1		1	
K. Building	11		21	
ABE Downtown	3		3	
Ft. Rich	4		4	
<u>SUB TOTALS</u>				
A.C.C.	56		86	
Ketchikan	3		5	
Kodiak	4		4	
Kuskokwim	11		11	
Sitka	3		3	
Juneau	7		13	
Kenai	5		5	
Mat-Su	1		2	
<u>TOTALS</u>	89		127	

ESTIMATED COSTS

Cost: (Estimates received from U.A.A. Planning Office)

Construction for 10 X 10 = \$1176 per office
Construction for 10 X 15 = 1764 per office
Removing Walls of K Building = \$20 per lineal foot

Cost of Needed Offices for B.U.M. (Estimated)

Adequate Offices 89 X 1200 = \$106,800
Standard Offices 127 X 1800 = 228,600
Removal of Walls 20 X 225 = 4,500

SUMMER CLASS OFFERINGS SLASHED

Report by Joe Connors

Various administrative sources at Anchorage Community College have expressed that they are expecting a rather sharp decrease in enrollment this summer (over previous summers.) As one reviews the "unofficial" offerings, I can easily see why their prognostication will no doubt come true. However, the problem goes deeper than the reduction in offerings and includes: (1) the failure to utilize input (faculty and student), (2) increased class size, and (3) poor time assignments for classes.

The figures speak for themselves:

COURSE OFFERINGS BY DIVISION

DIVISION	SUMMER 74	SUMMER 75	% CHANGE
Academic	80	41	-49
Career Education	57	70	+23
Community Services	55	53	-4

Within the Academic Division, one sees that there are decreases in such areas as:

DISCIPLINE	SUMMER 74	SUMMER 75
Art	4	1
Biology	3	1
Chemistry	1	0
Economics	3	2
French	2	0
Geography	1	0
History	10	3
Math	7	5
Music	2	0
Philosophy	3	1
Political Science	1	2
Sociology	7	4
Speech	7	4
Theatre	4	0

In an attempt to show that it's not all decrease, one can see a few increase; within the Career Ed and Community Services Divisions in such areas as:

<u>DISCIPLINE</u>	<u>SUMMER 74</u>	<u>SUMMER 75</u>
Corrections	3	5
Electronics	10	16
Law Science	3	6
Police Administration	5	6

I realize that these figures are subject to some error. However, the trend is obvious, regardless of what the specifics are. There is a rather large decrease in summer offerings in the Academic Division, while Community Services is remaining about level, and Career Education is increasing. These trends are very interesting when one goes the next step and examines how many students took courses in each of these divisions last summer. Utilizing a copy of the Course Enrollment Report, U of A Southcentral Region, dated 3/30/74, I came up with the following:

<u>DIVISION</u>	<u>STUDENTS ENROLLED</u>	<u>STUDENT CONTACT HOURS</u>
Academics	1,721	5,096
Career Education	534	2,024
Community Service	413	740

FANTASTIC! A new philosophy in education must be emerging which has as its basis that a good summer offering should include reducing the number of courses that attract students and offering more courses that students don't sign up for.

This brings me to my second major area, those issues that compounded the situation and no doubt will add to reduced enrollment this summer.

First, the lack of faculty input. In the discipline of Speech, we had

received requests from two health-occupation programs to offer certain courses and at specific times so that their students could enroll. Vickie Christie (Speech teacher) submitted a memo that included these requests. The administration developed the Speech schedule and the product was four courses in Speech, not one of which matched any of the six that Vickie had asked for. We have unofficially heard that our memo was a day late for the deadline. Very interesting, when other changes have been made after the deadline. I view this rationale as an excuse, but a poor one at best, for not accepting faculty input.

Another example reflecting this same arrogant behavior in developing the schedule is the treatment of the Instructional Advisory Committee formed as a requirement of the Community College faculty contract. At its first meeting last month, the Dean presented the "unofficial" summer schedule. That was on a Thursday afternoon, and the Committee had until Friday to respond. The Committee made various requests in terms of more courses being needed. A couple were added; however, for the most part the decision had already been made and the "unofficial" schedule stood.

As students you should also realize that class size has been increased almost across the board from 30/35 students to 45. This means that you will receive less time and attention by the teacher, since the class size has been increased approximately 50%. While this might be OK for some courses, I feel it will be a disaster in Speech, where individual speaking assignments are a must—we will probably have to reduce the number of assignments proportionally.

Third, another aspect that you should find interesting is the time scheduling of classes. It looks like a majority of the courses in the Academic Division will be in the evening; there is even a speech course from 8:30 to 10:00 p.m., certainly a poor time for students to stand up and do their thing, after they

have either worked or gone to school all day and have to again work the next day. I feel the time scheduling is not responsive to student desires but rather to administrative convenience (it's easier to find part-time teachers from the community to teach at night.)

The total summer schedule is a disaster and is an obvious attempt by the administration to prove their point--enrollment will be low. As a student, you will find the results disastrous, as you will have difficulty finding courses that you need and want and that you can take. However, while this poor offering exists, the administration will be going on their merry way this summer at a cost in excess of \$133,000.00 to run these courses.

Students, stand up and be heard; this is an issue that you can do something about. First, contact student government and urge them to get involved. Second, phone or telegraph your legislators and let them know how you feel about this. Third, contact the governor's office here in town at 272-1478.

C O U R S E S O F F E R E D

CATEGORY	DISCIPLINE	SUMMER 74	SUMMER 75
3	ABE	32	34
2	ACCT	8	7
1	ANTH	4	3
1	ART	4	1
2	AUTO	8	3
2	BA	4	3
3	BS	12	1
1	BIO	3	1
1	CHEM	1	0
2	CIS	5	3
3	CORR	3	5
2	ET	10	16
1	ECON	3	2
1	ENG	3	9
1	FREN	2	0
2	FST	5	5
1	GEOG	1	0
2	HE	1	3
1	HIST	10	3
3	LS	3	6
2	MA	0	3
1	MATH	7	5
2	MATT	2	1
2	MEDT	10	9
1	MUS	2	0
3	PA	5	7
1	PHIL	3	1
1	PS	4	2
1	PSY	9	6
1	SOC	7	4
1	SPCH	7	4
1	THR	5	0
2	SS	4	17
		192	164

COURSE OFFERINGS BY DIVISION

CATEGORY	SUMMER 74	SUMMER 75
(1) Academics	80	41
(2) Career Ed.	57	70
(3) Community Service	55	53
	<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
	192	164

BARGAINING UNIT MEMBERS BY DIVISION

Academics	64
Career Ed.	48
Community Services	11
Counseling	5
Outlying Colleges	50
	<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
	178

BARGAINING UNIT MEMBERS AND CONTRACT LENGTHS

Less than 9 months	-	8
9 months	-	129
10 or 11 months	-	8
12 months	-	31
		<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
		178

BARGAINING UNIT MEMBERS
CONTRACT LENGTHS BY DIVISION

ACADEMICS		
Less than 9 months	-	2
9 months	-	59
10 or 11 months	-	
12 months	-	3
		<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
		64
CAREER ED.		
Less than 9 months	-	2
9 months	-	24
10 or 11 months	-	2
12 months	-	20
		<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
		48

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Less than 9 months	-	2	
9 months	-	7	
10 or 11 months	-	0	
12 months	-	2	<u>11</u>

OUTLYING COLLEGES

Less than 9 months	-	0	
9 months	-	33	
10 or 11 months	-	5	
12 months	-	2	<u>40</u>

ENROLLMENT SUMMER 74 BY DISCIPLINE

DISCIPLINE	ENROLLMENT	STUDENT CREDIT HOURS
ABE	148	0
ACCT	218	654
ANTH	63	189
ART	92	276
AUTO	113	276
BA	141	423
BS	78	212
BIO	60	185
CHEM	90	272
CIS	51	153
CORR	24	24
ET	72	227
ECON	68	204
ENG	266	803
FREN	39	116
FST	36	108
GEOG	5	9
HE	15	30
HIST	263	795
LS	33	117
MA	0	0
MATI	137	411
MATI	1	3
MEDT	90	270
MUS	25	75
PA	54	162
PHIL	70	210
PS	75	225
PSY	244	732
SOC	175	525
SPCH	142	426
THR	30	90
SS	2	2

ENROLLMENT SUMMER 74 BY DIVISION

DIVISION	ENROLLMENT	STUDENT CONTACT HOURS	%
Academics	1,721	5,096	65%
Continuing Ed.	534	2,024	36%
Community Services	418	740	9%
			<u>100%</u>

Non-SUM Expense for Summer 75 at ACC

Dean's Office		
Dean	9,023	
Other	8,662	17,685
Career Ed		
Director	6,023	
Asst. Dir.	4,005	
Other	17,740	27,768
Community Services		
Director	3,725	
Counselor	4,851	
Other	5,549	14,125
ACADEMIC		
Broderick	6,931	
Ehling	5,539	
Roberts	5,983	
Sears	3,831	
Other	20,841	43,261
CONTINUING ED.		
Director	5,748	
Other	20,923	26,671

GRAND TOTAL \$123,097
 Admin. at ACC for Summer 75 from
 Dean to Directors Level (Note - with
 one exception does not include Unit
 Heads & Program Coordinator Expenses)

THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED AS
A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL FILE.

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT(S) MAY NOT FILM
LEGIBLY BECAUSE OF POOR QUALITY OF THE
ORIGINAL.

SBW

To: All ACCFT Bargaining Unit Members

From: ACCFT Executive Board

Subject: Retraction and Apology

The notice you received Wednesday, March 10, pertaining to ACCFT policy on the subject of termination and the agency fee contained the following remarks:

"The Union has considered the students' request carefully and has adopted the following policy:

...2. The bargaining unit member will commit himself/herself to cease immediately the utterance of inflammatory remarks regarding the Union or the agency fee."

This part of the statement (2.) did not and does not accurately report Union policy. The Executive Board's discussion clearly reflected a generally felt desire that such rhetoric would cease for obvious reasons. It was not, however, a part of the motion passed by the Executive Board that continuation of service was to be made contingent on such a commitment. It was not even our intention to ask for a cessation of such "utterances."

It is not the intention of the Union to interfere with anyone's right to the free expression of his/her views or to in any way say way on anyone's academic freedom.

To all bargaining unit members we therefore extend our sincere apology for the consternation this release has caused.

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) MAY NOT FILM
LEGIBLY BECAUSE OF POOR QUALITY OF THE
ORIGINAL.

8B76

ALASKA COMMUNITY COLLEGES FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

LOCAL 2404 AFFILIATED WITH AFL-CIO

2533 PROVIDENCE DRIVE, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503

E. Schuster

TO: All Bargaining Unit Members

FROM: Edie Lynch, ACCFT President

SUBJECT: Check-off

DATE: 2/26/75

Please sign both of the attached deduction authorizations. The first authorization is for the monthly agency fee, which will be deducted beginning with the March 31, 1975 paycheck. The second authorization is for the retroactive agency fee from August 5, 1974 through February 28, 1975. The retroactive fee will be the amount still owed to the ACCFT on April 1, 1975.

The Community College Faculty Contract states "all bargaining unit members shall, as a condition of employment or of continued employment, provide the University with a written authorization to deduct from each paycheck the Union service fee."

These authorization forms must be returned to Edie Lynch, Dave Lamborn, or the Southcentral Payroll Office no later than Friday, March 7, 1975. A list of all bargaining unit members who have not submitted these authorizations by that date will be forwarded to the Comptroller of the University of Alaska for appropriate action.

Name _____
(Please Print)

Social Security No. _____

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA DEDUCTION AUTHORIZATION

To: University of Alaska

Subject to the limitations of applicable Alaska and federal laws, and pursuant to section 10.2 (checkoff) of the collective bargaining agreement between the University of Alaska and Local 2404 Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers, I hereby authorize deduction of the service fee of the Union from my pay.

Date Signed

Signature of Employee

Received _____
Comptroller

Date

Name _____
(Please Print)

Social Security No. _____

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA DEDUCTION AUTHORIZATION

To: University of Alaska

Subject to the limitations of applicable Alaska and federal laws, and pursuant to section 10.2 (checkoff) of the collective bargaining agreement between the University of Alaska and Local 2404 Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers, I hereby authorize deduction of the applicable service fee from August 5 through February 28 from the check for my retroactive pay increase.

Date Signed

Signature of Employee

Received _____
Comptroller

Date

Note: No amount shown.

SB 76

7337 Old Seward Highway
Anchorage, AK 99502
February 26, 1975

Ms. Edie Lynch, President
AFT Local 2404
Anchorage Community College
Anchorage, AK 99504

Dear Ms. Lynch:

I have been asked as one of the spokespersons from our association to write this letter requesting clarification on the subject of agency fees. We respectfully request that you send us the following information:

1. The amount of the fee non-union members who are also in the bargaining unit will be assessed by your organization for the period prior to January 1, 1975.
2. The amount of fees you anticipate will be assessed for the periods after January 1, 1975, against non-union members, the monthly amount, the months of the year those fees will be assessed, and the total for the contract period.
3. A rationalization for the above amounts including past and anticipated costs so we can justify benefits conferred.
4. The date you have set as a deadline for payment of these fees, and a note as to whether you intend to request the administration to terminate bargaining unit members who have not made payment or arranged for future payment; and if so, when you anticipate termination will be effective.

We respectfully request that the above information be sent so that we receive the information at least fifteen days before any deadline you have in mind in order that we will have time to make a decision that may drastically affect our professional careers.

Very truly yours,

Max A. Fonger, Spokesperson
Concerned Community College Faculty

ps

cc Dean Eugene Short
Provost Haines

SB76

ALASKA COMMUNITY COLLEGES FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

LOCAL 2404 AFFILIATED WITH AFL-CIO

2533 PROVIDENCE DRIVE, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503

RECEIVED
3-6-75 4:45 PM

March 6, 1975

Dear Mr. Fonger:

The letter which you sent last week has been thoroughly discussed with the Executive Board of Local 2404. The Committee has instructed me to make the following reply to your letter:

1. Bargaining Unit Members' fees have been set in accordance with an election, the results of which are being announced today. For the period prior to January 1, 1975, such fees will not exceed \$65 total. Fees assessed after January 1, 1975 will be \$35 per month, to be paid for the first nine months worked in any calendar year.
2. The fee schedule alternatives have been developed as a result of literally hundreds of man-hours of work. It would be impossible to give a complete rationale here.

Suffice it to say that even the maximum proposed figures reflect a quite conservative projection of the cost of providing for adequate communication with the community colleges outside of Anchorage, and of providing for Union assistance for bargaining unit members who become embroiled in the grievance procedure. Since this will be the first time the bargaining unit members will be living with a collective bargaining agreement, it would be impossible to do an objective justification of benefits conferred before the fact. The major benefits which can be known in advance to bargaining unit members who pay their fees are: a) A negotiated salary increase of approximately 30%. b) The protection of a very rapid grievance procedure, including a provision for binding arbitration as the last step.

3. The deadline which we have established for payment of the monthly agency fee (which must be delivered to the Union Treasurer in person or by certified mail by the 10th of each month) or for submission

5076

of a signed fee checkoff authorization in lieu of payment, is March 10, 1975. Bargaining unit members may either sign and submit the retroactive agency fee authorization form by March 10, 1975 or pay the retroactive agency fee to the Union Treasurer (in person or by certified mail) within 10 working days after the issuance of the retroactive paychecks to bargaining unit members.

It is our intent to require that the administration live up to the contract clause which says "...all members of the bargaining unit shall, as a condition of employment or of continued employment, pay to the Union a service fee..." (article 10.1, paragraph 1). We have been informed by the payroll office that deduction forms received by the payroll office on or before the 10th of the month can be processed for that month's paycheck. Therefore, we shall request termination of any bargaining unit member from whom we have neither received payment nor a dues checkoff authorization on or before the 10th of a given month. Such termination shall be effective the first working day of the following month.

We hope that this information will be of assistance to you, and that the decisions which you make will be the ones which are ultimately the best for you.

Sincerely,

Edie Lynch
Edie Lynch

SB 76

USUAA

2651 providence ave./anchorage, alaska 99504/phone (907) 272-3557

April 2, 1975

Dear Legislator:

We would like to thank you most sincerely for the time you allowed for us to meet with you last week concerning S.B. 76. Your response and expressed concern encouraged us in our endeavor to maintain academic freedom throughout our University system. Although we realize the problem with which you are confronted is certainly not easily resolved, we are confident you will take every measure necessary to uphold the high standards for which we are struggling.

Just to keep you informed with developments on campus regarding the ACCFT and non-union members and especially as this affects students, please allow us to note that the senate hearings held on campus Friday received a great deal of input from both union and non-union faculty. The students, however, were not as well informed (due to lack of time and diversity of students). However, of the total number of students who did speak, only one supported the agency shop clause presently appearing in the union contract. That one student is a wife of a union faculty member attending the college free of charge via the new contract.

The Senior College Faculty Association of UAA as well as the faculty association of the Fairbanks campus and the Arts & Letters Department of that campus have all issued statements supporting the academic freedom and rights of non-union members to remain free from the requirement to support the union in any way.

Beginning this past Monday an ad hoc committee of twenty students began circulating petitions demanding the union withdraw its agency shop clause from its contract. The results of this petition will be sent to you the first part of next week.

Our committee, the Student Government appointed Student Liaison for High Education Committee has documented at least one instance (there have been more, but documentation of such an issue is difficult) of a union faculty member threatening to lower the grade of a student if that person appeared to testify at the public hearings. Also, we have documentation of a union faculty member ending his formal lecture early in order to "informally" denounce those students who came to Juneau last week to speak out on S.B. 76

The officers and Board of Directors of the union have not-to this date- spoken to any member of this committee concerning their interest in resolving the threat to education which they and the administration endorsed. The Union officials have displayed absolutely no public interest in responding to the issue other than maintaining their grounds of being legally "within the law".

united students / university of alaska, anchorage // people getting things done

JB76

April 2, 1975

Page 2

We trust this communication will bring you up to date and may serve to keep you informed on our state's only community college choice.

Again, we were deeply impressed with your sincerity of response to us and trust our relationship will build in quality as we seek to guarantee our education will be free from mandates forbidding the freedom to learn that which we deny when we forbid the right to teach.

Sincerely,

Student Liaison for Higher Education

Jay Brown

Jay Brown

Kathy Burgess

Kathy Burgess

Dan Cocklin

Dan Cocklin

Robert Heasley

Robert Heasley