

UFF-FSU Budget Crisis Poll

December, 2008

This web-based poll of FSU bargaining unit faculty was opened and announced at approximately 1:20pm on Friday, December 12th, and closed at approximately 6:30pm on Tuesday, December 16th. Three hundred and seventy-one (371) responses were received. Nearly all responding individuals (369) answered the forced-choice question on furloughs, layoffs, pay rate reductions, or other. Most respondents (70%) commented on their response to this question, and a large number (42%) offered additional comments on the budget crisis. The results and comments (minimally edited) follow.

If cuts to core academic faculty and staff compensation costs are unavoidable, which do you prefer as the one best way to accomplish cost savings?

148	40%	Furloughs (mandatory unpaid leave)
78	21%	Layoffs
81	22%	Pay rate reductions
62	17%	Other

Please comment on your response to the previous question.

259 70%

Furloughs have the advantage that there is no danger that they lead to permanent pay reductions, and in addition they show what it would be like to operate with reduced personnel

I would rather see some sort of across the board pay cuts than see people or programs layed off. Perhaps some really highly paid administrators could absorb more of the cuts.

Mandatory LWOP [leave without pay] is the best way to save money, but note that it is problematic in that the savings are one-time -- they do not reduce continuing current annual E&G expenditure in future years. Nevertheless, they may be an acceptable response if there is a reasonable expectations that available recurrent funds will recover within the planning horizon. However, because of their impact on personnel, they should be framed in terms of 'hours per payperiod' over the entire fiscal year, not in terms of days -- this also helps with equity between nine and twelve month personnel and continuity of benefits and operations. I would also suggest that the base and progressivity of the example in the UFF document are unwise as initial [or target] bargaining responses -- take \$50,000 as the base, and make it say one hour (1.25%) per payperiod for each \$8,000 excess over \$50K.

Cutting the annual salary of staff and faculty who are already underpaid according to national standards should be a measure of VERY last resort. The problem with a furlough is that faculty will STILL be responsible for doing the same work, but will not be paid for completing the work. I believe high paid administration should work for \$1 as automobile company CEOs have offered to do... or the burden of furloghs, pay rate reductions, etc., should fall on administrators who are paid much more highly than are faculty and staff.

--layoffs too likely to become permanent

--unless pay rate reductions can be guaranteed not to become our new base salaries, furloughs seem the better option.

Begin with faculty above retirement age.

I would urge Furloughs for those that make over 50,000 per year.

- Consider temporary salary reductions for those making over fixed amount (\$100,000? \$150,000)?

- roll back raises for administrators w/in past 3-5 years that exceed specified rate (5% ?)

I disagree that the furlough measures should be progressive...those with higher salaries generally have higher expenses. I think a uniform number of days for everyone is more appropriate.

The suggestions presented in UFF's "Budget Crisis Ideas" paper are perfect. I enthusiastically support every word in that document.

Layoffs are better than pay rate reductions, if they can be targeted at unproductive faculty and/or unproductive units. Across-the-board pay rate reductions will make us even less competitive, and will punish everyone.

I like both the underlying philosophy and practicality of the proposed furlough schedule. I don't know if the specific formula is the best one, but this can be worked out.

Progressive furloughs, whereby the lowest-paid are asked for relatively smaller sacrifices, are a good way to make the best of a bad situation.

I am persuaded by the UFF-FSU team's arguments that this is the best way to go if there must be compensation cuts.

A % reduction would seem to be the fairest.

I would prefer a smaller, fully funded organization than a large, underpaid group

I heard a report that 64% of the workforce agreed that they would accept a 5% reduction in pay to save jobs. I think it would be strange for a union to support job loss over that option.

This would allow us to maintain classes and everyone to still have some funds to pay bills.

I think it is better to rip the bandaid off. Other measures seem misleading and temporary.

cut other items like travel, phone, printing first

It doesn't make sense to cut pay rate, would weaken everything even more. I think it would be even better to offer those close to retirement a reasonable incentive package to retire sooner.

Furlough in lieu of pay rate reductions and layoffs, simply for the reason that pay rate and position are retained for when the economy improves.

I would not apply furloughs to staff in the lower income range (e.g., under \$40,000)

at least you get them in return for giving up money and it spreads it across the board

I might be inclined toward pay rate reductions but ONLY if they were temporary and one's base salary rebounded to its prior level after the budget rebounded

Eliminate low performing departments.

layoffs are terrible, furloughs will be on non-class days, so...

Start cuts at the top with Administration instead of bottom with staff. Only when that is exhausted should any of the three options trickle down to faculty and then to staff. All options are equally awful.

Seems a bit silly to ask a broad question like this. It will depend unit by unit. I suspect that entire departments or programs may be the most logical way to eliminate some costs -- these will be layoffs. If such cuts are impossible, then pay cut reductions could occur.

The furloughs should at first be imposed upon the faculty AND the ADMINISTRATION (the admin. needs to be part of it).

We should protect our new faculty (hired in the last 2-3 years) from the furloughs, if we want to keep them. If absolutely needed, their furlough period should be lower.

The staff, should only be furloughed, if the faculty's cost savings are not sufficient. Most staff are not paid well to begin with and can ill-afford a cut.

The obvious answer is to buy out higher paid employees who are on DROP and replace them with new hires. Not rocket science. No pain.

At least with a layoff you can collect unemployment

Such a pay reduction should be progressive (i.e., Epps Professors and other extremely well-remunerated colleagues should accept a higher percentage pay-cut)

We should avoid layoffs or cuts to the base rate of pay at all costs.

Furloughs sound great but they punish the industrious as well as the lazy and will drive the best away. There are some programs, and some Professors, who need terminating

Imposing greater furloughs on higher paid workers is not as equitable as it might appear. Workers may be higher paid because they are more productive.

Another alternative: pay cuts for employees making over a specific amount (\$100,000? \$150,000?).

There should be pay rate reductions, but they should be from the top down, beginning with the maximum from the administration, so that lower paid faculty and staff will not bear an undue share of the burden or need to be laid off.

reduce #s needed at high-level administration

Look for a solution that is not permanent and life-altering. It would be a hardship to find other employment or manage financially during a furlough, but at least life could resume normally when the crisis passes.

Tough times allows admin to make hard choices

I could not afford any of the above options.

I am in favor of a furlough or temporary salary give-back for all faculty and administrators earning more than \$X where X would be determined by the level of need, perhaps %75,000 or \$100,000. It is critical that we not decimate the poorly paid support staff who have less stability and less ability to absorb a temporary pay cut.

Furloughs are much to be preferred to layoffs. If they could be timed to Spring Break or periods between semesters, etc. that would reduce the impact on students. Alternatively, rolling furloughs, perhaps, a quarter of a department at a time or by departments, seems preferable to shutting down the institution for a week (unless it could be done during a break).

I think it would be wiser to impose layoffs than to impose furloughs or pay reductions. It's true that we would lose a certain number of people from the layoffs, and it wouldn't be easy for those people. However, I think we'd lose more in the end by going with the other two options. We already are TERRIBLY underpaid compared to institutions in other states. We already haven't gotten much in the way of meaningful raises over the last 5-6 years (we got one this year, but it doesn't NEARLY compensate for the cost of living over the past 5-6 years). We have HUGE problems with inversion and compression. I know of MANY faculty who are considering leaving the university and the state of Florida altogether. If they cut salaries or implement forced unpaid leave (which is a cut in salary), I think A LOT of faculty would be pushed over the edge. I know I would.

I think that we should seriously examine our academic programs and streamline. We need to identify and eliminate poor performing academic and administrative units.

We also need to focus on laying off poor performing individuals. We have many staff positions in our college who do practically nothing!

Fairest across the board

This is under the assumption that someone forced to take unpaid leave or a pay cut will be in a poor position to seek other employment or any type of unemployment benefit that could soften the blow to the employee economically. I have worked at other universities where furloughs and pay rate reductions were used, and the impact on morale was severe. Furloughs and pay rate reductions seem the most likely to have a negative impact on productivity, such that an employee may be forced into a situation where their productivity is diminished, but they are still receiving some pay. It seems better to layoff a subset, and not negatively impact the pay of other employees that can be paid with the funds freed up by the layoffs. Hopefully, the remaining employees will be able to maintain a high level of productivity (although having colleagues laid off will undoubtedly have a negative impact on morale, also).

No furloughs. The university underpays and does not give cost of living raises. Furloughs are already built into our salaries.

My preference is to reduce the extreme reliance on the "Pathways to Excellence" faculty hires. These highly paid faculty that were hired as a means of getting AAU membership seem hardly necessary given the budget crisis. The idea of progressive furloughs may get at this idea.

Definitely, lay off the post-DROP faculty. The point of DROP was get a lump payment. If they didn't want to retire, then they should not have done so. This is one of the most egregious acts of greed that are present in the university.

Short term mandatory unpaid leave may leave some small gaps in wallets but should not impact long term benefits or job status. Layoffs tend to be more permanent and difficult to replace at future time points after people have shown that, worked to the bone they can cover the shortage of staff. Pay rate reductions will result in benefit loss in terms of retirement pay and may be more difficult to recoup given the state's parsimony with pay increases.

A furlough is the best way to prevent losing valuable un-tenured assistant professors who are the future of the institution.

this option continues the health insurance and other benefits.

I strongly favor furloughs.

There should be a threshold at \$60K/year, i.e., no reduction if a faculty makes less.

especially for those faculty who are not meeting expectations in service research or teaching.

this can be adjudicated by per review

I'm wondering who is the most vulnerable to losing a job: people at the high end of the pay scale or people at the low end? Wouldn't faculty who have earned tenure be completely protected?

Our salary rates are already low and we all want to avoid layoffs.

I answer "furloughs" with four provisos:

- 1) volunteers for furlough should be invited before mandatory furloughs are imposed
- 2) furloughs should be for one year only in any individual case
- 3) furloughs should be shared fairly around all units, including administrative units
- 4) the university should pay the full cost (not just the university's normal share) of medical insurance for those on furlough and their dependants

The furlough rate should not be progressive but an even percentage across the salary range. I am at the low end of the range presented in the suggested table.

Administration has increased disproportionately respect to Faculty.

Reduce administration, and reduce the big salaries of our administrators, including all the VPs and vice VPs. Let them show some ability to sacrifice

rather than the options above, consider enforcing the hiring freeze. then, through natural attrition over the next 2-3 yr, there will be a general staff reduction. the obvious downside is less-staff-more-work, but hey, it's a crisis.

Furloughs cannot be continued indefinitely, but layoffs and pay rate reductions will become permanent. Also, during a furlough the university will be closed. No courses will be offered and an air of crisis will be shared by everyone in the state. There will be considerable public pressure to end the furlough. Pay reductions and layoffs will place the burden on a percentage of the faculty/staff but will not be very obvious to students and their families, or to state legislators.

Pay rate reductions and furloughs are essentially the same thing to non-tenured faculty...either way I lose some of my hard earned salary.

Progressive furloughs are temporary. People will still have their jobs. This seems like the best means to help us get through this crisis. Pay rate reductions are "too permanent", although not nearly as permanent or as undesirable as layoffs and worse-still: reductions in work force. Anything besides reductions in work force and layoffs is GREATLY preferred!

don't make little cuts by doing admin staff

As a non-teaching faculty member in a research support position, my concern is that layoffs will lead to a) the deterioration of vital research capital assets and b) the loss of technical expertise and skill sets equally vital to research. If these two things are allowed to occur, the loss to the university will ultimately be considerably larger than the current state revenue deficit. The university has supported capital research assets and technical research positions for decades as part of a long term commitment to research. To allow these assets to evaporate and/or deteriorate would undermine a long term commitment by both the state and the university to research and the instruction that is a part of research.

extremely distasteful, but marginally better than the alternatives; I prefer the progressive furlough concept to any same-across-the-board approach

Continue with attrition.

Cut ADMINISTRATIVE salaries which are among the highest in the country.

Layoff unnecessary administrators (at last count I found 1 administrator per 11 faculty including NTT. Why should PhDs need this level of supervision?

Depending on the depth of the financial crisis, a combination of all of the above may be necessary.

Start with faculty who make more than 100K

Untenured faculty and ops personnel should be let go before any tenured faculty positions are eliminated, furloughed or offered reduced salaries.

I suppose if I have to pick I'd pick furloughs, though only if everyone has a furlough of the same duration, and if there is considerable advance notice to plan.

The differentiated furlough scheme proposed is, however, manifestly unfair, and I would not support it at all. Though in a way it is the inverse, it paradoxically shares some underlying attitudes with the union's views toward raises. In the union's typical stance on raises, everyone gets more or less the same thing, regardless of merit, accomplishments, etc. In this case, those who have accomplishments that have enabled them to receive higher compensation are in effect punished for it. The shared attitude is that the union is very hostile to employees with higher compensation rates, and this is what has led me on more than one occasion to consider dropping my membership. I haven't done so yet, but if the union goes forward with this as a proposal, I will.

Why do those with higher compensation rates need to give more back to the university?

The assumption that those with higher compensation rates can better afford to lose salary is a false one. The furlough length proposed for my pay rate would be a major financial hardship to my family, because I am the only salary earner in my family and support four people.

Additionally, I'm unclear how furloughs would not disrupt the academic mission of the university. Presumably we are not going to be expected to teach classes on days we are not paid. And I'm certainly not taking my furlough days only on days I would be doing research (which the proposal suggests I should perhaps just continue doing anyway on those days). So, my students would end up missing, say, three or four random days of class out of the term? How's that gonna work?

Some of the departments here do not pull their weight financially or academically. They should be shut down without further fuss.

I think that this crisis can be seen as an opportunity to cut some of the fat - people who do not work hard, who do not work effectively, who's job description is outdated. Fewer of the most efficient workers will make us stronger in the long run.

Rather than take a pay cut, I would prefer to do more work (e.g. increase our teaching loads, so that we could save money by not hiring adjuncts). If that is not possible, I would prefer unpaid leave. At least then I would have the time and I could use it to try and make money other ways. Perhaps cancel summer classes.

furloughs up to 2 weeks will be better than layoffs and permanent pay rate reductions.

Pay rate reductions until regular pay rates can be restored. Another alternative is moving f/t faculty/staff into p/t positions in the form of working less days per week or less hours per day.

I would be willing to take a cut in pay or teach more courses to save individuals their jobs, including mine (as a first year Asst. Prof).

could plan for a furlough financially and enjoy the time off

I strongly prefer the progressive furloughs that you propose in your "Caucus Ideas" memo before pay rate reductions or layoffs. This seems like a good compromise (although, of course, I hope that not even this will be necessary).

We just have to do more with less, or actually we will have to work more efficiently.

I would rather not see people let go for any amount of time. Rather, allow individuals to continue to receive some compensation so that they can still eat while seeking employment in a different state.

It is probably worth noting that laid off workers may be eligible for government assistance while I'm not certain that this is the case for furloughs.

There are likely still positions that can be consolidated or shared across departments or colleges. These extra positions are truly luxuries that we might not be able to support during a crisis.

9-month faculty are already on "unpaid furlough" 3 months per year. It is thus appropriate that before any 9-month faculty are furloughed, 12-month faculty/administrators should be first in line.

See below...

Cut administrators salaries and positions. Pay reductions for those making above \$150,000

NOTHING should be done "across the board". This type of thinking is a major problem with this union and a reason why I am not more active in working with the union. Cuts or layoffs need to be targeted to units or persons who are underperforming, not harming all units or persons.

Furloughs are weird limbo-like states. Pay rate reductions set a precedent that

will make it difficult for UFF-FSU to fight for faculty raises in the future. Layoff procedures are systematically laid out in the contract. People expect them; it's clear.

Furloughs are the least objectionable of these options. Layoffs are more expensive to recover from down the road and would cut deep into the bone of the university's core academic mission. Pay rate reductions would only increase long term problems in faculty retention and salary inequality. Further, pay reductions send precisely the wrong message after the negotiation of salary increases earlier in the year. Three percent forward and five percent back is not the right direction.

I believe this would be the best way to keep the University functioning and spread out the 'pain' evenly amongst core faculty and staff - these reductions should, of course, last only as long as the budget crisis does.

perhaps the state legislature could be persuaded to do this also

I read through the UFF's Causas Ideas
and in general I agree with them.

Obviously, none of these are pleasant options. Layoffs allow the administration to eliminate what it perceives as its least productive employees, subject to the large caveat that tenure will protect lots of faculty. Pay rate reductions are likely to be across-the-board, and would cause our better faculty to leave, and those with no good alternatives to be forced to stay, although a bit disgruntled. Similarly, furloughs, even if they were targeted to those who would have been laid off, will send those with good options to new jobs, leaving FSU taking back possibly the least desirable of those furloughed. None are good options, but among these layoffs are the best because that allows FSU to retain its best people, and does not keep people who are likely to be disgruntled as a result of a furlough or pay rate reduction.

This is a really tough question. As a jr. faculty, I can't even afford the temporary pay cut of a furlough. The explanation sent in the email from UFF strikes me as overly optimistic -- sure, I'd love "extra vacation" but that's not really what we're talking about. Furthermore, it can take up to a year to plan for external funding/grants (which are often contingent on travel in my field), so that's not a good option either. Regardless, furloughs seem to set a terrible precedent (perhaps even worse than layoffs).

It's tough for me to call for layoffs and hope that I'm not affected, because this would merely pass the burden on to others, so I can't advocate for that, either.

I would stick out for reduction of excess administrative positions, reductions in faculty positions by attrition, and perhaps even early retirement buyouts, if necessary

Layoffs stemming from elimination of programs make sense. General layoffs without changing anything else should be deemed unacceptable.

If furloughs are required, it may be best to consider the period at the beginning of the Fall semester prior to the start of classes. That would give some faculty the option of extending their summer research funding to cover the additional period.

I would rather keep my job and get paid a little less, than to have no job and no pay check at all

I very much support following the layoff plan of reducing personnel (faculty/staff) - with faculty let go per the UFF outline (non-tenure-earning faculty, non-tenured faculty, tenured faculty; by order of seniority). I do not support any furlough, pay reduction or other measure that will impact current salary levels.

That could be the least painful option. I think the formula outlined in the document referred to above is fair.

I'm not against intelligent restructuring. I'm sure there's still much waste in the budget. But I doubt the waste will be the first to go. Just as raises are based on

percentage of salary so should be potential pay deductions. Keep more jobs.

Ideally, each employee at risk would be able to choose between two options. Some people might prefer a rate cut to a layoff, others might prefer a furlough.

Reduced pay is better than layoffs.

It seems to me that if people are laid off they may never come back or if we accept pay rate reductions those might not come back either -- but periods of leave would be most likely to be restored. And we can do research in the meantime.

Cuts in the salary of the highest 10% paid employees. Collapse of administrative positions. For example, how many Associate and Assistant Deans do we need?

Furloughs provide the option of returning. I would also suggest that people who were on drop, retire, and return after 1 month should be eliminated first. Faculty are willing to teach more classes, but this notion of still holding us to AAU aspirations has to go. Students come first.

Furloughs seem like a wonderful idea to share the pain, but are unworkable. The progressive plan would require higher paid persons to either work without pay or to seriously compromise FSU function. Program discontinuation is my preferred unthinkable option.

We will probably lose faculty if we simply cut salaries which are already very low for mid-level and senior people relative to peer institutions

Anybody but my unit!

At my salary of approx. \$37K I can't take much of a cut w/o it causing a dramatic effect. However, it is essential that I receive some compensation on a regular basis so that I am able to meet my personal budget needs. I can adjust my month-to-month budget based on a lower salary, but I could not go without pay on a regular basis. I may not understand a furlough entirely but I would rather get something on a regular basis.

Furloughs treat every hard working FSU person fairly equally; this is the best way to maintain trust in the system, maintain some level of consistency for students and workers, and still motivate people to do their best and step up to the plate during turbulent times.

Furloughs would work only if there is an end in sight for the budget problems and that end is within a year. Otherwise I think it has to be layoffs. The university already underpays most of its employees, so reducing pay for (most) staff and faculty would be a really bad idea. However, now that I'm thinking about it How about reducing administrator pay to the same percentage of the national average as faculty and staff pay?

Freeze Hiring, Reduce Salaries of FSU Administrators (e.g the president, provost, and vice presidents), & Eliminate FSU Administrative Positions

Particularly cuts in administrative staff, since that group has grown so much over the past few years at all levels, from the president's office down to the associate deans. Administrators assume their value, but the university is here to teach and administrators should be cut first.

Reduce pay of administrators and others receiving six-figure salaries.

If FSU implements furloughs, then faculty should not be required to teach classes on those days that have been so designated. In at least one other state that implemented furloughs this year, those faculty who taught classes five days a week were required to be in class during the furlough period. That is, work without pay.

Please consider other creative options that faculty might want such as being offering lower paying positions. For instance, some with research assignments may want to cover more classes and teach and be paid less. If offered, there may be a considerable number and savings.

I support reductions, but our AOR's must reflect a different load! I want my record of teaching/service/duties in general to be amended with the pay cut.

Specifically, I don't mind the teaching staying as is, but the service would have to be severely amended with a reduction of pay. Specifically, service to department committees. If we could concentrate on teaching, then we could continue, perhaps, in a larger capacity on our research as scholars, which is good in its own way.

Also too, considering the nation-wide freezes on hiring across the academy, I'd rather have a job here than no pay at all. Sad, but that is what the future would bring to many.

BUT! I'd like to see pay cuts at ALL levels of faculty/admin/deans/VPs/Provosts/pres. We are all in this together.

I'd also like to see reductions made to the sports programs. If we are to demonstrate to the people of Florida the severity of the situation, carrying on with the same agenda of sports activity does not send the message and therefore instructors' sacrifices will be hidden--again. Reductions should affect everyone, bottom to top.

I would rather see weaker departments (or even colleges) eliminated than strong departments effected by good faculty leaving because of pay cuts.

Many faculty are paid way too much. I like the idea that we could voluntarily help each other in a time of otherwise bad trust in financial things.

Those options sound like options that the AFL-CIO might solicit opinions from factory workers on, and as a consequence I examined the UFF-FSU Caucus Budget Crisis Ideas document to see if my impression was off-base. Sadly, I found that, on the whole, it is a document that would make the AFL-CIO proud. Even the misguided efforts of the administration have never left me feeling like a factory worker--but now the UFF-FSU has. Congratulations. If we're to behave this way, perhaps we can also enter into negotiations for federal bailout money (if you can't tell, that's sarcasm).

Reduce the number of administrators. Reduce their salaries.

Most fair.

Cut the pay of administrators--who have swelled in number and enjoyed double-digit pay raises in recent years.

As much as I hate to put someone out of a job, we do have areas that have few students and a relatively high number of faculty and/or faculty who are not teaching their fare share. We can streamline.

I'm very uncomfortable with the precedent set by a furlough or pay rate reduction. We're underpaid as it is. I think more top people will leave (I'm already considering it).

The furlough idea shaped on the UFF-FSU website makes sense in that it does share the burden. The reality is if a department is dissolved or faculty/staff dismissed those funds will not come back (at least not in the near future) This will mean heavier course loads and responsibilities for those remaining.

none of the above are acceptable. we are underpaid as it is.

Sacrifice should be shared

Not all segments of FSU are equally critical to the academic mission. Rather than across-the-board cuts (as you recommend), there should be selective elimination of non-critical programs

Furloughs would be my second choice, but ideally, we could have the extremely well paid and overpaid coaches give up some millions to keep the custodial staff able to feed their kids. Ideally, we could use a temporary budget roll-back structured so that the best paid members take the deepest cuts, and the least paid members, like secretaries and maintenance workers, take NO CUTS. Across-the-board cuts disproportionaltely harm the lowest paid workers and much be avoided. (This would be true of a furlough as well.) But a truly progressive cut--whereby someone paid an

obscene 5 million dollars takes a 60% cut, someone paid a million dollars takes a 20% cut, someone paid 100K takes a 10% cut, someone paid 75K takes a 5% cut, someone paid 50K takes a 2% cut, and no cuts below 50K: that would seem better. Numbers to be worked out, but in some kind of geometric fashion so that the weakest are protected by the strongest. If we do a furlough, better tell us asap--course syllabi are going live on line very soon! I would recommend extending spring break another few days, or better yet, ending the semester a week early! In Fall 09 we could easily furlough by having student arrive as all civilized schools already do, after Labor Day, and classes begin in leisurely fashion late that week.

How will we get our jobs done so that if we ever get out of this our mission won't be sunk... if furloughs have to be implemented... I can argue pros/cons of each of the others and have checked Other... Like insulating a house, a number of smaller actions might do it?

I guess furloughs - though frankly I don't see how these would happen. Do I get to cancel classes those days? Not go to my many committee meetings? Skip office hours? I understand the reasoning, but I suspect that the reality would see me simply doing the same thing I would do on any other day. I'd like to see some major reductions in administration (and the highest salaries here), athletics (after all, they've been sanctioned...some cuts would certainly reinforce the university's commitment to academic integrity), and an increase in tuition and fees. I don't understand why it is a badge of honor for a research one university to have some of the cheapest tuition in the country.

Honestly, I'm not sure what to recommend. I know that if departments across the board are asked to make these cuts, that out the window goes faculty travel, we'll also NOT be accepting new doctoral students. . .

Which of course makes it more and more difficult for faculty who are already underpaid.

The brain drain continues. . .

Reassess the policy of hiring "retired" post-DROP employees into high level administration positions at high salaries. Eliminate positions, if possible, and replace others by promoting existing employees. These post-DROP employees

I cannot believe that the administration must resort to faculty and staff pay cuts of some kind... good Lord, we're woefully underpaid as it is. However, I suspect that they could find a number of places to cut in athletics. We are an academic institution, correct? If the administration can't see its way to cutting the athletics budget, then academic faculty should hear the message loud and clear - that we are merely a front for an athletic organization. In that case, those of us who are serious about our scholarly work can go elsewhere; that is, those of us who are still here. Certainly the threats of pay cuts will send most of us back into the job market to institutions whose primary goal is to protect and support scholarly work and teaching.

The university is simply too large and covers too much for the money it receives from the state. The only way to ever begin to bring the university back in line with salaries, workloads, and the like is to reduce its size. In addition, perhaps this would finally send a message to our politicians that there is simply nothing left in the system to remove without damaging some aspect of the students' educations. Taking furloughs or pay rate reductions simply says to them that we can always find some ways to cut because we have room to cut. In addition, furloughing some faculty/staff will simply mean that everyone has to work harder to make up the slack, which again sends the message that we could work harder. All the faculty I know are working straight-out 80 hour work weeks already. The staff are completely bogged down with all of the things that they have been asked to take on in the last few years. Telling everyone to do more will only decrease morale more. We need to let the state know that we are now in the

position of having dropped education in this state to the bare bones and there is nowhere left to cut fat from.

Share the pain

Furloughs of limited duration seem reasonable an alternative to more drastic (layoffs) or long-term (pay cuts) solutions.

Pay rate reductions do nothing positive for any faculty. Layoffs will set the University back a decade or more, especially making hiring difficult. Furloughs at least leave the opportunity for faculty to pay themselves from research grants, and in general minimize the MAJOR costs that any of these actions would entail.

Bobby Bowden pay rate reduction, who can better afford it.

start with administrators.

I'm non-tenure faculty, and I'm mostly in fear of losing my job.

I think surgical cuts are the best option for us strategically, because the University should emerge a leaner, better place than before. It sounds ruthless - and perhaps it is - but making our top programs and faculty suffer to support underperforming or weak programs is a big mistake. We'll lose our best faculty, keep our weak faculty, and end up slipping even closer toward mediocrity. There's no question that this is how we should proceed; the question is whether the administration has the guts to make this call.

Across the board pay cuts are probably the most economically wise way to react.

Layoffs are probably the worst. They have a heavy knock-on effect in communities hit by such layoffs. Also, the processing of layoffs by Human Resources is a significant cost in itself.

Furloughs, while not as traumatic as layoffs, are individually stressful events and would entail administrative costs for the university if these were long enough for unemployment benefits to kick in (I believe that furloughs more than one week can cause unemployment insurance to kick in, but I am not cognizant of the details in Florida.)

I believe that a combination of furloughs and pay reductions would be preferable to layoffs. (Furloughs would be highly impractical for teaching faculty, but could be managed by non-teaching faculty.) As a long-time observer of state government, I have noted that "laid off" positions have a tendency to disappear, even when the budget situation improves. While the person originally laid off may have found other employment, the department is still lacking that position.

If pay is reduced, it will be hard to get it back. Furloughs seem like a more temporary option.

The only concern is that across the board furloughs might demand more of some (staff, etc.) than others at higher pay rates.

As bad as layoffs are, I would rather see the University use layoffs to reduce low performing faculty, staff, and/or units than to do an across-the-board rate reduction.

Also, I do NOT favor the proposed furloughs, whereby higher paid faculty would be required to take more unpaid leave than lower paid faculty. If pay cuts or mandatory leave ultimately is required, it should be an across-the-board cut rather than a graduated cut.

pay reductions as a percentage of salary spreads the burden of hardship

Once pay reductions go into effect, we have to make sure there are specific dates in place in order to guarantee we go back to our original salaries.

This seems like the most equitable response to this issue.

half a job is better than no job

No on furloughs
It will minimize the financial damage to those affected
Consider laying off adjuncts and giving extra classes to research-unproductive faculty (as measured by a reasonably objective criterion).
Rate reductions spread the pain but could become permanent
What would be the criteria for layoffs?

What about early retirement?

layoffs for administrators

Faculty replacement costs are high; layoffs are not an option.

I am deathly afraid that Layoffs and pay reductions would become permanent.

I think the FSU is at the minimum number of faculty that is required and laying off will increase work loads for others. It seems that pay rate reduction may be unavailible given what happened in other state.

Layoffs should be done on a programmatic basis, getting rid of less important/under-performing programs rather than across-the-board furloughs or pay rate reductions.

Layoffs, furloughs or pay rate reductions are unacceptable. The State of Florida needs to know that anyone with any type of mobility will leave for other colleges, universities or private sector positions.

For competent faculty, furloughs and pay rate reductions are unacceptable as the current faculty pay-scales are not very competitive. I consider furloughs and pay rate reductions an exit strategy to find new, better paying jobs elsewhere.

Furloughs are preferable to layoffs; pay rate reductions are absolutely not acceptable. Before any of these options are considered, ALL of the other UFF-FSU Caucus ideas on FSU budget cuts should be implemented, especially rolling back the administration levels and the pay for athletic coaches.

None of the above is acceptabe.

Pay rate reductions to very highly paid faculty only. It is unfair to cut pay to faculty who are already underpaid (i.e. below national standards).

Furloughs = 1st choice. I think many will be willing to bear this pain together for the short term rather than suffer major layoffs (my 2nd choice). Pay rate reductions, on the other hand, if invoked, would be soon be made permanent or long term and then the hill back up will be even steeper. The only long-range solution for Florida, in my opinion, is a state-income tax.

It depends on the length of the furlough, but it is temporary and when you return, it is status-quo ante. Second would be pay rate reductions--employees still have jobs, though at a lower pay; pay might be restored at a later date and that could be built in. Layoffs are harder to undo; that should be the last choice.

Layoffs of suspected personnel staffing excess while monitoring detrimental effects -is there any fat? If none, and perhaps there isn't, then furloughs to spread the pain.

According the the proposed furlough schedule *none* of my non-tenure non-teaching twelve-month faculty would be furloughed -- kinda says something about how much our services are valued. (Yes, I'm aware the chart is for nine-month faculty.)

If I were to be paid less, I expect to work less. That way I either have more free time or the opportunity to earn money doing something else. I would also expect that when the crisis is over, it would be easier to ask for increased hours at the same rate than ask for more money (that will be considered a raise)for work that you have already proven you are willing to do at a lower rate. It would seem to me that there is much more incentive to spend more money on staff at a later date when it is coupled with a proportional increase in productivity.

As soon as I am overpaid and independently wealthy I may reconsider, but until then

you get what you pay for.

Assuming that non-critical staff have already been laid off....

There are other places to cut costs as stated in the UFF memo. I would add travel, phones, copying, assistanships, etc.

I voted for layoffs because mandatory furloughs and pay cuts will end up costing us our best and brightest minds. If done properly, layoffs will cost us outdated programs and poor performing faculty.

second choice would be pay rate reduction

Furloughs are less likely to become permanent and are the best way to preserve the university. It is not a good solution but the least bad solution.

Look at programs that are not directly related to academics and consider cuts there first.

Cut funds in athletics.

Reduce salaries of top administrators.

Cuts should be across the board, to everyone

Admit doctoral students every other year.

Teach larger sections of classes.

The pay rate reductions should be spread around not just equitably, but a bit progressively -- somewhat greater percentage off higher salaries.

Furloughs will only be effective if they are during the semester, i.e. students are send home.

make the spring break two weeks (by shortening the semester) and shut down FSU, except the bookstore. During this time, reduce even the critical services, like police forces.

Layoff of administration, staff, part-time faculty, then untenured faculty, and then unproductive tenured faculty. Penalizing productive faculty as the Association proposes is dreadful.

Furloughs are a short term solution to a long term funding problem. Furloughs effectively cut pay, which encourages the best faculty to leave. The progressive furloughs will damage higher paid departments. If there are furloughs, they should be equal across faculty.

Other: force all potential retirees to retire at 65, instead of laying off whole departments.

We already have a mandatory "leave" of 3 month, general layoffs will certainly not help to deal with the large number of students AND will not make us an AAU university either. Pay rate reduction: aren't we fighting for at least average US professor salaries already?

I am troubled by the assumption that ANYONE who is making a higher salary should take more of the hit. What about the individual who is the primary provider for a family?

The idea that any pay rate cuts or furloughs be progressive is the very reason I will not join the union. Flat percentage rates, by their very nature, are progressive because higher pay grades still pay more. Any thing other than that is unfair. The assumption that people who make more can pay a higher percentage is completely naive. You have no idea what people's household cashflow situations are like and thus have no justification for such a scale. The concept of "From Each according to his Ability, to Each according to his Need" has never worked and never will!

If furloughs by themselves cannot accomplish sufficient savings, then pay rate reductions should be next, ahead of layoffs.

My preference would be for across the board pay cuts in order to minimize the number who would otherwise experience layoffs.

Will benefits remain intact, e.g., health, annual and sick leave accumulation?

Faculty morale will plummet if layoffs are started. There will be a mass exodus for more enlightened states.

Although layoffs should be the last thing we do, furloughs and pay rate reductions are hard on everyone, since faculty is so poorly paid already. The administration, however, should take pay rate reductions -- that is if they don't lay off anyone, which they probably won't.

Anyone over 150,000 takes a 15% cut, between 100 - 149,000, a 10% cut and 80- 99,000 takes a 5% cut. Obviously, some stepped plan spreading the reductions proportionally across the spectrum is what this is geared to do, the numbers are just ideas. Not sure if this is enough without details of faculty salary.

provided there is an end point to the reductions.

We should all share the burden instead of dumping it on several unlucky personnel

Furloughs and pay rate reductions are a bad idea. Layoffs would protect the core of the university.

If furloughs do occur everyone needs to be affected - faculty, staff and administration. For example, if a furlough would only apply to non tenured faculty and staff, and not to tenure seeking faculty there would be a riot because we work just as hard as they do. Also higher level administration should share in this furlough process too. The amount of time people should be furloughed should depend on their salary rate. Pay rate reductions are a terrible idea because they are permanent and Florida state worker salaries, compared with those of the rest of the nation, are pathetic.

Furloughs would give faculty the option of returning to their position later if things improve. This would probably mean putting some programs or courses on hiatus instead of permanently cutting them, which would seem to keep options open for a while.

What about the option of job sharing so that if a position is cut faculty might have the option of going 1/2 time and sharing a position with another faculty member?

It is difficult to generalize without more details

If there's a furlough of several weeks, I would prefer that the weeks NOT be consecutive. This would then not be so detrimental to employee's earnings.

hope insurances can be paid as usual during furloughs period.

It seems unlikely that the gaps needing to be closed can be taken care of without layoffs. Furloughs are a good way to minimize the number of layoffs, however. Pay rate reductions should not be contemplated.

Pay rate reductions OK too IF they are explicitly temporary.

layoff administrators

I am serious. Reduce the number of Administrators and their supporting staff. Legal council, assistant and associate or associate assistant etc. Way more than needed, ADMINISTRATIVE LAYERING IS THERE FOR JOB SECURITY. Now is the time for that to be put into effect. We have already had Pay rate reductions preemptively, by not giving us the raise to cut.

Raise tuition. (revenue). Reduce administrative salaries to be in line with the typical full professor.

Mandatory unpaid leave for faculty and staff who are not contributing actively and productively. Resources should be kept to retain the best faculty and staff.

Layoffs and pay rate reductions may not be reversed

I have been involved in many other organizations, including several decades with the military. Cuts need to be performance based. That is, cut people with non mission essential skill sets and under-performers. Given the structure of the university, this should not be difficult. My unit includes 5 deans and 24 working faculty. This sort of structure is not sustainable given our current funding structure.

It would be better in the long run to layoff some faculty than to demoralize everyone with either furloughs (how would THAT work for teaching faculty?) or pay cuts for everyone.

Faculty teach overload: one course every-other-year. University award them a modest stipend (\$750-\$1000) for teaching one additional course. Still huge savings to the university

Dismiss all adjuncts and increase our teaching loads to cover classes. Reduce HR personnel to bare minimum as I am always directed to a contractor when I raise a question.

Pay rates are already very low at FSU, further reduction through pay reduction or furloughs will crush what little moral is left. Good departments will have many of their good people leave. The long term consequences of such actions would be quite severe.

I would say the worst way is pay rate reductions. These are likely more unfair to those with low compressed salaries.

I don't see how layoffs can be avoided.

progressive furloughs will have the least disruptive impact on the FSU staff and the services they provide to the university

Furloughs and across the board pay reductions will distribute the impact more evenly than layoffs

keep people's jobs.. less pay is better than no pay.

Obviously, any cuts of any sorts will result in disgruntled faculty. Better to have a few disgruntled ones who no longer work for FSU than to have the entire faculty be disgruntled. I'd hate to have such a morale buster hit every single employee. Also, I don't have tenure and was just hired 2 years ago so this might mean me. But that seems like the best thing for the university as a whole.

Targeted program reductions.

Find the least important areas and cut them.

Increase the size (slightly) and number of courses taught by all faculty (including senior faculty). Assign selected staff and administrators to teach courses as part of their assigned responsibilities.

I think all Ph.D. Programs should quit admitting new students for at least the coming year. This would save a lot of money across the University, and a one year hiatus would not harm the programs at all. I also think that all non-essential faculty travel should be cut for one year. Faculty Travel could also be limited severely over the coming year, as not attending meetings for one year would not be a big issue. If faculty are to be laid off, the first to go should be all the adjuncts, as they generally are using instruction as a supplement to the main employment.

1. Hiring Freeze
2. Temporarily eliminating all funding for conference travel, etc.
3. Have administrators (deans etc.) teach courses without extra pay - because, with the hiring freeze, they'll have more time

Pay rates for Assistant Ins is already far below par, and Assistant Professors in most cases are earning less than 60,000, which is just enough for a small family to live comfortably. If any pay cuts are to be implemented, I recommend a temporary (1-2 year) salary freeze on those earning 75,000 or more per year.

Regarding layoffs, although some offices may be able to function with fewer office staff, we are at a shortage for faculty and competent administrators. If any office staff positions need to be cut, I would recommended starting with students who occupy positions that are paid hourly.

Should be a combination that results in the least disruption to the University

community over the long run. Who is in the best position to determine this is not clear to me.

I think there is no one answer. I would advocate a combination of all of the above. It also depends on the amount of cost savings we are talking about.

pay reductions to have a defined duration

It is important not to lose sight of our research and teaching mission. Layoffs should in the first instance be made in the administration, then among part-time and untenured faculty. We should do everything we can to retain our productive and distinguished scholars. Otherwise we risk losing our reputation as a serious research institution.

I would rather have less pay, instead of no pay, while looking for another job.

Given the expected temporary nature of the budget situation, a short-term pay reduction would have the minimal long-term effect on the institution.

I prefer to see everyone keep their jobs even at some cost as opposed to some of us remaining employed while others have to attempt to find new work in an extremely unfavorable environment.

graded pay rate reductions with top salaries assessed more - like income tax scale.

If job cuts become reality, I would rather explore the options for furloughs or pay reductions over layoffs. I can make it through a few weeks or a month knowing I have a job to come back to. A layoff in this economy is truly frightening.

fit it!

I would suggest ranking these as (1) layoffs, (2) furloughs, (3) pay reductions.

I would be willing to take the furlough. Maybe they could be voluntary at first, and unlimited time to see if that could help out the situation prior to a mandatory move.

In a "rated" scale, so that those who make more, take more furlough, but fairly. cut unessential curricular programs, all non-curricular programs, esp. athletic programs which do not make a profit for FSU; reduce Dean's salaries, cut the President's discretionary money. Reduce grounds staff, especially the ones who sit on machinery and do not actually work, and finally, cut administrative assistants--let the bog boys and girls do their own grunt work.

At least we would have jobs; 2) cut administrative salaries, and non-teacher positions.

Chosen as a lesser evil.

It would be more efficient to eliminate or consolidate programs that are small and do not generate adequate FTEs than to mandate an unpaid leave for all. I would guess, too, that there are administrative units that could be eliminated without affecting the integrity or day-to-day operations of the university.

Where do I begin? This has to be the most shortsighted idea I have encountered from our union yet. To even suggest a "progressive" furlough without consideration of tenure, rank, or the disproportionate impact it will have on colleges/programs with higher salaries indicates that the union is not interested in advancing the university. This plan will cause many of our best and brightest to leave while we will maintain our worst and dullest. I can only hope that our administration ignores the "voice" of the faculty - it's for our own good!

No new hires - eliminate Pathways first; 2nd cut programs rather than anything across-the-board, which would mean layoffs.

Reduce grad enrollment for next year. Trim administrative lines back. Cancel summer school. Draw on SRAD funds. Layoff adjuncts.

Not an option

In some cases layoffs might be optimal solution, but preserving the university

core by offering (temporary!!) pay rate reductions appears generally the least intrusive approach.

I would rather be free to look for another job than gradually be squeezed to death by furloughs and pay decreases.

Cut luxury staff whose work is not required to carry out university business. Cutting faculty should not be an option since it is their expertise that brings in the best students across the US and abroad.

This should be done on a graded scale, with highest salaries suffering the highest percentage reduction.

Actually fire, increase teaching load or reduce pay to those faculty that are chronic under producers/"deadwood" but DO NOT penalize those faculty that consistently achieve at the highest levels in the department. DO NOT get rid of promotion raises as those are the only real significant raises a hard working faculty can look forward to...if those go, I think a lot of faculty will too.

Rank the need and amount of furloughs based on current pay: the higher the pay, the first to have furlough.

Try to reduce energy costs

do not carry through with Pathways Initiative

reduce the number of vice presidents

Keeps health insurance benefits in place

People are people, no matter how small

This crisis is inexcusable! The State of Florida can well afford to position itself differently-our tax burden on residents is very low. Someone needs some courage, ethics, and honesty.

Any additional comments on the university budget crisis and responses to it?

155 **42%**

I'd suggest a critical look at the athletic programs -- there must be some fat that could be cut

I think it is ridiculous how our funding is funded and determined. There needs to be a better system. If we need to raise some costs than I guess we do.

It is very important to have clarity over permanent reductions in base budget and one-time savings in expenditure -- the first requires actions like pay rate reductions, layoffs or reductions in force, the latter can be handled by furloughs or LWOP. One objective of any UFF bargaining should be to get from the administration an explicit statement of what they regard as a reasonable level of continuing funding the planning is predicated on, recognizing that part of the present decline ought to be seen as a temporary reduction rather than a permanent loss -- which State budgeting conventions require it to be regarded as in a purely technical, legal, sense.

Before cuts to core academic faculty and staff compensations costs are considered, it is essential to cut all unnecessary expenses - travel, many office supplies, computer upgrades, etc. Travel, etc., should be eliminated for all employees... including administration. In addition, the College of Education should consider eliminating the costs of NCATE accreditation.

Energy saving.

All department and teaching buildings I am aware of have wasted energy since savings measures:

heating/airconditioning is set to start at 3 or later in the afternoon after a day when indoor temperatures are too high or low.

airconditioning still set too high in many offices.

Not a major item, but could save thousands and thousands of dollars.

I fully support tuition increases, increase out-of-state enrollment, and develop other options to improve revenues. FSU is well below the average compared to other public universities.

The suggestions presented in UFF's "Budget Crisis Ideas" paper are perfect. I enthusiastically support every word in that document.

I also agree with the principles in the UFF working paper on where budget cuts should come from, besides core academic programs.

Before cutting compensation for faculty and staff who are central to the university's core academic mission, there are several other options such as those described in the UFF-FSU's "Ideas" document that deserve serious consideration. Compensation cuts per se should be a last resort.

We need regime change in the legislature to allow us to stop having to make the best of a bad situation and instead get on with doing our work!

A close look at the various "vice ..." positions also may be in order. enrollments must be reduced to match budget shortfalls. We cannot do more with less.

Unfortunately, I'm not enough of an economist to have other ideas.

Thanks for being proactive

This action should be a last ditch stand with all repercussions outlined in detail in reports to the administration and ultimately to the legislature.

I think all the faculty need to know asap how many faculty will be laid off per department, so people can start seriously looking elsewhere.

lobby for the tuition increase

administrative staff/non tenure track faculty should be cut/reduced in pay/furloughed BEFORE tenure line faculty
football program

Absolutely no new hires!

Please don't move to any sort of cuts prior to seeking additional revenues

I'd like to see the administrators take a voluntary pay cut as well

It seems to me that in recent years there have been many layers of administration added without any direct relationship to the core mission of instruction. I think the university should look there first for things to cut.

Layoffs to be avoided at all costs; but if necessary to start with non-teaching administrative positions, with duties picked up by others.

It seems that individual colleges and departments have made staffing decisions over the past few years that now appear to have been short-sighted, as essential faculty have retired and their positions frozen, the educational mission of the university is being adversely affected.

There should be protections for the faculty and staff who are at the lower end of the pay scales. Many of us are in precarious positions.

If lay-offs are required, cut administrative staff with salaries in excess of \$60,000 first! This includes Assistant Deans, Assistants to the Provost and assistants to the Vice-Presidents, etc. These are non teaching and for the most part non research staff, not essential to the mission of the university. Then look for unproductive units where productivity measures are clear and agreed upon by the bargaining unit.

Please don't continue or begin again to reduce maintenance on buildings and grounds. Having a clean and non-leaking place to work is important for morale. Also in this troubled economic time, it is important to continue to provide good police services on campus to insure the safety of students, faculty and staff.

Frankly, this university is in huge trouble. We're in a downward spiral, and pretty soon most people who have options to obtain employment elsewhere will leave.

We need to find a way to spin this to build our national reputation. Given the economic downturn across the country, there is a lot of pressure on universities to cut

costs. We need to position ourselves as a leader in operational excellence and offer best practices to other universities about how to operate efficiently and effectively.

Suspend "Pathways." Compensate existing faculties to mitigate loss of talented faculties to other institutions.

My guess is that many faculty will leave after the budget crisis is over. The President/Provost should really give a lot of thought about retention of faculty more so than anymore obsession of AAU membership.

Previous tax breaks implemented by the Bush administration must be considered valid for reinstatement. As well as dipping into reserve funds to balance the budget.

Some colleges and businesses (like Disney) continually solicit employee input on cost saving ideas. Perhaps FSU could start a program like this.

Very much agree with the point that we should reduce non-essential expenses first, and am glad to see that the issue of hiring post-DROP faculty should be reviewed/discouraged.

1) Increase 1 year sabbatical number at 50% pay to allow more time to attract outside funding.

2) Given the stock market today, a FSU "fixed rate bond" at current interest rates may bring in substantial money at low long term costs.

cut administrative salary.
cut ineffective faculty, I know my unit has at least one in my opinion

Will all travel money be slashed completely, or are faculty/staff layoffs on top of completely gutting the travel budget?

A staff member in Criminology makes \$50,000 for working 10 hours a week on "marketing." These sorts of scams need to be addressed by the administration.

Expensive extras such as the 'Pathways of Excellence' should be shut down forthwith. This is not the time for FSU to be suffering from the 'Marie Antoinette Syndrome'.

I think a less confrontational, more proactive tone would be beneficial to negotiations. If the crisis is temporary, then I favor a temporary budget savings (furlough) over firings that require a rebuilding period.

Prohibit rehiring folks who used the DROP to retire, except perhaps to teach individual courses for adjunct pay.

The those job vacancies to new hires (at presumably lower rates of pay).

FSU is spending way too much on administration including administrator salaries.

I strongly agree that after DROP high-paid employees should not be allowed to return to administration positions. The university needs new blood...

I agree with many of the proposals in the first section of the ideas...another possibility would be to push or offer early retirement to those that are close...filling their positions from below them and eliminating the lowest position that is unfilled that that time.

Re-hiring "post-drop" employees is a ridiculous practice...it defeats the whole reason for drop. Another great idea was adjusting coaches and others to a \$1 salary...they

have plenty of other funds and it wouldn't cause any financial stress to them at all.
The ideas in the two-page document are all quite good.

Personally, I genuinely fear that my tenured faculty line may be restructured out of existence as a way for my unit to effectively lay me off before laying off some untenured faculty in my unit. Consequently, before the administration announces their plans, I feel I have no choice but to seek employment elsewhere immediately. I pity the students who will be in classes in the spring because my first thoughts and priorities must be on how my family and I am going to survive economically.

What/who are considered CORE academic faculty and staff?

I would be amenable to the following solutions:

- * a temporary across the board reduction of pay rate
- * a temporary pay rate reduction that is graded according to pay rate so that the lower wage staff are not unduly burdened in this economy.
- * temporary furloughs corresponding with a closure of the university for additional operating cost reductions: e.g. between each semester.
- * a temporary suspension of employer FRS and ORP contributions
- * mandatory "work at home" periods corresponding to a closure of the university to reduce operating costs.

One or all of these could be implemented.

Higher education in Florida was in a difficult position before this current shortfall of state revenue. If research and/or instructional programs are allowed to collapse, or if they are crippled by eroded staffing, funding, and capital assets-- it could be a perfect storm for higher education in Florida. We are already losing faculty and technical staff. We need to not allow our higher education institutions to implode. If we do, it will be much more costly in terms of time, human resources and capital to move forward when this economic crisis starts turning around.

I think a great deal of what the University does is useful and appropriate, but some things must go, and those involved clearly need to prioritize well as decisions are made

I agree with your "ideas" point that Pathways hiring should not be held harmless while the rest of the University suffers the immediate and longer term effects of a hiring freeze.

Administration must rank departments in terms of prioritizing resources. It is best to salvage a few areas of promise rather than have all departments sink.

I only wish this were a university with some semblance of management protocol. Unfortunately, it's an institution run by liars and fools. We can expect only the chaos of the old fashioned insane asylum, since our 'managers' (from Chairs upwards) have the brains and initiative of lobotomy patients.

Decisions for pay cuts and layoffs should be made after careful evaluation of each faculty or staff member's potential contributions to university revenue by way of external funding. Staff whose positions lead to increased external funding opportunities for the university should be protected, as should faculty not paid from their own contracts and grants.

Once the fat is cut - merit raises for the remaining people who make up the slack.

None

Take away our office phones....they are cumbersome and likely expensive. Tell

us how much paper we can use....there is TONS of waste.

No to post-DROP employment.

think they are doing the best they can with a bad situation

I appreciate your email communications to the faculty updating us the situation. I support all of the ideas laid out in the "Caucus Ideas" memo, not only about the furloughs but also about increasing revenues and reducing non-central operations.

The uncertainty of this is frightening!

This are indeed lean times we are currently enduring. It will get worse, I am afraid, before it gets better. The university must learn be more more efficient in providing services to the academic community and the university needs to narrow the scope of its mission. We simply cannot be a major research university AND a major undergraduate university. Lets hope the univesity strategic plan will reflect a more narrow and focused scope.

Employees paid off of contracts and grants should absolutely not be included in the UFF's proposed furlough program. The reason is clear. External entities have contracted with the university to provide a certain amount of labor on their projects during the year, and the budgets have been approved. This contract and grant salary money cannot generally be reallocated to the university general fund or any other fund so if it is not used for its intended purpose, then it can be lost (with its overhead). There also may be contractual obligations with the funding agencies that need to be considered regarding paid effort of faculty and staff. The UFF's stated plan of sharing furloughs across all units, ranks and employee groups should not apply to those who are entirely paid off of contracts and grants, but rather to those who are paid from the general budget that is in crisis. C&G funded employees have their own worries, in that if they do not generate all of their own funding, they are out of a job. They do not have the safety net of E&G employees. They must not be lumped together with the rest of the university employees under a misguided attempt at maintaining an artificial concept of "fairness".

Re: the UFF-FSU Caucus Ideas on FSU Budget Cuts (12/12/2008)

While I support the majority of the ideas presented under Point 1, I am distressed to see such operations as the "Asolo, the Ringling Museum, and Panama City" lumped together as being not "central to FSU's primary academic mission" (Point 1a). These -- unfortunately underutilized -- resources are unique jewels that should be built up and encouraged along with other jewels such as the Study Abroad Program, etc. Using poor economic conditions as an excuse to get rid of these programs will result in a greatly diminished university once we are past the current crisis.

I am even more distressed, however, at the suggestion that "the pain should be shared across all units" (Point 2a) and that "the measures should be progressive" (Point 2b). We are long past the time for such a "feel-good" approach. We are already at a crisis point, where strong programs suffer so that weak programs can be saved, where top-performing faculty are lost to other institutions while poor-performing faculty remain.

While it's hard to imagine a university without, say, an Anthropology department or a Computer Science program, it is imperative that we take a hard look at all departments from a national perspective, and re-double our efforts to save those programs with high national rankings. There should be no across-the-board cuts this time; poorly performing departments and personnel should be eliminated.

Nationally-ranked programs at this University face a grave risk, and if they are not

saved, it will take decades for them to recover their rankings. And every time the University loses nationally-ranked faculty to other institutions, these programs suffer further. We need to make every effort to save our top programs and our top faculty. Rather than sharing the burden equally, the entire burden needs to be placed on "the unfortunate few" -- and if that means the elimination of entire programs and departments, so be it.

Finally, it is critically important that our tenured and tenure-track faculty be protected. This university already places too great an emphasis on non-tenure-track faculty and staff. The tenured and tenure-track faculty *are* the University; when it comes to layoffs, saving the jobs of non-tenure-track faculty and staff should be an extremely low priority.

FSU is top heavy. Cut administrator positions and salary.

I oppose "progressive" plans, such as those proposed in the latest union email. The cuts if there are any should be the same percentage or number of days furlough for ALL workers; those making more salary would be cut more dollars, but not a larger percentage. If there are furloughs, 12 month employees should be furloughed 1/3 more than 9 month as they are paid for three months more work.

Nope.

The university has far too many levels of administration. These should be downsized and cut as they are not central to the educational mission of the university. Tuition must be raised to sustainable rates.

I see on the "Caucus Ideas" draft, that there is a consideration to eliminate E&G funding for 'capsules'-- being centers, institutes, etc. that are not central to FSU's academic mission.

This is a little disturbing to me, as many of these 'institutes' are central to research. For example, MARTECH provides analytical services and other technical resources to the local research community. CSIT provides computational tools and expertise to the local research community. I'm sure there are others that escape my mind.

I hope the measure of FSU's academic mission includes technical training and research opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students in the sciences. If not, these very vital resources could be in jeopardy.

I do think there may be some exceptional circumstances where a unit should be eliminated. There are a few units that have very few majors, produce very few SCHs, and bring in little or no grant funding. In these cases eliminating such units may make sense. But there should be quantitative measures, not just subjective opinions.

Obviously, freezing the Bright Futures amount and giving universities discretion in their tuition levels will help long-run: as soon as next year, but not this year. But I know I'm not the first one to have suggested this.

Cost savings always seem to rest on reducing personnel costs without addressing the basic bureaucracy. Streamlining the bureaucratic processes to reduce the workload should be investigated rather than simply cutting people and retaining the same volume of bureaucracy.

I think there are many areas to cut costs before reductions in personnel - travel, electric, adjuncts, student stipends, etc. Although, once these are exhausted, RIF may be needed. Again, I do not support any salary reductions in any way. Furloughs do not work - as we would continue to write, etc. anyway. What would be furloughed - less teaching? Less committee service? Are we going to have lowered tenure/promotion research expectations? There is no such thing as a reduction in workload at FSU. It would just be more working at home for less pay. Although, if ranking them, I support layoffs, then furloughs (which, at least, keep the current rate of pay), and then LASTLY

pay reductions (because these would take forever to get back again). Do NOT negotiate any pay reductions!!!

I agree with the measures outlined in the crisis ideas document; there are many measures that can be taken before layoffs and pay cuts to faculty.

Define unavoidable. Obviously, the state needs to increase tuition. A high percentage of students attending now come from families who can afford to pay more. There should be some give there. And the "brain drain" argument is a hopefully good one for legislators. Kill the FL state universities and Alabama, MS, LA wont be tourist destinations anymore. They will be Florida.

Coaches have contracts that you can't change to a dollar per year. As with the furloughs, the option will generate greater cost in attorney's fees that it will save.

Now is probably a good time to bring administrative salaries back into line with peer institutions.

Too bad no one planned for this rainy day

Please make number 2 your last option. Won't 1A through 1H be sufficient?

I love and appreciate athletics and their programs at the University, but if they are receiving pay from non-state funds and state funds I don't agree given the current situation.

Any cuts and reductions must happen fairly and equally at every level. If the highest paid administrators are protected and the lowest paid staff are the ones who suffer ... the 3 auto makers begging for a bailout by flying in with private jets and using the bailout money for bonuses comes to mind if that happens.

Reduce the number of deans? Make some of the small schools/colleges part of a larger, existing, college.

Reduce the number of support personnel in administration? I have the impression that there are many more people in administration than there used to be.

Cancel the Bryan Hall LLC? Since it is geared toward liberal studies and most of our students arrive with liberal studies credit already and since there are a number of specialized LLCs now, I don't think it serves much of a purpose any more.

Promote University programs that are less common in other places - e.g. oceanography, marine biology, the circus - to out of state students (the circus works; I know an undergrad from New Jersey who came here because of the circus!).

Revive the idea of splitting the engineering school so that FSU has its own College of Engineering that can be improved to really compete with UF to draw more good engineering students here.

Ask the faculty and staff for suggestions (this is a suggestion for the university!). Make the actual situation clear to everyone.

Stop overcooling inside spaces.

There should be no pay-rate reductions, since FSU faculty are among the lowest paid in the nation. The administrators, however, are rather well paid. Perhaps the president could take a \$1 per year salary just as the CEOs of GM and other automakers have proposed. It is scandalous to have such a highly paid president at a time when faculty must be laid off -- shame on him.

Time for this idiot state to adopt a realistic tax system and "real-world" tuition.

Reduce amount spent on athletics and raise tuition.

My department area is already cut to the bone in terms of teaching faculty, so I don't see how it would be possible to grant majors to our students if core courses are

cut due to inability to teach the courses. Core courses are taught by our small area, quite a lot of them. So, our whole requirement for graduation would have to be restructured.

Thanks for your work on this and for your continued advocacy and action. Thank you for polling, I feel that I have an opportunity to contribute to the process.

Seems like administration could take cuts, too. And folks on DROP.

Raise tuition and work for a more equitable tax policy that isn't so easily affected by economic downturns. Less dependence on sales tax, real estate, and tourism-- income tax.

The untenured faculty need to be sure that any layoffs of staff in conservatory and film departments are made by seniority, and that upper administration make these layoffs, honoring existing rules. Otherwise we are going to lose our most experienced faculty in both areas -- and our most experienced faculty are often the most present in the international and national arena. New faculty has no time to 'get out there'. The entire untenured precedent in the arts needs an overhaul to maintain great faculty under these trying economic times. Our arts faculty are respected nation wide, as are the graduate schools they teach in. We face, every day, the spectre of unemployment and are looking for other jobs. There are few out there. That untenured faculty be cut when they took a risk to come to FSU rather than to go to tenured job with less exciting students is outrageous. It is no solace that everyone is in the same boat.

We need to be responsible and argue professionally for the high value for what we do - and stay together as a community that is under attack in globally very tough times

- a) The number of administrators (and their staff) should be cut by 30%.
- b) When a full prof retires, he/she is replaced by an asst prof at 1/2 the salary. When an administrator leaves, the successor is usually paid a higher salary. The professor model should be applied to senior administrators.
- c) I share your gall at senior admin's who are hired back after DROP. However, if that practice were outlawed, it wouldn't save any money, unless b) is enacted.

This budget crisis is a rare opportunity to cut the bloated, obscene coaching salaries, not to mention cutting upper level admin fat. (Dept chairs and below are not bloated, and should not be cut. We have a great dean and good staff in my college, but how many associate deans do you really need? Why aren't those people teaching and researching instead of making us go to unnecessary meetings? Faculty time = money. Fewer meetings = happier and more productive faculty.) Another way to save would be to go paperless: today in campus mail I received a flyer from the president announcing that the Lawton Professorship nominations were open. Why was this not on email? How much money did that flyer waste? Another thing: the timing of paychecks is said to be a money-saving trick that the university could use to keep higher figures in its accounts: if we were paid on Fridays, instead of Thursdays, the money could linger in FSU accounts over the weekend and earn some surprisingly high aggregate returns, or so I am told. Also if we went to a monthly instead of biweekly paycheck, we would save a lot in administrative payroll costs (that should be a voluntary thing, rolled in partially at first--some people cut it quite close paycheck to paycheck---and the first time it's done, the people receiving the first monthly payout should get the whole month in a lump sum, and then nothing, not the other way around). Another suggestion: no night classes, or cut them to only one or two nights---night classes are a bad idea anyway given the exhaustion and security factors---no one likes to teach night classes, and many of us feel frightened and unsafe having to do it, especially lately. Then we could shut down building energy at 5pm every night and on weekends--that would save a bundle. Also, buildings are overheated in winter and overcooled in summer: 68 in winter, 79 in summer should be the norm. Finally, I think it will be crucial not to lose

good research faculty at this time---all too tempting to turn it into a Community College for teaching revenues---but research leaves, grant support, and promotion support should be retained 'til the bitter end. Likewise library and labs, where the real (unpaid but most important) work of the university gets done. Thank you for listening and for caring.

I heard cluster hiring is still going on, and that rather than hiring those they are this year where there are actually student boots on the ground needing them, they are going through with (rather than postponing) promised hires when senior people were hired.

Can faculty pay themselves some days during academic year?

In spite of the many energy efficient things I'm hearing about, I'm seeing a *ton* of wasted energy on campus. There's also so much building going on! I know there are separate and distinct funds all over the place, but this seems like an ideal time to reassess those distinctions, particularly if we come to the point of laying off faculty or reducing salaries (including via furlough) or building a new parking garage. I'm a single parent, and struggling enough already.

Tell the people in the "Pathways to Excellence" Program to start teaching and shoulder their share of the load or hit to road. If their teaching performances are inadequate (as is likely to be the case) they should also be given notice to take their research "skills" elsewhere.

The "crisis" is due to a bad state funding model and is only compounded by the economic downturn, not caused by it. Thus we need to beat the drum for fewer tax loopholes for the wealthy, etc.

We should also be asking what the administration is doing to share the pain. Are we reducing high-paid administrative overhead?

FSU faculty in the College of Engineering are being hurt everyday by the financial association with FAMU. Bills are not paid. There is no fiscal responsibility at FAMU, and now this mismanagement is negatively impacting FSUs abilities to conduct its business in the College.

The University needs to leverage these very troubled financial times to make power plays in an effort to gain some control over what we do. Increased tuition rates and the establishment of entrepreneurial programs are keys to our future. Let's cut ties with state government as much as we possibly can.

During the next few months, the dilemma of university funding may very well be couched in terms of "hard working taxpayers" vs. "elite, entitled academics." A creative (and honest) answer to that charge will be essential to maintaining a sufficient funding level.

I'm looking at other states for faculty positions.

It is time to be creative but also to address the cowardly politicians running the state who are fearful of raising taxes or removing exemptions even temporarily in the midst of a crisis.

Can't the football program chip in?

Cut Bobby's salary in half (only ONE MILLION!). Sell the President's farm!!!

I hope that the university will listen and care about their faculty's opinions.

This "crisis" has been manufactured by the Republicans that dominate the State House, Senate and the Governor's Mansion. Beginning with the Jeb Bush administration, the refusal to recognize the funding needs of the State of Florida, together with the systematic cutting of taxes in good times leaving State services and employees exposed to serious risks in bad times.

The Republican's should be asked to explain what their lack of stewardship allowing the State of Florida to become a laughing stock of the nation by finishing last in state

spending on the critical services of its citizens.

Lastly the Republicans in charge of State government must be made to understand that macroeconomic policy is the province of the Federal Government. If a tax increase is necessary to maintain essential services then they must do the right thing.

It's crazy to continue to do a half-baked, largely fruitless job with a grossly underfunded "Pathways" initiative rather than to put those and all other available resources into filling the gaping holes in the faculty ranks needed to teach our basic, critical undergrad major's courses (those needed for graduation). The Administration needs to recognize that we are no longer contenders for the nation's top 50 Class I Research Universities and won't be for a long while considering the budget crisis we are now immersed in. Let's be realistic and shelve that goal for now.

Instead we must all recognize that we are now in a survival mode here, and that the Legislatures is funding us strictly by FTEs, not research output, whether we like that or not. But unless we can plug the mega-holes in FSU's curriculum dike and quickly, our entire educational effort and the public goodwill we have so laboriously earned here at FSU over the years will quickly spiral downward and crash big time if we can't even service our critical undergrad major's courses.

Eliminating summer school would save a lot, I think, and send a message. It would amount to a pay reduction for many, but it is not guaranteed anyway for most faculty. Some accommodation would have to be made for 12 month employees.

I absolutely agree with your listings of items to cut first, especially athletics and Pathways.

Thanks for keeping us informed. I learned more from your two-page posting than I have from the entire Blackboard site.

Laying off faculty would dig a whole for the University that will take 20 years or so to get back out of....

A long term funding plan for the Universities must be in place. A year to year crisis is not a plan. If the state wishes to have a much smaller and poorer university system then that should be stated and we can find other jobs.

Millions of dollars and thousands of hours of faculty and staff time could be saved if the university colleges and departments would approach the outside accreditation entities to put a hold on the review/accreditation process. There are some colleges and departments that have necessary accreditation such as the law school, med school, education, etc... However, there are many colleges and departments that waste money and time on unnecessary accreditation that does nothing for the graduating students. These colleges or departments could do away with accreditation permanently.

the union should be watch dog, such as budget cuts are dealt with in an uniform and correct way across the campus. For instance, a senior professor should not have more access to some funds (unrelated to salary, but related to, e.g. research) compared to a young professor, and so forth.

It is crucial to maintain our most productive faculty. Proposing pay-cuts will drive them away faster than they are leaving now and will destroy the credibility of the university.

The Association's proposals are the worst I have ever seen a "faculty" association ever put forward.

I am not that this is a good idea because the admin will jump on anything we suggest, perhaps this university and the others should lobby for a state tax that goes towards education (the lotto funding is just a shame). [but of course this will not help shortterm]

Any response should spread the pain around. It will be immoral if those making six figure salaries spare themselves by laying-off those making five figure salaries. The most secure must make proportional sacrifices.

I agree with many of the suggestions in the UFF-FSU Caucus Budget Crisis Ideas, especially those relating to cuts in sports funding.

This is a difficult time for everyone, and hopefully cool heads and concerned hearts will make the best decisions for the most number of people affected.

The crisis has been brewing for some time, but the administration has waited until most faculty are off campus and away for the holidays to ask deans and chairs to propose almost catastrophic cuts in their academic budgets. This allows almost no time for consultation and is likely to put heavy pressure on chairs who are unable to discuss proposals with senior colleagues. Is this by administrative design?

Higher ed has done a terrible job convincing voters of its role in society.

The Florida legislature does not care about state workers which includes university personnel - that's evident and truly sad.

I am curious about why the state is starting new medical programs in this time of crisis. Is there a shortage of MDs? Also it seems odd that FSU is seeking membership in the AAU at a time when basic survival seems of utmost concern. Perhaps membership in the AAU means increased funding? I think if the administration came forward to discuss their philosophy about dealing with the big picture faculty might understand the variables involved more clearly, and thus be able to give more constructive/enlightened/useful feedback and ideas. For instance, when the faculty was asked for input about the recent reorganization proposal the timeline was incredibly short and we were not told why. I realize everyone cannot be pleased with whatever the ultimate decisions are, but if we knew the reasoning behind them it could help us cope and maybe plan a little better.

I would hope that some of the cuts or reductions in services that are made be temporary in nature, and could be restored when times get better.

High paid administrators who have come back after drop and retirement are gaming the system. It is not fair. They should go.

"Capsules" or institutes mentioned as recommended early targets in item h, employ union members on E&G, and should be treated as such by the union. Targeting capsules threatens some members to benefit others.

Let us see. My guess the response will be to reduce staff to depts, which are already pitifully paid, so much impact there. Now, reducing administrative staff will save more money and improve efficiency. But they will really like to go for is selective firing of faculty. You know, the people to teach in a University. Yes, we need fewer of them.

Tuition needs to be raised and Bright Futures needs to be fixed.

Cut all non-essential operations first. There is a good bit that could be cut back aside from personnel. For instance, I know that TK will say that facilities 'come from a different pot of money' but my Dean just spent 300K remodeling her office. This is insanity. It would have paid the salary of 4 assistant professors, benefits and al, for the year.

WE MUST CEASE OUR FORMER SPENDING PATTERNS AND BE BETTER STEWARDS OF THE PUBLIC MONEY.....PERIOD.

All construction must cease and the money budgeted for such should be redirected to cover money shortages. It is not acceptable to hear that construction money comes from another budget.

Regrettably, layoffs are the lesser of evils (for the university).

I've friends in the public defenders office who have been put on furloughs with no reduction in work. It is criminal

it is very important to put a stop on the bleeding of human resources. if we have temporary layoffs of teaching faculty, support non-teaching research faculty and other staff-- we will not get these people back. they will find work elsewhere before any call-back is announced.

we need to gather the wagons for a few months to a year or so until the issue of increasing state revenue can be addressed. in any event, economic downturns typically only last a few years, and we are already into it. if we hemorrhage talent the cost to the university and the state will be much greater down the line.

cut all empty positions, allow faculty to retire early and even enter drop early. Offer faculty optional leave of absence ..

As fluorescent lights in hallways have two tubes, I recommend taking one tube out of each light in the interest of reducing energy costs. I would suggest leaving lights in offices as they are.

I also suggest setting the air conditioning 2-3 degrees higher -- it is often far too cold in classrooms anyway.

I like the idea of shifting the cost of supporting revenue-generating-sports personal to non-state funding sources so those resources can be redistributed to core academic functions and, perhaps, when the crisis ends, to non-revenue sports that diversify opportunities for student athletes and local spectators.

We should worry about the great number of outstanding faculty who are contemplating leaving FSU. It should be a major aim of the Association to retain distinguished faculty who contribute powerfully to FSU's credibility in the national and international arenas.

Unfortunatley, FSU probably also needs some program eliminations.

The university could also explore additional closings such as between Christmas and New Years. Spring Break is a possibility and perhaps a week between summer sessions. I don't know what the ultimate savings would be, but it might be helpful. The number of summer offerings could also be considered for reduction.

They need to cut back on all those international programs asap and focus on the national/state crisis.

REQUIRE that a percentage of booster contributions be earmarked for academic programs/faculty retention/faculty recruiting/teaching programs.

Tighten up management--good sound fiscal management!

Whatecer the solution, leave students and faculty out of the equation.

I am not in favor of any furloughs or pay rate reductions that are across-the-board. The union should embrace quality where it exists, and protect teaching at all costs in all departments. Good teachers may be lost at the expense of good researchers ("productive"). Think of the students - that is our core mission.

Fight all cuts. Publicly protest. Administration must lead.

Pay cuts starting at the Governors level then down thru the over paid government - why put the burden of finance on the lowest paid teachers of any university system in the country

Unstable funding policy for education hurts not only staff, faculty and teachers but above all our students. We trade quality for quantity. It makes Florida much less attractive and competitive.

For the sake of the university, I think it's better to cut weaker programs and save stronger ones. Cutting evenly across the board may doom us all.

FSU budget crisis is causing university to loose faculty to other institutions. This is going to affect our severely hurt our rankings.

Staff should be preserved as well, with a pay reduction, again on a graded, but lower percentage scale. Research Universities cannot exist without adequate staffing.

Keep enrollment down, raise tuition the full 15%. reduce any travel, equipment and postpone improvements and building projects as long as needed.

We have too many layers of administration. One new dean added a layer of associate deans this past year.

There needs to be a way to shift the building budget to other areas of the budget. We all do this at home: if we have a crisis (perhaps a medical emergency) and need money for the crisis, then we are able to shift money from other items to cover the crisis (we don't build the deck, the additional room we want, concrete the land, landscape, and instead use the money for the crisis). I am perplexed when I constantly hear that all this building and renovation have to occur since the money is there and cannot to moved to another budget area. Let's change that restriction.

Glad they are raising tuition

Increase tuition.

I wouldn't mind an across-the-board pay cut as long as EVERYONE was cut by the same percentage.