

# AAUP Works

Chapter Bulletin-Article Reprint

Volume 15, Issue 8

December 1, 2008



## UC AAUP Executive Council

### President

Steve Howe

### Vice President

Daniel Langmeyer

### Secretary

James Westheider

### Treasurer

Jane Thompson

### At-Large Members

Larry Gilligan

Rosemary Franklin

Rick Paul

### Associates Council Chair

Joel Helms

### Associates Council Vice-Chair

Greg Loving

### Organizing Committee Chair

John McNay

### Contract Compliance & Education Committee Chair

Lynn Davis

### Budget & Compensation Advisory Committee Chair

Steve Pelikan

### Political, Social & Academic Freedom Issues Action Committee Chair

Howard Tolley

### Immediate Past President

Sally Dunn

## UC AAUP Staff

Deborah M. Herman,  
Executive Director

Dave Rubin,  
Director, Contract Administration

Stephanie Spanja,  
Director, Contract Administration

Anne Feldman,  
Administrative Assistant

## Tuition Remission: A Review of the Benefits What's Changed, What Hasn't

The AAUP staff has received several inquiries in recent months regarding the changes in the University's tuition remission policy with the implementation of the 2007-2010 collective bargaining agreement. Since there appears to be some uncertainty among the faculty as to which aspects of the tuition remission policy have – and have *not* – changed, we thought it would be helpful to review the current tuition remission policy.

The process of changing UC's tuition remission policy was initiated by the University approximately two years ago. As we discussed in *Works* 14.4 last year, the UC administration, through its Tuition Discount & Remission Working Group, had been exploring various ideas for changes to its tuition remission policy, culminating in the Working Group's dissemination of possible proposals for changes in January and February 2007. These possible proposals included a 3-year waiting period for eligibility, an age restriction of 25 for unmarried dependents, a 30% co-pay for all undergraduate coursework for unmarried dependents who were not Pell-grant eligible, and a 50% co-pay for all graduate coursework, among others. The Working Group's list of possible proposals engendered deep concern among the faculty, prompting the AAUP Executive Council to issue a position statement in early March 2007, wherein it outlined the principles it would use to assess any proposals regarding tuition remission made by UC during bargaining.

Among these principles were the insistence that tuition remission policies must not be viewed in isolation from the faculty's overall compensation and benefits packages, that proposals to close access to certain programs or schools must be accompanied by data showing the need for change, and that the Council would require that assertions of potential cash cost savings be accompanied by supporting data.

In spring 2007, the AAUP conducted a survey of faculty regarding possible administration proposals on the tuition remission policy, the results of which showed significant opposition to the Tuition Discount & Remission Working Group's suggested proposals for changes in the tuition remission policy. Importantly, the survey made clear that faculty regarded UC's tuition remission policy as a key factor in faculty retention and recruitment, and as a necessary, if only partial, recompense for salaries which lag behind those for faculty at peer institutions.

Consistent with its March 2007 position statement and with survey results showing the importance of a generous tuition remission policy for recruitment and retention purposes, the Executive Council rejected UC administration proposals which would have instituted a vesting period for new faculty, an age cap for dependent children, eliminated tuition remission

for all post-baccalaureate work and placed a number of restrictions on faculty use of tuition remission credits.

However, where UC was able to demonstrate that its tuition remission policy constituted a financial burden or was otherwise able to show a reasonable rationale for a policy change, the AAUP negotiating team and the Council entertained those proposals.

The negotiations yielded certain changes to the tuition remission policy, which is set forth in detail in Article 11 of the collective bargaining agreement. Crucially, **there were no changes in the tuition remission policies with respect to Faculty Members themselves.** There were, however, several changes in tuition remission policies for spouses, domestic partners and dependent children. Most notably, tuition remission benefits are being phased out for post-baccalaureate work in Law, Medicine [M.D. only] and Pharmacy [Pharm.D only] for spouses, domestic partners and children. The Council agreed to this phase-out because UC was able to demonstrate that these colleges have long waiting lists, limited space, and that UC bore a significant financial burden as a result of the loss of \$1.2 million per year that tuition-paying students would have brought in.

The chart [below] lists key aspects of the tuition remission policy as it applies to Faculty Members and their spouses, domestic partners and unmarried dependents. Please note that the chart is merely a summary; if you are considering making use of the tuition remission benefit, please review Article 11

and, if you have any questions, contact our office.

With the implementation of the new tuition remission policy there have arisen some issues regarding the impact of graded courses for which a Faculty Member’s spouse, domestic partner or unmarried dependent received a “W” on the 216-credit hour maximum at the undergraduate level.

***Do “W”s received prior to the implementation of the new tuition remission policy count toward the 216-credit hour maximum?***

Yes. Credit hours for courses for which a spouse, domestic partner or unmarried dependent received a “W” in the past are applied toward the 216-credit hour maximum at the undergraduate level.

***Must a spouse, domestic partner or unmarried dependent of a Faculty Member reimburse the University for the tuition cost of a course for which he or she received a “W” in that same quarter?***

No. The University’s contracts with IUOE and AFSCME require that an employee or eligible dependent who withdraws from a course after the normal deadline for tuition reimbursement must reimburse the University 100% of the tuition reimbursement paid on their behalf. The AAUP agreement **does not** contain such a provision. If you experience any problems with the University Registrar with respect to this issue, please contact our office.

— Stephanie Spanja, JD  
 Dave Rubin, PhD  
 Directors, Contract Administration

	Credit Hour Maximum – Undergraduate Level	Credit Hour Maximum – Graduate Level	Credit Hour Status	Out of State Residence Fee	Colleges of Law, Medicine and Pharmacy 9/1/2008 – 8/31/2009	Colleges of Law, Medicine and Pharmacy effective 9/1/2009
<b>Represented Full-Time</b>	6 credit hours per quarter	6 credit hours per quarter	Graded	None	Full	Full
<b>Represented Part-Time</b>	3 credit hours per quarter	3 credit hours per quarter	Graded or audited	None	Full	Full
<b>Spouses or Domestic Partners</b>	216 credit hour maximum	No maximum	Graded only	\$10 per credit hour	If enrolled by last day of Spring term 2008, full remission; if enrolled after last day of Spring term 2008, 50% remission	If enrolled by last day of Spring term 2008, full remission; if enrolled after last day of Spring term 2008, no remission
<b>Unmarried Dependents</b>	216 credit hour maximum	No maximum	Graded only	\$10 per credit hour	If enrolled by last day of Spring term 2008, full remission; if enrolled after last day of Spring term 2008, 50% remission	If enrolled by last day of Spring term 2008, full remission; if enrolled after last day of Spring term 2008, no remission