On October 15, the MSCA was shown yet again that Management does not take our bargaining sessions seriously. Many of the points that were brought up at the table had been articulated already–and Management insisted that faculty and librarians do not understand the landscape of higher education. The topics of conversation at the table demonstrated clearly that Management has not been listening to union concerns or understanding what faculty and librarians do in the course of their work.

The MSCA constructed a package that took Management's concerns into account while also addressing MSCA members' needs; MSCA wanted to ensure members did not fall behind even further in terms of pay while moving closer to a final contract. To that end, the MSCA package addressed outstanding proposals, suggesting that both MSCA and Management withdraw what was left while accepting a new financial proposal (of 15-7-7, a significant concession from MSCA's original position), payment for mileage for both student teacher and internship supervision, language identifying what must be posted to a university's learning management system (LMS), and updated and more appropriate language for the Classroom Observation form. The MSCA team felt that this package represented a good-faith effort to close out this cycle of contract bargaining.

Unfortunately, the MSCA was again disappointed by Management's approach at the table. When addressing the LMS proposal–where the MSCA team again raised concerns about open-ended, vague, and confusing language regarding the mandated use of an LMS, even in face-to-face classes–Management doubled down on requiring an expansion of unit members' workloads, arguing that all materials (or a good portion of them) in the classroom, regardless of modality, had to be posted on the university's LMS. The argument that this contravened members' rights to academic freedom, especially in the selection of materials to teach and the way they are communicated, was ignored, while Management could not answer direct questions about how they defined terms like "course instructions." What this demonstrated again was that the presidents' team has absolutely no idea what being in the classroom is like.

A similar attitude was clear in the MSCA's addition of internship supervision to a proposal to pay for mileage for supervising student teachers. The MSCA acknowledged that teacher supervision is both a critical and expansive part of educating future teachers but wanted to also acknowledge other types of site visits that are essential to the high-impact practice of internships. Management refused to accept this addition, arguing that adding compensation for site visits to ensure an adequate internship experience would be too onerous for the universities.

At the beginning of the session, Management seemed to indicate that they had a revised financial proposal for the MSCA, but stated that they wanted to hear what MSCA was proposing first. Management ultimately stated that they had nothing new to put across the table, especially financially, and instead asserted their previous position that 4-3-3 was the best that they could do. The MSCA again significantly revised the financial proposal, working instead to prevent falling further behind Day part-time instructor compensation by suggesting an adjustment of 15-7-7. In our explanation, we stated that this was the lowest adjustment that would address inflation, the high cost of living, and the fact that DGCE was not given the 8% raise other contracts were in the last fiscal year. We pointed out that the current Management proposal constituted a $145/credit hour ***loss***. For a 3-credit class, this amounts to a $438 pay cut; for a 4-credit class, it is a cut of $582. ***This is a significant cut***, one that makes it even harder for our members to make ends meet in a high cost-of-living state. Management refused to acknowledge this fact. Management repeatedly refused to answer whether or not they believed their proposal addressed inflation at all, stating that they may never actually answer the question as we posed it to them. Even as Management refused to consider our financial proposal or construct a revision of theirs, they clearly indicated that they wanted the MSCA to withdraw all the outstanding proposals we had indicated in the package–without accepting the package.

The message of the session was clear. Management believed it did not have to move at all financially, even as its proposals expand unit members' workload. The unwillingness or inability to answer direct questions about addressing inflation or even defining terms they used in their proposals (while claiming our proposal was too vague and unclear) demonstrated a complete lack of understanding of the work of faculty and librarians in DGCE. They repeatedly framed more equitable pay as necessitating charging students more–though DGCE administrators have been consistently getting cost-of-living adjustments including the 8% that unit members did not get.

We need our members to tell the University Presidents this is unacceptable; we need our members to insist that the University Presidents acknowledge the work DGCE faculty and librarians do. University Presidents need to be informed about how they are being represented at the table, **PLEASE EMAIL YOUR UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS, ASKING IF**

THESE POSITIONS TRULY REPRESENT THEIR ATTITUDES ABOUT DGCE FACULTY AND LIBRARIANS. Our next bargaining session is in person at Worcester State University on November 7 from 1 to 4. **PLEASE SIGN UP TO BE A SILENT REPRESENTATIVE AND SHOW THE MANAGEMENT TEAM AND THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS THAT DGCE FACULTY AND LIBRARIANS DESERVE A MORE EQUITABLE CONTRACT.**