Roadblock on Bargaining Street
Brad Art

The MSCA Bargaining Committee worked over the summer, trying in vain to negotiate a one-year extension to the 2001-2003 collective bargaining agreement. Central to our efforts was the principle that any extension agreement would have to include across-the-board salary increases. The Board of Higher Education (BHE) and the Council of Presidents (COP) refused any salary increase. One of the reasons they gave was the fact that other higher education contracts have not been funded by the Legislature.

For those of you who don’t know the history, here it is. In the summer and fall of 2001 other higher education unions representing a range of employees in the state and community colleges and the University of Massachusetts negotiated and ratified collective bargaining agreements. Then-governor Jane Swift submitted to the Legislature the necessary funding requests for these contracts. The funding legislation sat in the Legislature through the end of 2001 and half of 2002, but was finally passed five months before Swift left office. Swift then vetoed the very funding legislation she had filed, apologizing for “reengaging” on the deals. Since then the affected unions have been struggling to get the Legislature to override Swift’s vetoes or to pass new funding legislation, but to no avail.

Since then, no state employee collective bargaining agreements have been funded, and negotiations have generally come to a standstill. The MSCA is one of the unions now being stalled at the bargaining table while the other unions’ long-overdue funding awaits action. That’s the roadblock.

The last offer from the BHE-COP team contained no salary increases. The MSCA rejected it and decided instead to return to our original plan of securing a three-year contract with raises. In order to pursue that goal, we need your help in getting the message to the Legislature to fund the other contracts. The Legislature’s failure to do this has seriously damaged the collective bargaining process for all state unions and must be remedied immediately. [See Page Three.]

We recognize, however, that the BHE-COP team will argue that the state lacks the funds to give any raises. That is unacceptable.
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Campaign Continues to Eliminate Social Security Offset
Len Paolillo

You may not know it, but the Social Security system in this country considers you a second-class citizen. Why is this? Upon retirement you will be receiving pension benefits received, the retiree’s Social Security or survivor benefits. For every two dollars in public

For example, pay increases for promotions effective in each year above were paid, even though there was no across-the-board increase that year. Other examples of non-comprehensive pay increases include equity and minimal salary formula adjustments made between 1986 and the present; longevity adjustments; some merit increases (e.g., Departmental and Academic Performance Awards, College Citations for Meritorious Service) that were paid on the base; and the like.

What are we doing about this? The NEA has had a three-year contract with raises. In order to pursue that goal, we need your help in getting the message to the Legislature to fund the other contracts. The Legislature’s failure to do this has seriously damaged the collective bargaining process for all state unions and must be remedied immediately. [See Page Three.]

We recognize, however, that the BHE-COP team will argue that the state lacks the funds to give any raises. That is unacceptable.

continued on page 2

Campaign Continues to Eliminate Social Security Offset
Len Paolillo

You may not know it, but the Social Security system in this country considers you a second-class citizen. Why is this? Upon retirement you will be receiving pension benefits received, the retiree’s Social Security or survivor benefits. For every two dollars in public

For example, pay increases for promotions effective in each year above were paid, even though there was no across-the-board increase that year. Other examples of non-comprehensive pay increases include equity and minimal salary formula adjustments made between 1986 and the present; longevity adjustments; some merit increases (e.g., Departmental and Academic Performance Awards, College Citations for Meritorious Service) that were paid on the base; and the like.

What are we doing about this? The NEA has had a three-year contract with raises. In order to pursue that goal, we need your help in getting the message to the Legislature to fund the other contracts. The Legislature’s failure to do this has seriously damaged the collective bargaining process for all state unions and must be remedied immediately. [See Page Three.]

We recognize, however, that the BHE-COP team will argue that the state lacks the funds to give any raises. That is unacceptable.

continued on page 2

MSCA Communications
Salem State College
Salem, MA 01970

Non-Profit
U.S. Postage
P A T D
Permit No. 93
Salem, MA
No More Zeros!
The NEA-sponsored salary study included in this Perspective confirms what we all know. We cannot accept any more years with no salary increases. We trail our peer institutions because of years of neglect by the employer. This neglect damages our professional and personal lives.
The most recent failure in bargaining by the BHE-COP demonstrates a lack of imagination and courage. The BHE-COP would not agree to a mere 2% cost of living increase, 1% of which was to substitute our own negotiated professional development money for half of the salary increase.

We must demand that our salaries rise to levels competitive with our peers. Without raises, our relative position will deteriorate, making us even less competitive as the cost of living rises and we are forced to pay more for health insurance and medical expenses.

During the last round of bargaining, we faced a carefully planned campaign to discredit us and strip us of crucial protections. Because the MSCA, with the assistance of the MTA, held firm and fought back, we were able to secure a contract that achieved important economic gains and preserves the rights and protections of academic freedom, guarantees just cause in post-tenure review, and provides monies for professional development.

We face another tough challenge today. It is a two-part challenge: Get the Legislature to fund the other higher education contracts (which means getting a veto override margin in support of this funding), and get the BHE-COP to bargain seriously for a fair contract. Our message and our mission: NO MORE ZEROS!

Some people have suggested that the MSCA should not bargain with the employer under these circumstances. Know that we will never walk away from our responsibility to bargain on your behalf.

To walk away is to concede to management through silence what it cannot get through negotiations. Bargaining continues, and we must not yield to another year with no cost of living increase! The BHE-COP Team has confirmed bargaining on October 31, November 14, and December 12, 2003. We do not know what direction our talks will take, but we will keep you posted.

—Brad Art is Chairperson of the MSCA (day) Bargaining Committee and Professor of Philosophy at Westfield State College.

FYI: Promotions and Terminal Degrees
Effective September 1, 2003

Faculty and librarians who were promoted effective September 1, 2003, should have received a salary adjustment appropriate to their new rank in their September 12th pay advice. The full impact of the salary adjustment should be included in the September 26th pay advice. The full impact of this salary adjustment should be included in the September 26th pay advice.

During the negotiations this summer, the MSCA undertook to analyze state college faculty salaries compared to peer institutions as defined by the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education and adjusted for cost-of-living (COLA). With the assistance of the NEA Division of Higher Education, JBL Associates, a research consulting firm in Washington, DC, was engaged to conduct these analyses.

The average salaries that appear in the accompanying tables were computed using salary data obtained by JBL from the U.S. Department of Education for the FY 2002-2003. Salaries for teaching faculty on nine or ten month work-years, only, were included.

Two sets of results were obtained because there is more than one acceptable method to adjust for cost-of-living. The underlying methodology in both cases was the same. The average salaries for the state colleges in both Tables 1 and 2 are true averages. The average salaries for the peer institutions were computed after these salaries were adjusted to the cost of living in the city where each corresponding Massachusetts state college is located. The specific COLA values used were those most recently available from the U.S. Department of Labor’s cost of living index.

The average salaries for peer institutions in Table 1 (JBL Method) were computed by JBL, using what might be referred to as an absolute difference method. The peer average salaries in Table 2 (ACCRA Method) were computed by the MSCA using what might be referred to as a relative difference method used by ACCRA, a self-proclaimed “non-profit organization dedicated to economic development and policy research” (http://www.coli.org).

The JBL method used the actual (or absolute) difference in the costs of living of the peer institution and state college cities to increase or decrease the average salaries for faculty at peer institutions. The MSCA/ACCRA method used the percent (or relative) difference in the costs of living of the peer institution and state college cities to increase or decrease the average salaries for faculty at peer institutions.

Regardless of the method used, the fact remains that we—as state college faculty—are paid far less than our counterparts at peer institutions as defined by the Board of Higher Education, especially when cost-of-living is factored into the analysis.

—C. J. O’Donnell is Chairperson of the MSCA Salary Database Committee and Professor of Mathematics at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

Comparison of State College Faculty Salaries Adjusted for Cost of Living: Massachusetts State Colleges and BHE-Defined Peer Institutions

C. J. O’Donnell

During the negotiations this summer, the MSCA undertook to analyze state college faculty salaries compared to peer institutions as defined by the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education and adjusted for cost-of-living (COLA). With the assistance of the NEA Division of Higher Education, JBL Associates, a research consulting firm in Washington, DC, was engaged to conduct these analyses.

The average salaries that appear in the accompanying tables were computed using salary data obtained by JBL from the U.S. Department of Education for the FY 2002-2003. Salaries for teaching faculty on nine or ten month work-years, only, were included.

Two sets of results were obtained because there is more than one acceptable method to adjust for cost-of-living. The underlying methodology in both cases was the same. The average salaries for the state colleges in both Tables 1 and 2 are true averages. The average salaries for the peer institutions were computed after these salaries were adjusted to the cost of living in the city where each corresponding Massachusetts state college is located. The specific COLA values used were those most recently available from the U.S. Department of Labor’s cost of living index.

The average salaries for peer institutions in Table 1 (JBL Method) were computed by JBL, using what might be referred to as an absolute difference method. The peer average salaries in Table 2 (ACCRA Method) were computed by the MSCA using what might be referred to as a relative difference method used by ACCRA, a self-proclaimed “non-profit organization dedicated to economic development and policy research” (http://www.coli.org).

The JBL method used the actual (or absolute) difference in the costs of living of the peer institution and state college cities to increase or decrease the average salaries for faculty at peer institutions. The MSCA/ACCRA method used the percent (or relative) difference in the costs of living of the peer institution and state college cities to increase or decrease the average salaries for faculty at peer institutions.

Regardless of the method used, the fact remains that we—as state college faculty—are paid far less than our counterparts at peer institutions as defined by the Board of Higher Education, especially when cost-of-living is factored into the analysis.

—C. J. O’Donnell is Chairperson of the MSCA Salary Database Committee and Professor of Mathematics at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

Table 1: JBL Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mass. Average</th>
<th>Percent at Rank</th>
<th>Peer Average</th>
<th>Percent at Rank</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent of Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$67,400</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$79,400</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td>$56,700</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>$65,900</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof</td>
<td>$48,600</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$53,700</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$43,100</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$37,100</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ranks</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$64,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: ACCRA Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mass. Average</th>
<th>Percent at Rank</th>
<th>Peer Average</th>
<th>Percent at Rank</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent of Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$67,400</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$82,800</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>$15,400</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td>$56,700</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>$68,100</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$11,400</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof</td>
<td>$48,600</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$55,600</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$43,100</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$39,400</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ranks</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
All salary data were provided by JBL Associates (Washington, DC) from data from the U.S. Department of Education.

Cost of Living Adjustments were made for the salaries at peer institutions based on COLA factors for the 200 largest metropolitan areas in the United States.

For Massachusetts State Colleges, only five (5) colleges provided salary data for the rank of Instructor (Bridgewater, Fitchburg, Framingham, Salem and Worcester).
## MTA Legislative Agenda for Fall 2003

**Patricia V. Markunas, MSCA President**

The Massachusetts Teachers Association has filed the following bills on behalf of higher education members across the three state systems. At the behest of the Higher Education Leadership Council, the Higher Education Contract Funding bill (HB2153) has been designated as the Number One priority for all MTA divisions and staff members over the next four to six weeks.

### Title of Bill/Bill #/Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Committee on</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Contract Funding - HB2153</td>
<td>to provide funding for all the unfunded higher education contracts including MSP/PSU, MSP-Lowell, USA and APA. Vetoed by Gov. Swift in July 2002</td>
<td>Committee on Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees Health Insurance – HB225</td>
<td>Clarify current law by ensuring that the standards for pension and group health insurance coverage are the same for all public employees.</td>
<td>Committee on Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance Benefits for Part-Time Higher Education Faculty – SB1539</td>
<td>Require that faculty who teach at least two, three or more credit courses per semester or four, three or more credit courses per calendar year at one or more state higher education institutions, including a division of continuing education, be eligible for state employee health insurance coverage.</td>
<td>Committee on Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIC Membership – SB904</td>
<td>Add more union representation, including MTA, on the state Group Insurance Commission.</td>
<td>Committee on Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditable Service for Sabbatical Leaves – SB1489</td>
<td>Provide that public higher education faculty and professional employees are granted a full year's creditable service toward retirement for each full year sabbatical leave taken.</td>
<td>Committee on Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Optional Retirement Plan Modifications – HB224</td>
<td>Permit higher education professional employees to be eligible for the faculty Optional Retirement Plan (ORP).</td>
<td>Committee on Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditable Service for Peace Corp, VISTA, Teacher Corp, and Americorps Service – SB1502</td>
<td>Enable state employees to purchase up to three years creditable service toward retirement for time served in the Peace Corps, VISTA, Teacher Corps and Americorps.</td>
<td>Committee on Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditable Service for Prestigious Non-Sabbatical Academic Leaves of Absences – SB1490</td>
<td>Authorize creditable service for higher education faculty who accept prestigious fellowships, awards, scholarships or other special assignment opportunities that benefit both the individual and the employing institution of public higher education.</td>
<td>Committee on Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty Pension Improvements – HB255</td>
<td>Require that part-time faculty who teach at least two, three or more credit courses per semester or four, three or more credit courses per calendar year at one or more state higher education institutions, including a division of continuing education, earn a year of creditable service for this time, and have earnings for this time counted in determining one's pension. Also, those who have accrued at least five years of creditable service through ten years of part-time work shall be deemed vested in the retirement system.</td>
<td>Committee on Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease Pension Contributions – SB1448</td>
<td>Decrease public employee pension contributions from 11% to 9%.</td>
<td>Committee on Public Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This chart was prepared by the staff in the MTA Division of Governmental Services.**
David Nolta

DN: So, Mr. Stigliano, what “made” you a sculptor? When, in your not-so-distant youth, did you know you wanted to carve and cast?

CS: I’ll give you three answers, and you can choose one.

I played with play-doh when I was five years old. I remember my father saying, “Make another horse like that one you made before.” But I didn’t remember what horse he was talking about. So possibly I made something else that I thought was a horse. Or, one of my brothers or sisters made the horse, but I tried to make the horse for him anyway. And I made about four or five horses, or parts of horses, and everytime I showed one to my father, he would say, “That’s good, but that still isn’t the one. Make one like you made that other one.”

Here’s another possibility. We lived near a river, and there was a lot of clay, and I used the clay from the riverbed to make all sorts of figures. It was during this period that I started making nudes.

Finally, it’s obvious that I became a sculptor because I need a lot of attention. As one of eight kids, I needed something to set me apart.

DN: And teaching? Have you always felt that as part of your artist’s’ vision?

CS: I always liked school, and even during those occasional periods when I wasn’t sure I wanted to be an artist, I always knew I wanted to be a teacher.

DN: And Massachusetts College of Art? What’s your feeling about working there, after how many years is it? Eighteen years?

CS: I love Mass Art, I love my department, and I love the people I work with. It’s difficult right now to work in any state school. The people controlling our budgets don’t necessarily share our priorities. We’ve lost courses, we’ve lost faculty and we’ve lost positions. But we continue to get outstanding students, which continues to make my job do-able, even enjoyable.

DN: Thank you so much for sharing these thoughts, and for sharing your work with us over the past many years.

CS: Thank you.

DN: No no, thank you!

CS: No, I insist, the pleasure is all mine.

—David Nolta is Associate Professor of Art History at the Massachusetts College of Art.

What is VOTE?

(Voice of Teachers for Education)

VOTE (Voice of Teachers for Education) is MTA’s Political Action Committee (PAC). Contributions to VOTE from MTA members make it possible for MTA to contribute to candidates who will stand up for public education. Your dues dollars are not used to make direct contributions to candidates. Massachusetts’ campaign finance law limits the amount of support MTA can directly give to candidates. It also restricts who can solicit political contributions. For example, the law not only prohibits public employees from soliciting political contributions from anyone, it also prohibits anyone from soliciting political contributions in any public building, such as in schools and on college campuses. Therefore, you and your colleagues, because you are public employees, are legally prohibited from asking for contributions to VOTE anytime and anywhere, and no one (public employee or not) can ask for a contribution at school or on a public college or university campus.

These restrictions offer a significant challenge to devising effective ways for MTA to raise funds for VOTE. Some options include fundraising events at MTA’s Annual Meeting, off school/campus site meetings with MTA staff or MTA retirees soliciting and collecting contributions, and telemarketing efforts.

MTA’s Candidate Recommendation Committee (CRC), which is separate from VOTE, consists of two MTA members elected by their colleagues from each of the ten congressional districts. The CRC determines which candidates receive MTA’s recommendation for election to statewide and legislative offices. By pooling the contributions of MTA members, VOTE can give educators a stronger voice and more of an impact than they would have by contributing individually to candidates for elected office.

For further information, contact Cathy Finchner of the MTA Division of the MTA Division of Governmental Services at (800) 392-6175.

In the Association

Charles Stigliano, Professor of Sculpture at the Massachusetts College of Art, is the newest member of the MSCA Board of Directors. He has a long history of work for MSCA on his campus. Stigliano has won major sculptural commissions for the Baltimore Aquarium, the “Renaissance” in New York City’s Times Square, and the North Shore Jewish Community Center. Most recently, he had a successful exhibition at Bentley College, which was positively reviewed in the Boston Globe.
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Update on DGCE Negotiations

David Twiss

I wish that I could write factually about the successful negotiations of a new DGCE agreement, but I can’t do that. To put it succinctly, we have progressed from point A to point B. We have been informed by the management representative that the State Colleges are having budget problems. We knew that! What we don’t know is why the budget shortfall should influence our bargaining to the degree that is cited at the DGCE table.

We all know that the DGCE programs must be “at no cost to the Commonwealth.” We’re told that the colleges really need money generated by these programs to offset, in part, the budget shortfall. We are told that there is no need to increase our DGCE compensation because management has no problem finding people to teach DGCE courses.

Management has a unique way of saying “thank you” to you for your efforts in maintaining the viability of a program we are told is necessary to keep the colleges afloat.

If any progress is ever made in our quest for a contract, it will be my pleasure to inform you.

—David Twiss is Chairperson of the MSCA/DGCE Bargaining Committee and Associate Professor of History and Political Science at Worcester State College.

Contracts Available in All Chapter Offices

Copies of the 2001-2003 MSCA day unit contract and the 2000-2003 DGCE unit contract are available for all members from the local chapter offices. For a copy please contact your local chapter president or the MSCA President’s Office at 978-542-7282 or <pmarkunas@aol.com>. Contracts are also available on-line at www.mscassociation.org.