Vote “NO” on Question 1 on Nov. 4

Income Tax Repeal

A group called the Committee for Small Government has qualified a question for the November ballot that would repeal the state personal income tax. If passed, this initiative (Question 1) will become law, costing the state more than $12 billion a year in revenues, or about 40 percent of the state budget. A similar question on the 2002 ballot garnered 45 percent of the vote. Early poll results show that this question could pass if the public is not educated about the damage it would cause.

The MTA and AFT Massachusetts strongly oppose the initiative because it would devastate public education, the economy and our quality of life in Massachusetts. The consequences would be dire.

Public Education

Slashing state revenues would lead to unprecedented and unsustainable cuts in public schools and higher education, which receive a substantial share of their funding from the Commonwealth. Our schools would be thrown into chaos and dysfunction. Our public colleges and UMass would have to cut services and sharply increase tuition and fees, putting the cost out of reach for many students.

Economy

By making deep cuts in investments in public education, public safety, roads and bridges and other areas, this proposal would do severe damage to our economy, making it harder to attract new businesses to the state.

Property Taxes

The initiative would force local communities to raise property taxes significantly to lessen the damage. Those who think New Hampshire has a tax model we should follow should consider that New Hampshire ranks first in the country in property taxes as a share of personal income.

Taxes in Massachusetts are already lower than those of most Americans. The graph at the right shows that Massachusetts taxpayers pay a smaller percentage of personal income in state and local taxes than the US average.

Coalition Opposes Ballot Measure

Question 1 is opposed by a growing coalition of labor, civic, human services and business organizations. Michael Widmer, president of the Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation, a business-backed budget watchdog group, said, “The income tax repeal would have a dramatically negative impact on the Massachusetts economy. Essentially, the sponsors of this ballot question are attempting to repeal the 20th century.”

Bargaining Updates Posted on MSCA Website

As we go to press, the status of negotiations is in flux. A comprehensive bargaining report was posted on the MSCA website in late September and updates will be posted as warranted. Please go to <www.mscaunion.org> for the latest information about bargaining.
MSCA Committees to Convene and Elect Chairs

At its meeting of Oct. 3, the MSCA board of directors nominated MSCA members from each chapter to serve on MSCA’s standing committees. The nominations are shown in the box below. In addition, the MSCA president, C. J. O’Donnell, serves as an ex-officio member of every MSCA committee.

In accordance with the MSCA constitution, each committee elects its own chair. At its meeting of Sept. 5, the MSCA board established a nomination process for these elections. On Oct. 17, MSCA committees will be convened by MSCA vice president Amy Everitt to elect a chair to serve a two-year term.

Vacancies exist on some committees. If you are interested in serving on an MSCA committee that has a vacancy for your chapter, please contact your chapter president (listed on page 4). Committee information can be found in the MSCA constitution, posted on the MSCA website; use the ‘About the MSCA’ link.

All MSCA members in good standing, including full-time, part-time and DGCE members, are eligible to participate in MSCA governance. The results of the Oct. 17 elections of committee chairs will be published in the November/December issue of the Perspective.

### Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framingham</td>
<td>Susan Dargan</td>
<td>Susan Dargan</td>
<td>Robert Donohue</td>
<td>Susan Dargan</td>
<td>Robert Donohue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLA</td>
<td>Deborah Foss</td>
<td>David Eve</td>
<td>Deborah Foss</td>
<td>Dana Rapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. Maritime</td>
<td>Linda Letourneau</td>
<td>Arthur Aldrich</td>
<td>Joseph Murphy</td>
<td>Gerald Concannon</td>
<td>Gerald Concannon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>Tracy Ware</td>
<td>John Otieno</td>
<td>Amy Everitt</td>
<td>Margaret Vaughan</td>
<td>David Goodof</td>
<td>Paul McGee</td>
<td>Michele Sweeney</td>
<td>Margaret Vaughan</td>
<td>Nancy George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>Christina Swaidan</td>
<td>Cheryl Stanley</td>
<td>Gary Meiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Bruce Cohen</td>
<td>Dan Shartin</td>
<td>Anne Falke</td>
<td>Bill O’Brien</td>
<td>Jean Mahoney</td>
<td>Anne Falke</td>
<td>Penny Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Did You Know...

... chairs, when evaluating a faculty member for personnel action (e.g., re-appointments, promotion, or tenure), are not allowed to use “incidental observations” or “anonymous student complaints.”

A chair’s evaluation must be based upon the materials a faculty member submits at the commencement of the evaluation period, which include:

- a letter to the chair highlighting the documents in your portfolio,
- an updated resume,
- course documents pertaining to each course taught,
- a summary of your student advising, and
- an Appendix A-1 (Professional Activities and Responsibilities) form, which requires you to check at least one area under “Continuing Scholarship” and one area under “Professional Activities” to indicate the areas you wish to be evaluated on, with a description of those areas and supporting documentation, and, when applicable, evaluation reports related to alternative professional responsibilities.

In addition, the collective bargaining agreement allows the chair to use:

- student evaluations,
- classroom observations,
- any interim assessment provided by an outgoing chair (a copy of which must be given to you),
- whatever material is in your personnel file (you may want to review your personnel file before your evaluation period commences), and
- any “relevant materials and validated information” submitted by you, the department chair, or the academic vice president.

It is important to note that chairs do not conduct this kind of evaluation for post-tenure review candidates. Instead, under alternative one, chairs conduct a classroom observation in the fall semester of the year a faculty member undergoes for post-tenure review. Under alternative two, chairs have the responsibility to rate the performance of faculty members and librarians as either “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” on the Appendix D-3 form.

For more detail, please refer to Article VIII, Evaluations, and Article VIII-C, Post-Tenure Review, of the day unit collective bargaining agreement.

— Margaret Vaughan, Chair, MSCA Grievance Committee

An earlier version of this article was published in the Salem Chapter newsletter.

Contracts Available in Chapter Offices, Online

Copies of the 2004-07 MSCA day unit contract, the 2007-08 day unit agreement, and the 2006-09 DGCE unit contract are available for members at the chapter office on campus. Please contact your chapter president (listed on page 4) for copies of these contracts. All contracts are also posted on the MSCA’s website – www.mscunion.org –.
Post-tenure Review and the Law of Unintended Consequences

Faculty in High-Demand Disciplines Most Disadvantaged in PTR

Pat Markunas, Editor

During the day unit negotiations in spring 2005, MSCA’s bargaining committee reluctantly accepted a management proposal to institute a merit pay structure under the guise of a post-tenure review system. Management’s own faculty salary study conducted the previous fall demonstrated that nearly all state college faculty were underpaid when compared to peers and that substantial salary inequities among state college faculty existed. Despite this evidence, management’s team never offered a single salary proposal to address the inequities or to make across-the-board adjustments based on seniority, as senior faculty members were most disadvantaged when their salaries were compared to peers.

Instead, management proposed a money-based post-tenure review system based on the stated desire to “reward” those faculty and librarians who, in their opinion, deserved to earn higher salaries. MSCA’s argument that all faculty and librarians deserved to be “rewarded” by earning salaries at least equal to those of peers fell on deaf ears.

When it became apparent that the contract would not settle without a merit pay component, MSCA sought to guarantee three elements: (1) that a minimum amount of money be expended each year (0.5% of the unit payroll), (2) that eligible unit members choose the year of their PTR in order of seniority, and (3) that no member’s salary increase be reduced in order to “reward” other members.

An article published in the Sept. 2006 issue of the Perspective made the argument that the post-tenure review system, as implemented, served only to punish a small number of faculty members and librarians by denying or reducing their pay increases. The evidence thus far would support that point of view.

Table 1 (below) shows that over three years of post-tenure review, alternative one, 84% of faculty and librarians received a rating of “exemplary” after completion of the contractual appeal process, the professional development process and the resolution of some grievances based on procedural violations.

Table 1 Post-tenure Review Alternative One: Initial and Final Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Final Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># (%)</td>
<td># (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Acceptable</td>
<td>Not Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meritorious</td>
<td>135 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>474 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the bargaining team found evidence that higher education merit pay systems favor male faculty, that has not been the case here. Thus far, only 14 faculty (elderly without a combination of “not acceptable” and 88 faculty and librarians, 65 of whom are male, have a rating of “meritorious.” Consolidated grievances and some individual grievances based on procedural violations are still pending.

That the real purpose of post-tenure review was to deny or limit pay raises for some members does not surprise those of us who served on the 2005 MSCA bargaining committee as well as MSCA members. What is a surprise are the discipline of those faculty who, to date, have been disadvantaged as a result of management’s implementation of the post-tenure review system demanded in 2005. Table 2 presents PTR ratings to date by broad categories of academic discipline. (See the box for an explanation of how faculty were assigned to discipline.) Ratings were combined into two categories: exemplary and non-exemplary (a combination of “not acceptable” and “meritorious” ratings).

Table 2 Post-tenure Review Alternative One: Final Ratings by Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Exemplary Ratings</th>
<th>Number of Non-exemplary Ratings</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-exemplary Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences, Mathematics, Computer Science and Industrial Technology</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Economics</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Allied Health Sciences</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences, Criminal Justice and Social Work</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Maritime Faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Communications</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Humanities and Interdisciplinary Studies Departments</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty in three general disciplines – natural sciences, mathematics and computer sciences; business and economics; and nursing and allied health fields – received a higher percentage of non-exemplary ratings than the 634 members overall. There is no legitimate reason to believe that state college faculty in some disciplines are less worthy of merit-based pay increases than others, but management’s implementation of post-tenure review, alternative one, suggests otherwise.

Management’s implementation of the post-tenure review, alternative one, system may have undercut several major initiatives by the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education.

The BHE’s 2007 faculty salary study noted that faculty in business, computer science, nursing and health sciences are most at risk of leaving academia to pursue employment in more financially rewarding positions. State college business administration/management faculty are particularly undercompensated when compared to peers.

However, state college administrations have spent the sizable salary gaps between these faculty and their peers by their implementation of post-tenure review.

The BHE has also begun initiatives to increase the numbers of nursing faculty and faculty in STEM fields (science, technology, engineering and mathematics), as these disciplines are crucial to the science and health care sectors of the Massachusetts economy. Management’s implementation of post-tenure review has unfairly distorted salaries in these fields, not improved them.

After all of the other negative effects of post-tenure review, alternative one, these unintended consequences are especially distressing to consider.

Categorizing Faculty by Discipline

It sounds like an easy task: sort faculty members in the state colleges by discipline and conduct whatever research or comparisons one wishes to make. This task is not as easy as it looks.

Every state college has a different organization and nomenclature for its academic departments, which vary by the size of the institution, its mission, its history and its specialized academic programs. The larger colleges have the greatest number of specific and stand-alone departments; the smaller colleges often group several disciplines together in unique fashion.

Consequently, judgments had to be made about which departments to combine, where certain faculty should be categorized and what to do about special programs or disciplines. The decision was made to avoid publishing small categories that would reveal the identity of individuals on campuses.

The BHE, as the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, categorized faculty in disciplines such as “other humanities” but some faculty of dance are housed in their health and physical education departments.

The academic organization of the Massachusetts College of Art and Design presents particular challenges. Critical Studies faculty members who could be identified as science/math or social sciences were categorized as such; everyone else, as well as all faculty in the art and studio departments, was categorized as “other humanities.” Art education faculty were categorized as “Education.” “Health and Physical Education” houses those faculty in the original physical education departments at the former normal schools, all of which now have different, long and complex names to convey the variation in their current programs. It was not possible to combine the wide variety of programs in any single liberal arts domain or the health sciences.

Only the information provided in the PTR letters received by faculty members and on college websites was used to determine academic department and discipline. No contact was made to individual faculty members or offices of academic affairs for additional, possibly clarifying, information. It is doubtful that switching a few faculty here and there will change the overall results of this compilation.
A change in the MSCA presidency brings about other changes as well. In mid-July, after nearly six weeks of preparation on both ends, the MSCA president's office was moved from Salem State College to the Hurley Library Room 207, at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

Roberta Gowni was hired by MSCA president C. J. 'O'Donnell to be his executive assistant and she began work in mid-August. Roberta was born and raised in Texas and earned her bachelor's degree with two majors, history and political science, from the University of Texas at Arlington. She spent her senior year in the former Soviet Union and even lived in Eastern Europe. She returned to her old digs in Sullivan Building 202 to begin work for Maggie and, as needed, the editor of the MSCA Perspective.

Clark expressed hope that the search will reach a conclusion年底前的itic. "Ms. Kelley is well-known within the Massachusetts higher education community, having worked at the department of higher education (DHE) for 12 years," Clark stated in a recent email. "Most noteworthy is the work that Anduera and her team have done to review and bring to the Board many new academic programs. These programs help educate more Massachusetts students and provide them with the knowledge and skills needed to work in our knowledge-based economy. Kelley earned her bachelor's degree in sociology and anthropology from Swarthmore College and her master's degree in public policy from UMass Boston. She is currently enrolled in the doctoral program in public policy at UMass Boston and does not intend to be a candidate for the permanent position."

In a recent interview, Kelley said that she intends to continue to enact the initiatives of the BHE, including coordinating educational efforts across P-16, supporting public higher education, and assisting in academic program approvals and advocating for public higher education, especially for faculty members. The DHE plans to sponsor programs on campus safety, veterans issues and student success, to bring together higher education constituents for dialogue and collaboration. Plans are already being made for activities to commemorate the second Public Higher Education Week next spring.