Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP

Excellence in Education

Awarded the AAUP Assembly of State Conferences
Outstanding Chapter Newsletter Award

From the President:
Welcome and best wishes for the spring semester!

My thanks to the members of the FWC Executive Committee who kept the chapter on track and kept me well informed last semester while I was on sabbatical and in Tanzania. Also, my deepest thanks to the Co-Chairs of the FWC Action Committee who organized the very successful Celebrate the Chapter event on November 26 and who continue to provide leadership to our members - see their letter about our ongoing organizing activities on page 4 of this newsletter.

With regard to our Celebrate the Chapter event on 11/26, I am very pleased to report that our grant application to fund this event to the National AAUP's Assembly of State Conferences was approved and all travel expenses for the AAUP superstars that traveled to our campus to help us celebrate will be covered by that grant. We in the FWC leadership are honored at the support - financial and political - shown to us by National AAUP over the years.

Since the January 15 paycheck was the first pay period with the new, higher health care premiums, we asked the Faculty Salary Committee to provide information to our members on this matter. The members of the current (2012-13) and immediate past (2011-12) FSCs have done an outstanding job of explaining the increase, putting it in the context of last year's collegial discussions and this year's continuing discussions. They managed to write a clear explanation of a relatively complicated matter - and they fit it all on one page! I encourage you to read it (page 5) and contact members of the FSC if you have questions. In addition, the current FSC provided a very brief update on current discussions on page 7.

The FWC/AAUP continues to do all it can to keep our faculty informed and to promote faculty welfare. Solidarity, Mariann Regan underscores in her piece on pages 5-6, is critical to our continued success as a chapter. I, along with the FWC Executive and Steering Committees and FWC Action Committee Co-chairs, look forward to working together collectively with the membership to advance our shared commitment to excellence in education. I hope you find a few minutes to read this issue and I wish you a productive and satisfying spring semester.

Jocelyn Boryczka
FWC/AAUP President
Celebrate the Chapter
11/26/2012
THANKS! to all the faculty members who carved time out of their busy schedules to attend our Celebrate the Chapter event on 11/26/2012. We really have a remarkable AAUP chapter at Fairfield. Very special thanks to FWC Co-Chairs Sonya Huber and Kevin Cassidy for organizing a great event and thanks to all the members of the Executive Committee who pitched in to make the event such a success.

Gala Reception:
DON’T MISS the FWC-sponsored gala reception immediately after the next General Faculty meeting on February 8 - a chance to connect with friends and colleagues across schools and disciplines over a glass of wine.

Union Update:
As we reported in the November newsletter, last August, employees in the Department of Facilities Management voted for union representation by Local 30 of the International Union of Operations Engineers. Discussions between the University and the union are underway to reach agreement on a first contract and we wish our colleagues in the maintenance department well in these ongoing negotiations.

An Invitation to all AAUP members in Connecticut
A Better Path Forward: How Corporate Culture Threatens the Quality of Higher Education and What We Can Do to Resist its Encroachment on our Campuses

Presented by:
National AAUP President
Rudy Fichtenbaum
Professor of Economics,
Wright State University,
Dayton, Ohio

Thursday, February 28, 2013
5:30 PM - 8:30 PM
Courtyard by Marriott
4 Sebethe Drive
Cromwell, CT

5:30-6:30 pm – Cash Bar
6:00-7:00 pm – Dinner
7:00-8:30 pm – Presentation

Dinner & Program $50.00/person
A buffet dinner will be served including vegetarian options.

All AAUP Members Welcome
RSVP and payment collection through local AAUP chapters:
RSVP by email to FWC Treasurer Irene Mulvey by 2/7/2013
Many thanks to everyone who was able to support our Celebrate the FWC event on November 26, 2012. The FWC Action Committee Co-chairs along with members of the FWC Executive Committee worked hard to plan an event that would help our members understand what an incredible and incredibly strong AAUP chapter we have at Fairfield. Jane Buck (three-term National AAUP President) and Estelle Gellman (three-term National AAUP 2nd Vice President and former Chair of National AAUP's Collective Bargaining Congress) explained that national AAUP leaders know and respect our chapter. They refer to “the Fairfield model” and wish they could export it. Marty Lang (Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies) and Mariann Regan (Professor Emerita of English) told stories of our chapter’s early years -marveling at how far we’ve come and delighted that we’ve managed to stay united and strong. Mariann’s remarks, in particular, had everyone trying to figure out how we can convince her to come out of retirement and join us in our work. Failing that, we asked her for a copy of her remarks and they appear elsewhere in this issue. Barbara Bowen (Betsy’s sister!), professor of English at Queens College and President of PSC-CUNY, a union representing more than 25,000 faculty and staff at CUNY, made the point that resonated most deeply with many in the audience: as faculty activists, we bring our expertise as scholars and researchers to the intellectual and political work of protecting our profession and promoting higher education as a common good. Our work as faculty activists is intellectual work which continually redefines and reinvigorates higher education and our profession.
Dear Members of the Fairfield Faculty,

The Spring Semester has started, and with that comes talk of the MOU and the changing nature of our working conditions at Fairfield. If you care passionately about this institution, you no doubt have strong opinions about what should be done to voice our concerns to the administration. We need you. We need your insights about Fairfield, your thoughts on strategy and action, and most importantly your energy for the FWC Action Committee.

The Action Committee meets to plan rallies, public events, and other activities to raise the visibility of the FWC. We act to support the work of the Faculty Salary Committee, which means that we meet regularly with members of the FSC and the other committees of the FWC to get feedback and ideas about coordinating our work. We think carefully together about the tone and timing of our events, which is why it's a huge benefit to have many people involved in the conversation with different perspectives on Fairfield. All of our best ideas from last year came out of those conversations, and everyone contributed to successful actions.

We devised and pulled off the highly successful series of events last spring, including the "Rally for Unity" when nearly 150 faculty, staff, and students rallied to voice their concerns at the President's end of the year address in Gonzaga Auditorium. As the activity heated up in the spring semester we welcomed the efforts of coordinated teams working on different elements of that and other actions.

This spring, we will be focusing on the themes of "Restoration" and "Excellence in Education." Restoration refers to the goal of sharing with faculty and administration alike the fact that our total compensation levels have dropped significantly over the years, especially as we have agreed to salary freezes and agreed to shoulder more of the costs of our benefits. The goal of excellence in education is our daily passion, and we need to formulate ways to communicate that cuts and freezes to faculty as well as the limitation of faculty input all affect the future of Fairfield University and our ability to teach our students in the best way possible.

Major issues facing us including the question of long-term goals for faculty compensation, as couched in practical issues including a benchmarking system as well as our rising healthcare costs. The 95% percentile has been a defining feature of faculty negotiation and compensation at Fairfield for decades; it has given us something concrete and constant in our collegial discussions with the administration. We will have to be articulate about both concerns, and to find actions and ways of communicating these concerns to the faculty and to the university community.

Please join the Action Committee. When you do, you will get periodic emails about planning meetings as the need arises. Last year we met about five to six times as needed, usually after FWC Brown Bags or at other meeting times, and we emailed between those meetings to organize and subdivide the work required to mobilize.

This doesn't mean a weekly or monthly commitment. It's on an as-needed basis. And who knows, maybe we'll agree with the administration on all points of discussion and we won't need action! But it's better to be prepared.

You don't have to be tenured to be active, or to have put in many years at Fairfield, to play an important role on the Action Committee; it's a huge benefit for us to have messages and actions as well as outreach that connects with both newer as well as more established faculty-and to get the perspective of faculty who have worked at other institutions before coming to Fairfield.

This work is periodic rather than constant, and it's social and fun. Our meetings, our sign-making events, and our actions are all excellent ways to connect with colleagues and support each other, especially when the situation heats up on campus. It's a great way to meet people who are committed to a visible presence for the FWC on campus. The action committee also provides a welcoming face for those who want to get more involved.

We will have an Action Committee sign up at the FWC Gala after the first faculty meeting. Membership in the Action Committee is restricted to those faculty who are members of the FWC.

Send an email to either Sonya Huber (shuber@fairfield.edu) or Kevin Cassidy (kcassidy@fairfield.edu) to let us know you'd like to join.
On the 2013 Health Care Premium Cost Shares:

Our current contract, which was approved by the faculty in September, did not specify the amounts we would be paying for our portion of health insurance costs in 2013; we agreed to pay 10% of the cost but with no idea what that actual cost would be. With no idea of the total cost, there was no limit to how high the 10% faculty payment could be - essentially, faculty approved a contract with key numbers left blank. We did this because it was our understanding that health care costs were expected to increase by about 6% (more or less as they had increased for the previous 6 years). But what ultimately happened shows why we must be extremely cautious as we consider our next contract.

First, a little background. We have been paying a portion of health insurance costs only since 2010. In 2009, the faculty approved a change to the Faculty Handbook which resulted in faculty paying “no more than 10% of the healthcare premium for Option I or the HSA” (faculty who choose Options II and III pay up to 100% of the cost of the optional enhancements). Since our contract is based on the academic year but health care cost shares are based on the calendar year, faculty have always approved the contract without knowing the actual amount that would be deducted from each paycheck. To protect faculty, for the first three years of cost-sharing, a clause in the Benefits Plan Overview guaranteed that no matter how high the total cost of health care, faculty payments would not increase by more than 6%: we pay at most 10% of the total cost but the actual amount deducted from a paycheck would not increase by more than 6%

Last year’s FSC did an incredible job on a number of fronts - juggling proposals, counter-proposals, withdrawal of proposals, proposed give-backs and more. In particular, cost shares for 2013 were a major topic. Although the administration initially proposed cost shares as high as 15%, the contract that the FSC recommended to the faculty had our cost share amounts remaining at 10%. However unlike all earlier years, there was no limit on the potential increase to the amount deducted from each paycheck.

The 2011-12 Faculty Salary Committee recommended faculty approve the 10% cost share - even with no limit on the increase - because under the administration’s capped proposal (12% cost share with an 8% cap on the increase) and the way the administration insisted that it be implemented, faculty payments would have definitely increased by at least 20% and could have gone up by 30%. In hindsight, and not unexpectedly, the FSC’s recommendation turned out to be the best of the available options for the faculty. The option recommended by the FSC turned out to increase the payment for Option I by about 11%

Another reason the 2011-12 Faculty Salary Committee recommended faculty approve the 10% cost share even with no limit on the increase was because under the administration’s capped proposal (12% cost share with an 8% cap on the increase) and the way the administration insisted that it be implemented, faculty payments would have definitely increased by at least 20% and could have gone up by 30%. In hindsight, and not unexpectedly, the FSC’s recommendation turned out to be the best of the available options for the faculty. The option recommended by the FSC turned out to increase the payment for Option I by about 11%.

Faculty costs increased as shown below:

<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>I</td>
<td>$815</td>
<td>$905</td>
<td>11.04%</td>
<td>$1,656</td>
<td>$1,835</td>
<td>10.81%</td>
<td>$2,213</td>
<td>$2,457</td>
<td>11.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$1,286</td>
<td>$1,528</td>
<td>18.82%</td>
<td>$2,443</td>
<td>$2,935</td>
<td>20.14%</td>
<td>$3,431</td>
<td>$4,111</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$1,571</td>
<td>$1,766</td>
<td>12.41%</td>
<td>$3,157</td>
<td>$3,541</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
<td>$4,232</td>
<td>$4,779</td>
<td>12.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$715</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
<td>$1,308</td>
<td>$1,454</td>
<td>11.16%</td>
<td>$1,737</td>
<td>$1,937</td>
<td>11.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, health care costs are an ongoing concern and we should work together with the administration to contain health care costs where we can do so without sacrificing quality of health care. But, approving a contract with key numbers left blank and no idea how high those number could go is not in the best interest of the faculty. Given the miscommunication or misremembering that happened this year, the FSC will insist that any contract we bring to the faculty has both the portion of health care costs faculty will pay and a limit on how high our actual payments can go.

- Written and approved by the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 Faculty Salary Committees
Solidarity. How hard it is for any group to persevere when dealing with people who have power over them!

Everyone during life has come across some people able to overpower them: parents, teachers, bosses, bullies at school. Everyone has formed some psychological strategy to deal with this power imbalance. And each person has a unique, personal strategy.

These differences impressed me in 1989-1990, when Faculty Welfare Committee was being born. Some people with power over the faculty had broken faith with the Faculty Salary Committee. Back then, faculty salaries were alarmingly low. When I went around knocking on doors, recruiting for a faculty group to speak for honorable dealings and a fairer wage, the responses always surprised me. Some faculty would sign on to the group instantly. Others recoiled in fear of losing their jobs. Some were ashamed to complain. A few pretended to agree, but just so they could report our “scandalous doings” to Bellarmine.

Similar contrasts persisted through our vote to form the FWC on December 3, 1989, and to become FWC/AAUP on March 23, 1990. Here’s the thing: Once your group is formed, every person in that group still has a different “gut instinct” about how to act toward people in power. These vast differences can’t be argued away and don’t fade with time. They must be embraced into the group—somehow. To achieve solidarity, a group must accommodate an amazing hodgepodge of “gut” theories about how to deal with powerful people.

That first year, 1989-1990, we were all dealing with the same issues and the same set of facts. But throughout our group people expressed wildly different characterizations of Them (the powerful administrators) and Their true makeup. Some samples:

• If They really knew how much we were suffering, they would grant our requests.
• They don’t care about us, and every word out of their mouths is a lie.
• They’re slow to learn. We have to keep pounding them with the truth until they get it.
• They’re really very nice people, and we should be careful not to hurt their feelings.
• They don’t know how hard we work. We have to give them proof of how hard we work.
• Whatever you do, don’t antagonize them too much, or they’ll retaliate.
• They have to feel threatened, or they won’t move. What threatens them most?
• Aw, come on. Let’s just make friends with them. Then they will see how good we are, and then they will like us and treat us fairly.

What do these characterizations have in common?

• They assert the unknowable, with surprising conviction. For in the end, not even They are “sure” of Themselves.
• They lead to predictive arguments, notoriously weak: If we do X, They will do Y.
• They can start futile arguments within the group. Reason is not up to the task of deciding what They are really like. These arguments, taken personally, can divide the group members.

For solidarity, the group must find a way to embrace—and live with—these thorny differences.

Here’s my suggestion: Take each hypothesis-characterization of Them, and pin it on the bulletin board—metaphorically speaking. Let each stand, suspended in the background, in the middle distance. No one has to decide which characterization is best, and no characterization has to be refuted. Let them all hang out there together.

That way, the group’s actions will not be based on anyone’s notions of what They will do. No one knows what They will do. You can’t control Their responses.

There is a better foundation for group action: Concentrate on giving an honest account of your group’s principles. Focus laser-like on the goal of excellence in education. Get your facts straight. Be ethical. Don’t be evil. Don’t be mean. (cont’d next page)
Psychology of Solidarity
Continued from page 6:
Whenever there is a power imbalance, there will likely be a series of engagements. It’s reasonable to lay in protections against future loss, if you can. The split vote in the last General Faculty Meeting seems to signal disagreement about having sufficient protections for future MOUs. These disagreements are all right. In fact, they are inevitable. They often hinge on those “gut” hypotheses of what they will do.

Your disagreements themselves cannot destroy solidarity. And no future actions by Them can divide you, the FWC/AAUP. Only you can divide yourselves, by allowing your disagreements to cut to the quick and get personal. That has not happened here. You have had 20 years of grace and good fortune.

Through the years, your solidarity has stayed solid, through contract disputes and budget mystifications and protracted talks about governance, through the merit pay battle and carefully wrought presentations to the Trustees. You are a busy group: newsletters, gala refreshments, picnics, mutual encouragement, vigilance, great contributions of information and statistics and ideas, workshops, AAUP connections, not to mention an enthusiastic demonstration last spring. Your working together, while allowing one another all your differences—that is what protects you. Hold on tight to your faith in each other, your intelligence, and your persistence. Continue to air out your disagreements and let them breathe. Listen to each other, and accept each other. Then you will stay strong in solidarity.

by Professor Mariann Regan
FWC/AAUP Legend

Brief Update from the Faculty Salary Committee:
The Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) has been meeting with the Administration’s Compensation Committee more or less every week since the beginning of the academic year. In addition, the faculty of the FSC has met regularly and done substantial gathering and preparation of data. The committees agreed on the following agenda items for this year’s collegial discussions. Items 1-6 came from the FSC (based on the faculty responses to our survey last October); items 4, 7 & 8 were on the administration’s agenda:

1. Reaching agreement on the terms and language for a successor MOU
2. The erosion of salary and benefits
3. Restoration of salary and benefits
4. The benchmarking system
5. Clarification of decision-making authority of the administrative team
6. Clarification of merit pay rationale
7. Proposal for compensation for adjuncts and full-time faculty teaching overload
8. Cost share amounts for health care premiums

Everything is being discussed in frank, open and unrestrained discussions. The FSC remains cautiously optimistic about our ability to work with the administration and move forward together.

Regarding the discussions of our benchmark for compensation and the administration’s commitment to that benchmark, the administration insisted on engaging a consultant but also agreed to engage the services of another compensation expert selected by the FSC. The FSC then prepared a list of questions that was accepted by the administration and submitted in advance to both consultants. After some preliminary sharing of information and documents, the FSC and the administration team will be meeting with both consultants for a meeting on January 29 scheduled for 3½ hours.

We look forward to making a formal report to the General Faculty at the General Faculty meeting on February 8 and then talking informally with colleagues at the FWC-sponsored gala reception.

- by 2012-13 Faculty Salary Committee: Dennis Keenan, John Miecznikowski, Irene Mulvey, Marcie Patton, and Debra Strauss (Chair)
The Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP at Fairfield University is an ad hoc committee of the General Faculty and a chapter of the national AAUP. If you aren’t a member, please consider joining. We promote the professional and economic interests, broadly defined, of the Fairfield University Faculty. All our activities are open to all members of the faculty but we are funded entirely by our dues-paying members. To join, contact any member of the Executive Committee.

From the Archives:

General Faculty Meeting
September 18, 1992

An Address to the General Faculty
by President Aloysius P. Kelley, S.J.

An excerpt from Father Kelley’s remarks:

“We are committed to providing competitive compensation for all employees. We are at the 95 percentile in the AAUP rankings and intend to stay there. There will be no rolling back on this, the Board of Trustees has endorsed this and we have to recruit and retain quality people in a high cost-of-living area.”