

*e-Bulletin20081217*

## ***Turning Point in Negotiations TAUP Needs YOU***

***Art Hochner and Jim Korsh,  
on behalf of the TAUP executive committee, negotiating team and action  
committee***

---

We all are reaching a turning point in the calendar, with both the semester and the year ending. At the same time, TAUP has reached a turning point in our assessment of what can be accomplished at the bargaining table. We are working without a contract, under the terms of the old one. But no one has gotten a raise, no merit awards can be granted, no new procedures for tenure and promotion are going into effect, NTTs have no new rights or expanded pension benefits. We are all being affected.

The TAUP executive committee, negotiating team and action committee all agree that you need to know about the grim status of the contract talks. It is time for YOU to help us by taking action to reach our goal of a fair new contract.

We began negotiations with the belief that many of the thorny issues in the 2004-08 contract negotiated under President Adamany's dictatorial regime could be addressed, negotiated and resolved with the new, seemingly employee-sensitive administration of President Hart. We were wrong. We no longer believe that face-to-face talks alone will achieve a decent contract for our members. Here's why:

TAUP recently gave Temple management a comprehensive package proposal in an attempt to achieve a settlement. We informed you about this offer in our [e-Bulletin of December 5](#).

As of today, Temple has not responded to this proposal, nor has it made any counter-proposal. We have continued trying to meet to reach a resolution. In fact, TAUP president Art Hochner met with Temple chief negotiator John Langel, together with the state mediator, for two hours last Friday, December 12.

Take a good look at what has been happening in the contract talks:

### **Overall tone:**

Temple engaged an outside attorney to lead their negotiating team, creating an adversarial climate. They have taken an unbending position on numerous issues and have often derided, scorned or ignored the needs and desires of the members of the bargaining unit as we have represented you at the table. Temple came into negotiations with the attitude that the needs of the faculty and staff do not have to be addressed, that the Adamany contract was just fine the way it was.

We have heard that we have wasted time by bringing up your concerns about salary compression, workload assignments, selection of chairs, fair procedures for discipline, job security for NTTs, and many other issues. This impatience shows a lack of respect. They have acted as if the expressed needs of the faculty and staff are irrelevant, and that the only

important issues were the ones they brought to the table. Our surveys of your needs, our contract committees' input, our deliberate efforts to fashion concrete proposals to solve problems, all were apparently written off and not to be taken seriously. Our views about how to properly create a collegial, professional and productive environment are put down as uninformed or impractical, or the conversation has been shut off peremptorily with "we don't negotiate over policy."

Management's negotiating style, particularly on economic issues (salaries, benefits and anything with a clear monetary cost) is an attempt to dictate the final outcome rather than to engage in give-and-take bargaining. Now they are taking a hard-line stance, implying that they will not improve the proposal they have made, signaling a refusal to bridge the gap between us. Although the estimated difference between TAUP's salary proposal and Temple's would have minimal impact on Temple's budget, it would have a considerable impact on your economic situation.

### ***On salary increases:***

Despite the fact that TAUP gave Temple a full set of detailed contract proposals in June, Temple only gave us figures on their salary proposal on October 9, not even a week before the contract expired on October 15. That's when they gave us their "framework" of 3.75%, including 2% across-the board (ATB), 1% merit, and .75% bonus for the first year and less ATB plus more pay-for-performance (to replace merit) in subsequent years.

Temple management has attempted to make you think you are paid better than the average of so-called peer institutions by misusing statistics, [publishing meaningless numbers that misrepresent the facts](#).

They have insisted that they cannot go beyond the 3.75% per year and have made just minor adjustments in the relative proportions of the elements of their framework, citing the current economic crisis. Temple management still refuses to give fair and adequate across-the-board raises that would help us catch up with previous and current inflation. Temple and TAUP are not far apart on what the merit-based component of increases should be. The difference is over ATB. We have already fallen behind the cost-of-living during the last four years, and Temple's proposal would have almost all of us fall further behind during the next four.

When TAUP demonstrates that the University could afford better raises, Temple still tries to make you believe they cannot afford to commit to such a thing. They point to cuts in state appropriations to justify their stance, despite the reserves they have built and continue to build. They point outside to other universities' financial problems, mostly private ones and almost all without faculty unions, instead of talking about the actual situation of Temple's finances. But they could settle our contract by using money they already have. Our proposals would cost them less than \$2 million more per year than what they are proposing.

### ***On merit and pay-for-performance***

Temple management wants to impose a new system, called "pay-for-performance" to replace merit and clearly would like it eventually to supplant any ATB raises. This system would go beyond merit's focus on excellence and set the standard at "satisfactory" performance. They say that the Provost will develop new guidelines by next September from the existing tenure & promotion and merit guidelines. It is hard to imagine how to adapt those guidelines, since they call for excellent, outstanding and exceptional performance. Moreover, T&P guidelines don't cover the 400+ NTTs, so how would they be evaluated?

We can't accept a system so vague and potentially divisive. It would put faculty members in competition with each other for a major portion of their raises. Instead of calling it pay-for-performance, it ought to be called "let your boss decide your raise." Such a system not only would worsen the situation for NTTs but would make the situation for tenured and tenure-track faculty more like that of the NTTs. Everyone would be beholden to management for pay

increases and fearful of being the independent thinkers faculty are supposed to be.

### ***On NTTs***

Temple management has strongly resisted committing to longer-term contracts for NTTs after they have proved themselves valuable for several years. They keep focusing on “flexibility,” which means the ability to terminate NTTs with few limitations. Rather than consider NTTs as valuable members of the faculty who make significant contributions, management sees them as one-dimensional players, slotted into narrowly restricted roles, and ultimately disposable for reasons deans should not have to reveal or explain. Neither has management even responded to TAUP’s proposal to move pension contributions for NTTs toward parity with other full-time faculty.

### ***On fair share***

Temple accepted fair share in the last contract, albeit with limitations. By refusing to agree to a less-limiting fair share provision, despite its not costing the university a cent, management shows its disregard for TAUP. Although we represent all members of the bargaining unit, many receive TAUP services and representation without contributing towards them. Temple management has already agreed to the principle of fair share, but they prefer to try to weaken TAUP.

Instead of treating the TAUP as an important institution of shared governance, working in tandem with the Faculty Senate, Temple management continually tries to treat us as second class. Rather than see us as their partner in the academic enterprise and as legitimate democratic representatives of the faculty and staff, they act like we are a necessary evil they would prefer not to deal with.

### ***A call to action***

The negotiating team cannot achieve a fair contract without your help. Temple will move toward resolving the important issues left on the table when they see that you are ready to help. First, we ask you to become informed on the issues. Much information is available at <http://www.taup.org>.

Second, TAUP asks you to attend one or more of a series of informational meetings we will hold during the first four weeks of the Spring semester. We are planning meetings by department, college and/or building on the Main Campus and in other locations at Health Sciences and Ambler. We are available to help if you would like to schedule a meeting in your department or college. Toward the end of February we will hold a larger, bargaining unit meeting to discuss what it will take to achieve a settlement.

Finally, TAUP asks that you be ready to support and participate in further actions we can take, including serious job actions. We feel the pain of no agreement, but management must share that distress. We will achieve a decent contract when Temple understands that they are facing a determined and united faculty and staff who want fairness and justice.

---

Art Hochner is president of TAUP and associate professor of Human Resource Management in FSBM.

Jim Korsh is a member of the TAUP executive committee, co-chair of the action committee and professor of Computer & Information Sciences in CST.