

Faculty Assembly
March 25, 2010 at 4PM, Planetarium

The meeting is being held as a joint venture between University Senate and APSCUF for information and rumor control regarding the financial situation(s) at PASSHE schools.

Guests: State APSCUF President Steve Hicks & Mary Rita DuVall-Quinn, Director State APSCUF Contract Department.

Scott Davis called the Assembly to order at 4:04

Bill Chabala introduced guests and topics: Retirement and retrenchment rumors.

Retirement Incentive Package: Steve Hicks explained that the State (Gary Dent, Associate Vice Chancellor (VC) for Human Relations, etc) had a retirement plan, which was not shown until January, and without any details truly shared. Board said no, to first blush of plan. Conference held between VC and board a few weeks later. Hicks was then invited on Feb. 12, with other unions, to discuss. Not much room for negotiation the way it was handled. Discussion included the proposal as well as APSCUF's request for extension of contract. This was denied. Last week Dent said if we don't agree to retirement plan, it's off the table and added "There are other work force plans being made...". APSCUF has *not* signed off, whereas most of the other unions did sign off on the retirement package. In the package, eligibility is not accurate. If you have health care, they will offer 30% of base pay up to \$30G. Base pay for most is \$93G. There is a 60 days window for retirees to make choice. APSCUF has 774 people with average of \$93,000 a year. Some of the other unions have only a handful of people. We are a significantly bigger union. Chancellor's office would like to have an extension, Governor's office is not in favor. Q: is this connected with retrenchment. Hicks: *As stated by them*, these are 2 separate things, not related . Is this the "humane way" of reducing faculty?

Q: some have already sent in paperwork for retirement, this proposal is not fair to them. We're telling current retiree they will lose \$30G (or \$19G after taxes) state is offering because they won't open contract. A \$30 package has been lost through union not accepting this retirement package.

Hicks: problem is replacement. We would not need extension if we know we would have replacements for retirees.

Comments: This is an effort to push out a lot of people at the same time.

Negotiations included APSCUF *not* going to a meeting, why?

SH: this was NOT a negotiation meeting. Our lawyer advised us not to go. APSCUF said we will go if there is room for negotiation. They said no, so APSCUF did not go. APSCUF wished to bargain and had a proposal (including annuity plan). State would not consider bargaining.

Comments: There is too much money at stake. They will bring up another proposal. It's probably not over.

How does this offer compare with the last time this was an issue (10yrs ago?). And what is next step for Union?

Hicks: Difference is then it was state money, different pot, this is the State System's \$ and *their* plan. AFSME has a contract that is statewide. They don't want to set up a pattern for the entire state.

BC: they miscalculated stimulus \$. There was moving around of \$ for a % of that into retirement \$. They found a clever way to get rid of \$18 million. If one union gets a better deal, all state unions get a better deal.

SH: APSCUF has asked them to come back to the table. There is some time. APSCUF does not intend to change mind. Salary increases in future may be part of future deal.

Low enrolled programs: administrators are to send paper work to PASSHE by April 24. State looks it over and is to send back in May, to go to BOV in June. 10-12 programs are on the list (7 new programs under review). Moran says that programs going into moratorium should go through the curriculum process. State can still put into moratorium, then union would file a grievance. State system claims they are not determining this (the list of programs), that it is a local decision.

BT: we *did* ask for the programs/moratorium to go through the curricular process. Senate makes recommendations. This was denied.

SH: There might be a grievance here.

JM: but Provost Keller said he got the call from Moran.

BC: this is really about the state system looking for collaborative programs ("McDonalds-izing" schools/Penn State model), and for schools looking to cut expensive programs.

SH: contract language must be stronger re: faculty curriculum decisions in next contract. If we will be losing \$, we must have more curricular control. At least one court case decided that management has control over curriculum, precedent is not in our favor.

Mary Rita: this is not a retrenchment announcement; nothing has been announced. When state starts cutting programs, we *feel* we are in retrenchment. Article 29 and arbitration settlements have protections. State has obligation to discuss and share info with faculty, we have this right under contract. Our grievance protection includes rights to all info and documents. Unfair labor practice was filed.

In the process of retrenchment there is an obligation to substantial conversations re: attrition. Those that remain must be qualified to cover classes. A grievance can be filed if the proper order is not followed (reverse seniority: temp, 1st year, 2nd year...).

Retrenchment is looked at by department, seniority in each dept. University can pick the depts. There is a 60 day discussion period within dept. Financial documents would be made available.

SH: Kutztown is in process of retrenching. They have a concrete \$ number they are saving.

Meeting was moved to another location and minutes were no longer taken. Please see APSCUF News Item from April 8, 2010 from President Hicks.

Minutes respectfully submitted,
Christine Moulton, Senate Secretary