



TAUP BULLETIN

ISSUE 257 NOVEMBER 2008

Temple Association of
University Professionals

Editorial by Daniel Szyld

How the Contract Relates to Research, Scholarship, and Creativity of Our Faculty



Temple is an Urban Research University of over 35,000 students. The scholarly and creative activities of our faculty cover multiple fields, from science to literature. Our faculty colleagues write new books and compositions, create new knowledge and a better understanding of the world we live in. They also challenge us to think beyond the common, and

outside the box, and bring all these experiences back to the classroom.

Our colleagues' achievements make Temple's community proud. This research activity is part of what has increased Temple's reputation, and has made Temple a more attractive place for students. It may sound redundant, but "research" is in fact what makes Temple a Research University. Indeed, there are many indicators for this increase in activity, but let me just mention one of them: the amount of research funding that the faculty has brought to the university. This amount of money has consistently increased year after year. [Footnote 1]

In fact, President Hart was recently quoted saying that "Faculty represent the working capital of the university. Thanks to [their] efforts, Temple has risen to levels of esteem in Philadelphia, nationally and around the world." [Footnote 2]

(Continued on page 3)

Fair Share: Upheld by the Highest Court

In their article "TAUP Seeks Mandatory Fees from All Faculty," published in the October 13 issue of the *Temple Times*, Temple management made several misleading claims about agency fee, or "Fair Share." First, management claims that TAUP made up the name "Fair Share," implying that it is for propaganda purposes. However "fair share" is a term used by the courts. For example, Pennsylvania Commonwealth Court in *Zorica v. AFSCME District Council 33* (1996) has held that "fair share [emphasis added] fees as agreed upon by city [management] and unions do not constitute an unfair labor practice."

The United States Supreme Court, in *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education* (1977), in a six to three ruling, upheld

fair share and explained its necessity succinctly.

"The designation of a union as exclusive representative carries with it great responsibilities. The tasks of negotiating and administering a collective-bargaining agreement and representing the interests of employees in settling disputes and processing grievances are continuing and difficult ones. They often entail expenditure of much time and money. The services of lawyers, expert negotiators, and a research staff, as well as general administrative personnel, may be required. Moreover, in carrying out the duties, the union is obliged 'fairly and equitably to represent all employees ... union and nonunion,' within the relevant unit. ... [A fare share arrangement] has been thought to distribute fairly the cost of the activities among those who benefit, and it counteracts the incentive that employees might other-

(Continued on page 3)

Temple Association of

TAUP

University Professionals

1900 North 13th Street
 Barton Hall Room A231
 Philadelphia PA 19122

Phone: 215-763-2287

TU Phone 1-7641

FAX: 215-204-7645

taupaft@aol.com

www.taup.org



On October 22, over 50 union members and supporters stood out in chilly weather to greet guests of the Lew Klein Media Awards event and hand out informational flyers.

The goal was to educate the Temple community about TAUP's bargaining efforts, and the union's desire to reach a fair and equitable contract as soon as possible.

From L to R: Daniel Szyld, negotiating team member and author of this issue's editorials, Arthur Hochner, TAUP President and Chief Negotiator, Joyce Lindorff, TAUP Vice President, and Jim Korsh, Co-Chair TAUP Action Committee
 Photo: Terry Kilpatrick

TAUP Executive Committee

PRESIDENT
 VICE PRESIDENT
 TREASURER

Art Hochner
 Joyce Lindorff
 Al Findeisen

All Officers' Terms Expire on 4/30/2009

Terms Expire 4/30/2009

Terms Expire 4/30/2010

Terms Expire 4/30/2011

Terms Expire 4/30/2009
 (Delegates)

Carol Brigham
 Nikki Keach
 Jim Korsh
 Elaine Mackowiak
 Karen Palter

Bill Cutler
 Barbara Day-Hickman
 Patricia Hansell
 Anthony Ranere
 Joseph Schwartz

Lynne Andersson
 Billie Goldstein
 Elliot Koffman
 Maida Odom
 Robert Pred

Billie Goldstein
 Patricia Hansell
 Karen Palter
 John Sorrentino
 Al Vara

Staff

John DiBenedetto

Terry Kilpatrick

Dolly Hamilton

Executive Director

Member Services Coordinator

Secretary

How the Contract Relates to Research, Scholarship, and Creativity of Our Faculty

(Continued from page 1)

It is no wonder then, that issues related to creative and scholarly activities appear in several places in the contract being negotiated between TAUP (representing the faculty, as well as librarians and academic professionals) and the Temple administration - management. I would like to highlight a few of these issues.

Sabbaticals

Temple has had for many years a system of "study leaves." In this current system, a fixed number of study leaves are awarded every year, and faculty have to compete for them. It is not enough to have a good project; the project has to be better than that of your colleagues. I call this a quota system. I know of no other research university that does not have sabbaticals, true sabbaticals, where after six years of service one is eligible take a semester or a year off (with full or partial salary). TAUP has proposed that the quotas be eliminated. As of this writing, President Hart has not accepted this proposal, and her negotiating team continues to insist on a quota. They had agreed, though to change the name from "study leaves" to "sabbaticals," but as the saying goes "you can put lipstick ..."

Currently, one can take a study leave for a whole year at 65% pay (with full benefits). TAUP has proposed to increase this percentage to 75%. We believe that this will allow many more faculty to take the whole year, and as a consequence there will be more productivity. This will of course cost some money. This year (AY 2008-09), 25 colleagues have taken the whole year study leave. Their aggregate yearly (base) salaries amount to \$2.46 million dollars. This means that this year TAUP's proposal would have cost Temple about \$267,000 (10% of \$2.46 million plus pension contributions). If the number of faculty members choosing to take the whole year doubles to 50, the cost would be an additional \$534,000. Now, to put this amount in perspective, the faculty represented by TAUP has brought \$22 million dollars in grants last year

(AY 2007-08), of which about \$7 million are indirect costs going directly into Temple's coffers. [Footnote 1] I firmly believe that this increase is an investment in productivity worth every penny, and the money needed for it is a small portion of the money the faculty brings to Temple in grants.

Other Issues

TAUP has also proposed that when a faculty member receives a prize or fellowship whose stipend is below his/her salary (and the recipient is required to take a leave without pay) that Temple supplement the faculty salary and provide full benefits during that year.

Higher stipends for summer research grants were also proposed, to make it possible for faculty to devote 100% of their time pursuing scholarly and creative activities. Currently, the stipends are less than half the amount one would receive for teaching two three-credit courses during the summer. A report from the Office of the Vice-Provost for Research and Graduate Studies [Footnote 1] indicates that money spent on internal grants is an investment that reaps many benefits, including more grants. I think that the same logic applies to summer research grants.

In summary, TAUP proposals that relate to the scholarly and creative activities of the faculty would benefit Temple and continue to enhance its reputation as a Research University.

Footnote 1:

Report on the External and Internal Research Activity of Temple University - Fiscal Year 2007. Office of the Vice-Provost for Research and Graduate Studies, October 2007. 315 pages.

Footnote 2: Temple Times, October 13, 2008.

Daniel B. Szyld is Professor of Mathematics, and a member of TAUP's Negotiating Team

Fair Share

(Continued from page 1)

wise have to become 'free riders' to refuse to contribute to the union while obtaining benefits of union representation that necessarily accrue to all employees."


In the same article Temple states that "44%" of the bargaining unit are not members. In reality the figure is 40%. The Supreme Court would call them "free-riders."

Temple claims that the nonmembers, those who "disagree with the union's position in collective bargaining," should not be "forced to pay." They argue that fair share for nonmembers "fails to respect legitimate differences of

opinion and choices that faculty have made on their own." This statement belies the explanation that nonmembers have explicitly stated: "I support the union, but why should I pay when I don't have to?"

Fare share costs the University nothing but their prejudice. It would make the union stronger and thus better able to advocate for all the bargaining unit, especially for salary, benefits, and shared governance. The University's position indicates that Temple management would rather control the faculty than work collaboratively with them. A fair collective bargaining agreement is a mutual understanding between the union and the University; it is not a victory of one side over the other.

T A U P
1900 North 13th Street
Room A231
Philadelphia, PA 19122



Editorial:

The Institutions with which Temple Compares Itself

By Daniel Szyld

Temple Administration published in a special edition of the *Temple Times* on October 13 a table comparing the average salary of Temple faculty (by rank) with those at other selected institutions. We are told that "Temple faculty compensation is above average and compares favorably with [...] peer groups."

This is pure spin, and totally misleading. First of all, how can you compare Temple with the institutions listed in that table? Let me just mention the first few: Cabrini College, Chestnut Hill College, Cheney University (Pa.), Cleveland State University.

Temple is a research university with faculty fully engaged in the creation of knowledge, art, and literature (see the accompanying article for some further comments on this subject). Temple cannot be compared with many institutions in this list, because they are not research institutions. I would venture to say that the list of "comparable institutions" was not compiled by any academic officer of the university. Temple's comparison flies in the face of the emphasis from President Ann Weaver Hart and Provost Lisa Staiano-Coico on high-quality research and improvement in Temple's reputation.

We cannot accept a corporate view of the university, where the comparisons are made solely on the basis of averages with, for example, whatever institution happens to be in our neighborhood.

So, which institutions might be comparable to Temple? Although there are many answers to this, I want to focus this question in terms of faculty salaries. When Temple makes an offer, in many cases, the prospective faculty decides to go to another university. If we compile a list of these institutions, these could be our "comparables." Of course, salaries are not the only (or the main) reason someone decides to go to a competing institution.

In fact, if one looks at the average salaries at the University of Maryland (College Park and Baltimore), they are considerably higher than those at Temple.

But more importantly, comparing average salaries is irrelevant to a decision on salary increases. First of all, averages are pretty meaningless. If ten professors make \$50,000, and one makes \$500,000, the average is almost \$91,000. On average this may be higher than somewhere else, but I would say that the vast majority of faculty in this example are underpaid.

Furthermore, if it were true that our salaries are comparable with other places, why would we want to go down to the lowest common denominator? Inflation during the last year was 5.4% (Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers [CPI-W]).

Shouldn't our salaries keep up with inflation?