

FA News (9/9/2018): Bargaining and Restructuring

Join us Friday at the Grotto

We are pleased to announce our first social gathering of the year:

Friday, September 14, 5:00 to 7:00 pm, at the Grotto (201 E. Main St.)

All faculty are welcome to join us for drinks, hors d'oeuvres, and conversation.

Upcoming SIU meetings

The [FS meets Tuesday](#) (9/11)

The [BOT meets Wednesday and Thursday at SIUE](#) (9/13 and 9/14)

FA membership meeting on salary bargaining

On **Thursday, September 20 at 5:00 in Parkinson 202**, we will hold a General Membership Meeting to discuss negotiations with the administration about salaries. All FA members are encouraged to attend. Here's some background and an update on recent negotiations.

It's been more than five years since bargaining unit faculty last received a raise. As of last fall, we were underpaid by 15% compared to peers, according to the joint FA-administration salary study, and in the past year we've no doubt slipped still further behind. When the FA last bargained a contract, during the Rauner budget impasse, the administration said they would like to give raises, but could not do so until there was a budget. The FA agreed to a reopener clause to discuss salaries for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 if the state passed a budget.

Though the Rauner budget crisis has been over for more than a year, we have yet to see any raises. This isn't for any want of effort on our part. We began talks last fall, only to find the administration insisting that they had no money despite the passage of a budget. Eventually the administration began talking about a 1% raise for all employees, and the BOT is likely to approve such a raise for all non-unionized employees this week.

We recognize that SIUC faces an enrollment crisis, but the administration continues to find money for its priorities. They are paying back the money that they "borrowed" from internal funds ahead of schedule. They are continuing massive deficit spending on athletics. They even found \$175,000 to subsidize the Ice Cube concert.

The FA is therefore seeking a modest addition to the across-the-board raises that the administration is proposing for unrepresented employees. This would come in the form of making the raises retroactive to some point in the last fiscal year—giving faculty a few more months of the all too modest 1% raise. An additional 1% in salary for all FA faculty on campus would cost less than \$43,000 a month. We have also discussed

setting minimum salaries for faculty and “rolling over” the current contract with no other changes until July 2019.

The administration has managed to find small amounts to provide our deserving union co-workers in in the ACsES and NTT locals something above and beyond the 1% raise. In talks with us, they have shown interest in rolling over the contract, and displayed some willingness to make raises retroactive.

We believe that raises for faculty would be a smart investment in SIUC’s future, as they would do something to improve morale and staunch the faculty brain drain. Rolling over the current contract, extending it by one year, would allow both sides to concentrate on things other than negotiating a successor contract. The meeting on the 20th will give us the opportunity to discuss the proposals on the table and get faculty input.

Restructuring

The FA filed a number of grievances challenging the administration’s implementation of Article 9 of the FA contract. If an arbitrator decides in our favor, the administration will likely have to restart the Article 9 process for the proposed schools involved.

Over the last month, we have been in settlement talks with the administration about these grievances. No final agreement has yet been reached, and while one normally does not publicize settlement talks before their conclusion, we’ve needed to consult with many faculty about the process, so should inform all about what is going on.

We now expect that we will be able to settle some of these grievances, mainly in areas where the administration will agree to drop their school proposals. In these cases, the status quo will remain, including academic departments. This agreement would not affect any future plans to reorganize on the college level (including faculty sponsored plans). It would simply mean that the current proposed schools will not move forward, and the FA would settle the relevant grievances. Here are the schools this applies to:

Architecture, Art and Design

Engineering

Humanities

Media, Communication and Performing Arts

Social Science and Multicultural Studies

Our settlement would ensure these school proposals do not go forward. In other cases, we have worked with faculty to find solutions which would allow them to support modified versions of the current school proposals; the FA would then settle our grievances in exchange for modifications agreed to by the administration. We believe we have worked out a way to settle the grievances concerning the proposed schools of

Human Sciences and of Marketing and Management (the main point in contention for both was the status of the Sports Administration program).

As of this writing, however, we are not in a position to reach a settlement on grievances concerning three other schools.

Analytics, Finance, and Economics

Education

Physical Sciences

We remain ready to help faculty reach an accommodation with the administration in these cases which would allow us to settle these grievances. But in the absence of such an agreement, we will push forward with grievances regarding these schools.

In other schools, no grievant came forward to challenge the administration's implementation of the Article 9 process. Those schools have thus not been part of the settlement talks.

These settlement talks are not the only way the FA has weighed in on restructuring. The FA has submitted reports to the Faculty Senate and Grad Council concerning all proposed schools. Here is a list of the schools that are up for consideration [by the FS this week](#), with the FA "verdicts" and a link to our full reports.

Yes: [Mathematics and Statistical Science](#) (faculty plan)

No: [School of Agricultural Sciences](#)

No: [Analytics, Finance, and Economics](#)

Questions raised: [Justice and Public Safety](#)

I do not list our reports on Human Sciences and Management & Marketing, as they are now somewhat outdated, given the agreements we've helped to arrange between faculty and the administration in those areas.

As we've said from the beginning, the FA supports program changes, including proposed schools, that faculty support. We have thus been willing to settle grievances, where that is in the best interest of faculty, and we will continue to pursue grievances where faculty believe that is in their best interest.