
FAC'S SHEET

Newsletter of the University of Scranton Faculty Affairs Council
October 2008

FAC Members Meet October 16th in DeNaples

The second FAC meeting for 2008- 2009 is scheduled for **Thursday**, October 16 in the DeNaples Room 407.

Lunch will be served beginning at 11:15 a.m. with the business meeting starting at 11:30 a.m.

The Executive Committee urges all members to attend. Check in the right hand column for the agenda.

<i>FAC Meetings for 2008-2009</i>
--

The FAC Executive Committee has scheduled monthly membership meetings for the 2008-2009 academic year on the following dates and at the places indicated. Additional meetings may be called to address special issues or concerns.

October 16, 2008 – DeNaples Center, 407
November 11, 2008 – DeNaples Center 407
December 9, 2008 – DeNaples Center, 407
February 10, 2009 – DeNaples Center, 407
March 10, 2009 – DeNaples Center, 407
April 14, 2009 – DeNaples Center, 407
May 12, 2009 – DeNaples Center, 407

FAC'S SHEET

is published periodically by the Faculty Affairs Council at the University of Scranton. The editor is Betsey Moylan. Comments and suggestions from the membership are welcomed. Members may also check FAC's Web site at www.scranton.edu/fac for further information on the Faculty Affairs Council, an affiliate of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Copies of the Faculty Contract and Handbook are found on the site. Members may also link to the national AAUP home page.

AGENDA For October 16 Meeting

1. Chair's Report (Michael Friedman)
 - a. Faculty Resource Allocation Plans (FRAP)
 - b. Update on Negotiations
 - c. 2007-8 Gender Equity Salary Study
 - d. Academic Freedom Outside the Classroom
2. Contract Administrator's Report (Kevin Nordberg)
3. Treasurer's Report (Dan West)
4. Grievance Officer's Report (Ned Warner)
5. New Business (Michael Friedman)
 - a. Reappointment Meetings language
 - b. Administrators at Department Meetings

Poulson's "Complaint" or, the Advantages of a Roth IRA by Michael Friedman, FAC Chair

Susan Poulson, Professor of History, just loves money: the feel of it, the smell of it, the way that managing it properly can allow a person to put children through college and donate to noble causes. The thrill she receives from discovering new opportunities for retirement savings rivals the excitement that other members of her department derive from Penn State football. Therefore, in 2006, when Susan became aware that Congress had passed laws enabling employees to take advantage of the Roth IRA, she immediately resolved to open an account. The problem was, her employer, the University of Scranton, did not offer this option. Undeterred, she contacted her FAC officer (me) and, with my approval, resolved to approach Human Resources on her own, armed with several reasons why a Roth IRA program would be an advantage for faculty investors.

Susan pointed out to Joe Cortese that a Roth 403(b) allows an employee to elect to put away up to \$4,000 a year, in addition to any other investments in supplemental retirement accounts. She also noted that, since Roth IRA's are funded with after-tax income, they are not taxed when an individual withdraws the money

(Continued on Page 4)

FAC OFFICERS 2008-2009

Chairperson

Michael Friedman
English, CLP 210
941-4229 friedmanm1@scranton.edu

Contract Administration Officer

Kevin Nordberg
Philosophy, St. Thomas 554
941-7448 nordberg@scranton.edu

Grievance Officer

Edward Warner
Communication, St. Thomas 4122
941-4135 warnere1@scranton.edu

Secretary

Betsey Moylan
Weinberg Library, Room 209
941-4504 moylanm1@scranton.edu

Treasurer

Daniel West
Health Admin. & Human Resources
McGurrin 417
941-4126 westd1@scranton.edu

MINUTES from September 9th FAC Meeting

Michael Friedman called the meeting to order at 11:40 A.M. He introduced new and returning officers and paid tribute both to Joe Wilson, who stepped down as secretary, and Willis Conover, who completed his tenure as editor of the FAC's Sheet and Webmaster. He also noted that the October meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 16th because of fall break.

Chair's Report: The first cohort of CAS faculty eligible for the revised version of the FAP (now called FRAP) are invited to submit proposals to Dean Fahey by Dec. 1, 2008. Friedman reminded faculty that the plan is voluntary. KSOM faculty have been operating under their new plan since 2007. He asked if PCPS faculty had been invited to submit proposals by their Dean. The answer was no.

Friedman reminded faculty that we are in the last year of a three-year contract. Before negotiations

begin, a two-thirds majority vote of FAC members must ratify the table team. Speaking for the FAC Executive Committee, Friedman proposed the following faculty members for the table team: Dan West (PCPS), Dan Mahoney (KSOM), Bob Spinelli (PCPS), Terry Sweeney (CAS) and Joan Wasilewski (CAS). A motion to accept the slate was made and seconded. The Table Team was ratified with no audible dissent. Friedman then introduced the proposed members of the Steering Committee: Cathy LoVecchio and Pat Gross (PCPS), Murli Rajan and Len Tischler (KSOM), and Jody DeRitter and Christy Karpiak (CAS).

Friedman referred members to the handout explaining revised handbook language regarding section 21.3B (length of probationary period for tenure - initial contract). After discussion and further explanation of the need for this revision, a unanimous voice vote approved the revised language. Revision of language for section 20.1 (Stopping the instructor clock) was also introduced. Friedman explained that this was parallel to the language that was revised last year for the tenure clock. A motion was made to accept the revised language. It was approved unanimously.

A final proposal to change language in Section 8.1 of the Handbook regarding the "printing" of the master schedule to the "promulgation" of the master schedule was also approved unanimously.

Finally, Friedman announced the members of the Salary and Benefits Team, who have already begun work on research in this area. They are: Chair Rich Plishka (Computer Science), Margarete Zalon (Nursing), Bryan Burnham (Psychology), Michael Knies (Library), and Abhijit Roy (Marketing/ Management).

Contract Administrator's Report: Kevin Nordberg announced the addition of 6 faculty-reserved parking spaces in the garage. He also asked department chairs to monitor overloads of full-time faculty in their departments. With the tentative establishment of a new interdisciplinary department (Latin American Studies/Women's Studies), FAC will work with the Administration concerning a faculty member who will be chair and still remain a member of an existing department. As we near the end of the window retirement plan, Nordberg explained that faculty members considering retirement are free to negotiate a plan "on their own" that may include phased retirement. Nordberg has met with the new VP for Human Resources Patricia Day. He is also continuing to assist faculty members who have experienced problems with BC/BS. (Continued on Page 3)

(Minutes continued from Page 2)

Treasurer's Report: Dan West distributed an account balances report to the members. He also announced that he had contacted all 30 new faculty regarding union membership, providing them with the necessary forms.

Grievance Report: Ned Warner reported that there are no current grievances. He urged the members to discuss potential problems with Kevin before filing a grievance and consider time constraints as well.

Submitted by Betsey Moylan, Secretary

Rank and Tenure Deadlines for Almost Everyone

By Kevin Nordberg Contract Administrator

Every academic year at about this time, faculty members need to be aware of a series of deadlines associated with promotion and tenure. As this article will point out, these deadlines are not just for those of us who are planning to go before the Board on Rank and Tenure. By now faculty from the home departments of those aspirant faculty members also need to begin planning for their role in the evaluation of their colleagues.

When someone in a particular department intends to apply for either promotion or for tenure, the Faculty Handbook provides for several different official ways by which departmental colleagues can submit input on that candidate's qualifications. Timely awareness of these various methods of providing input can mean the difference between an informative, balanced, empirically based recommendation and a haphazard recommendation based on vague impressions and hearsay evidence.

Tenured colleagues are encouraged to submit individual peer evaluations on the green forms. These recommendation forms, of course, can be submitted whether the colleague attended the departmental evaluation meeting or not. The deadline this year for such peer evaluations is **November 21, 2008**.

By no later than **November 21, 2008** departments must have completed the following: meet and discuss the candidate's qualifications and, after a secret departmental vote, send along to the dean a vote total and a rationale for this vote total drawn from the meeting and approved by the members who were present at the meeting. Since the vote must be secret and taken at the actual meeting, clearly the attendance of a colleague

is required if he/she is to vote on the candidate. No telephone votes or votes submitted by absent members of the department are allowed for this departmental vote. A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member simultaneously with the transmission of the report to the Chair of the Board on Rank and Tenure. In addition to penning the department evaluation of the candidate, the chairperson of the department is required to submit a separate chairperson's evaluation of the candidate. The chairperson of the department must also write a chairperson's evaluation of the candidate's dossier and report.

If we take these duties seriously, we must take the time to find out more about the qualifications of the candidates from our departments. And since we all know how busy we can get with our teaching, research, and community service, we need to start planning now to visit our colleagues' classes or read their articles and review their dossiers.

This would also be a good time for candidates for rank and/or tenure to pass around drafts of their dossiers to colleagues for hints or suggestions on the presentation or organization of the dossier.

Luncheon Menu for October 16th Meeting (REALLY!)

- **Mixed Green Salad with Two Dressings**
- **Vegetarian Chili with Crackers**
- **BBQ Chicken**
- **Cole Slaw**
- **Potato Salad**
- **Fresh Cut Fruit Salad**
- **Rolls and Butter**
- **Usual Beverages (Coffee, Tea, Soda, and Water)**

Serving will begin at 11:15 a.m. in Room 407 The DeNaples Center

AAUP Summer Institute 2008

By Christie Karpiak

I was pleasantly surprised that my experience at this year's AAUP Summer Institute provided me with a clearer sense of how my work on our campus fits into the big picture in the field. At the welcome banquet, after some Woody Guthrie songs performed by a University of Rhode Island faculty band called the "Cognitive Dissidents," I talked with faculty and librarians representing universities from Alaska to New Jersey. Most taught at public universities, but some were from private universities and a very few from for-profit institutions. Most already had collective bargaining at their institutions, although some were merely in the process of organizing, and others had no hope of having collective bargaining but wanted to follow a union model in organizing faculty around working conditions.

Many attendees were facing challenges that had never crossed my mind, like preparing for negotiations for a contract that covers, and thus should be acceptable to, the faculty of several different universities within a state system. Others were dealing with pressure for legislative impositions into academics. These conversations were fascinating, and this sharing of comparative information continued through the grievance workshop I attended over the next two days. Bits of the attendees' contracts were integrated into the presentations at the grievance workshop, and I will admit that I felt some pride about the University of Scranton's documents. I think it is fair to say that our contract and our handbook are quite strong, and they are held in high regard by the AAUP. Our contract has many of the features of an ideal labor agreement: clear language that makes it relatively easy to determine whether or not a specific incident can be grieved; a limited time for the grievance to be filed and dealt with; and a direct link between the handbook and the contract, with the handbook incorporated into the contract and a provision that the handbook language cannot be changed without union approval. Our promotion and tenure procedure is very clear, and the language that we recently passed for stopping the tenure clock for childbirth and adoption attracted a great deal of interest from the other attendees from private universities.

However, my Rosenberg Grant-funded trip was more than just a series of interesting conversations and boosts to my pride in our collective bargaining agreement. At training sessions, I learned the nuts and bolts of grievance proceedings, role-played from the grievant and administration perspectives, and returned

home with both a big binder full of reference materials and new personal connections at other institutions. Learning about the experiences of faculty at other kinds of universities deepened my understanding of the handbook and contract at the University of Scranton, and the whole experience solidified my interest in serving our faculty through FAC.

(Poulson's "Complaint" continued from Page 1)

after retirement. Susan saw two benefits to this situation. First, she believed in the likelihood that future tax rates would be higher than current tax rates (based on the possibility of some unforeseen disaster, like a massive bank bailout). If future tax rates were higher, it would make sense to pay the tax now, at a lower rate, than to pay more in taxes later. Second, Susan knew that, with a traditional IRA, the employee pays taxes on both the contributions and the earnings when making withdrawals after retirement. However, with a Roth IRA, the employee pays tax only on the contributions, and the earnings increase tax-free for the duration of the account.

Finally, Susan argued that Roth IRAs make it easier for employees to pass down money to their heirs at their demise. Under traditional IRA rules, retirees must start making minimum withdrawals as soon as they turn 70½, which can quickly deplete the account, but with the Roth IRA, one is not required to withdraw the money during one's lifetime. The account can be bequeathed to one's heirs, who then can allow the interest to accrue tax free for their entire lifetimes (as long as they make an initial withdrawal from the account by Dec. 31 of the year of the IRA owner's death). On the whole, it is easier both to leave money in, and to take money out, of a Roth IRA than a traditional IRA.

Poulson's "complaint"* eventually reached a happy conclusion. On June 1, 2007, our Human Resources department began making Roth IRA's available to faculty. To start making contributions, one simply needs to visit HR to open an account with Diversified Investment Advisors and to fill out a Salary Reduction Agreement, which automatically diverts money from one's monthly paycheck into a Roth 403(b). Afterwards, stop by Susan Poulson's office and thank her for her efforts in securing this option for us.

*To be fair, Susan Poulson is neither a complainer nor a fan of the novelist Philip Roth. She graciously allowed me to link her name to his work in my title only after I assured her that the pun was absolutely necessary.