

Union News

**Connecticut State University
American Association of University Professors**

New Academic Year

***New
Contract***



***New
Benefits***

New Challenges

Inside this issue:

**Health Benefits
for Certain
Part-time
Faculty
Page 3**

**A Behind-the-
Scenes Look at
the Contract
Page 4**

**Legislative
Updates
Page 7**

**CSU-AAUP
Summer
Activities
Page 8**

Dates to Remember

- 9/14:** DEC receives and reviews records and notifies candidates for first year and second year renewals (Jan. hires only), all penultimate year tenure candidates, and all promotion candidates.
- 9/20:** DEC Chairperson informs penultimate year tenure candidates (Jan. hires) in writing of evaluation process; CSU-AAUP Council Meeting, 7:00pm, CCSU, Student Center, Bellin A&B
- 9/25:** Promotion candidates must inform the department Chairperson and DEC Chairperson in writing of desire to be considered for promotion
- 9/28:** Salary increase will be reflected in your paycheck
- 10/1:** DEC Chairperson informs first year renewal (Jan. hire), second year renewal (Jan. hire), penultimate year tenure (Aug. hire), promotion (all), and professional assessment (all) candidates in writing of the evaluation process
- 10/27: Equity Through Unity Conference**, CCSU, Memorial Hall, Constitution Room, 8:30am-1:00pm. All CSUS full-time and part-time faculty are invited to attend.

Union News

CSU-AAUP
Central Connecticut State University
Marcus White Hall, Rooms 305, 307 & 310
New Britain, CT 06050
Phone (860) 832-3790
Fax (860) 832-3794
Email: aaup@ccsu.edu
Website: www.ccsu.edu/aaup/csu

Editor: Ellen Benson
Bensonell@ccsu.edu

Where is the AAUP Salary Calculator?

Since there will be two increases to the full-time faculty payroll each year, the AAUP will not be producing its salary calculator for this Contract. Please call your local AAUP or Human Resources office if you would like to verify your salary.

Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure?

Your local AAUP office is there for advice and information!



Subsidized Healthcare for Certain Part-time Faculty

Effective with the Fall 2007 semester, part-time faculty who teach nine or more load credits a semester across any of the state's public colleges and universities are now eligible for state subsidized healthcare. For more information about how to take advantage of this benefit, please visit the CSU-AAUP website (www.ccsu.edu/aaup/csu), call your local AAUP office, and/or contact your local Human Resources office.

This benefit is a result of a two-year long effort by the state's public higher education unions, which asked the State Employees Bargaining Agent Coalition (SEBAC) to file a grievance in 2005. The State Comptroller's Office agreed in theory that part-time faculty who taught a full-time load at the state's public institutions should be considered full-time employees and receive benefits as such, but there were many complications to solve before this benefit could be offered.



The bulk of the negotiation resulted from one central question: who is going to pay for these benefits? Many options were discussed including universities paying a proportional amount of the cost

or the college/university that put the part-time faculty member over the nine credit threshold paying the entire cost of the benefits. Each option was further complicated with additional questions and problems. In the end, the Comptroller's Office agreed to pay for the benefits out of their budget.

CSU-AAUP and the other public higher education unions' role in negotiations were to ensure that the final agreement was the best possible settlement for part-time faculty. In collaboration with UConn-AAUP and the Congress of Connecticut Community Colleges (the 4Cs), CSU-AAUP made sure that all the

healthcare plans available to full-time faculty were offered to part-time faculty. In addition, the unions negotiated in favor of a shorter waiting period at the beginning of the semester for part-time faculty who are continuously eligible for this benefit. The unions also made certain that the reimbursement check from the state would be tax-free and not included as income on W-2 forms.

The AAUP office is interested in hearing from those individuals taking advantage of this benefit. How is it working so far? Have there been any problems? Please direct your comments and questions to Steve Greatorex, CSU-AAUP Business Manager, at (860) 832-3792 or by email at greatorex@ccsu.edu.

Equity Through Unity

Saturday, October 27

**CCSU, Memorial Hall,
Constitution Room**

8:30am-1:00pm

The CSU-AAUP conference will explore how part-time faculty and full-time faculty can work together to challenge inadequate professional and working conditions.

RSVP to Michelle Malinowski
860-832-3790 or malinowskim@ccsu.edu



A Behind-the-Scenes Look at the 2007-2011 CSU-AAUP/BOT Contract

Workload & Arbitration

Many full-time faculty members had high hopes for our contract proposals on the workload issue. Workload was one of the biggest obstacles during contract negotiations. CSU-AAUP studied the issue for over a year before negotiations began and was prepared to show management how they could afford to reduce the workload. Our team was creative in their approach to this important issue, however in the end the BOT team was not willing to move any further than what you see in the new contract language. Some would call this failure, but many recognize it as step by step progress—a means of “getting our foot in the door” with Article 10.6.5 (Reassigned Time for Curriculum Development, Faculty Development, and Instructional Enhancement).

Could we have taken this issue to arbitration? Yes, but the decision to go to arbitration involves careful consideration of not only what we stand to win but also what we stand to lose.

In arbitration, Management submits a last best offer (LBO) and CSU-AAUP submits a LBO. The arbitrator can only choose between these two LBOs; they cannot award a compromise. There are specific factors an arbitrator must consider: “the history of negotiations between the parties including those leading to the instant proceeding; the existing conditions of employment of similar groups of employees; the wages, fringe benefits and working conditions prevailing in the labor market; the overall compensation paid to the employees involved in the arbitration proceedings, including direct wages compensation, overtime and premium pay, vacations, holidays and other leave, insurance, pensions, medical and hospitalization benefits, food and apparel furnished and all other benefits received by such employees; the ability of the employer to pay; changes in the cost of living; and the interests and welfare of the employees.” (Collective Bargaining for State Employees, Chapter 68, Sec. 276(e)5). Other important factors to consider are (1) Management can also choose one or more

issues to take to arbitration so we must factor that into our decision-making process and (2) going to arbitration holds up implementation of the entire contract, not just the items you take to arbitration. During the final hours of negotiations, issues become packaged by both sides.

The Negotiating Team was able to make some progress on workload during negotiations with a new category of reassigned time for curriculum development, faculty development and instructional enhancement (Article 10.6.5), as defined in the Contract. In the past, Management has awarded reassigned time for these activities, but now there is a contractual minimum allocation per semester of 132 at CCSU and SCSU, 64 at ECSU, and 87 at WCSU, totaling 415.

Please Make a Note!

Contract Correction

Table 1 (Evaluation Process Due Dates) on page 23 of the CSU-AAUP/BOT Contract

incorrectly lists December 15 as the date Deans submit recommendations for Promotion candidates. The date should be December 18.



Who Benefits Most From the New Contract?

Every member benefits in the new contract, but in the feedback AAUP has received since the passage of the Contract, there has been debate over which special interest group benefits the most.

Full-time members have argued that the union was able to negotiate a significant number of improvements for the part-time faculty. This Contract establishes a course cancellation fee and institutes the possibility of multi-semester contracts. This new contract language goes a long way to strengthen job security for part-time faculty. In addition, part-time members will receive an across-the-board 4.5% salary increase, and the maximum amount allowable for travel funds per contract year for part-time members was increased 25%.

However, part-time members have argued that the full-time members reaped a greater benefit from the Contract revisions. Full-time members will receive two salary increases each year; there will be a 3% increase to the full-time faculty payroll for the first thirteen pay periods and an additional 2.5% increase to the full-time faculty payroll for the fourteenth through twenty-sixth pay periods. Under the GASP procedure (see article

“While it may be human nature to only recognize those changes that directly affect you as an individual, the benefit of a unionized campus is that there is one body which acts to strengthen and empower the faculty and other academic professionals as a whole.”

on page 6 for an explanation of the formula), full-time faculty will receive raises that average between 3.5% and 7% a year. In addition, full-time members benefit from the increase in the minimum allocation of reassigned time for research, a 10% increase in the appropriate number of system-wide sabbatic leaves, and establishment of a new category for reassigned time.

Is the grass really greener on the other side? Every member receives some benefit in the new Contract. It may not have been exactly what was desired, but that is the nature of the collective bargaining process. No party receives everything they want. While it may be human nature to only recognize those changes that directly affect you as an individual, the benefit of a unionized campus is that there is one body which acts to strengthen and empower the faculty and other academic professionals as a whole. It is understandable that members compare themselves to their colleagues, however it is important to recognize that the wages and working conditions for the membership as a whole were strengthened in this Contract and that in turn further empowers all CSU-AAUP members.

The Tenth CSU-AAUP/BOT Contract: How Far Have We Come Since 1977?

The first AAUP/Board of Trustees Contract was agreed upon in 1977. At that time, the Connecticut State College AAUP represented full-time faculty, librarians, and counselors. Coaches and part-time faculty were not included in the bargaining unit until a later time. The first Contract contained provisions relating to academic freedom, but there was no process outlined in the Contract for handling violations of this provision.

In 1977, entry level salary minimums were \$12,750 (Instructor), \$14,200 (Assistant Professor), \$17,800 (Associate Professor) and \$20,800 (Professor), more than tripling for each category at the start of the 2007 Contract. By the time the current contract expires, these salaries will be more than 5 times the amount they were in 1977! There was no department chair stipend or possibility for market adjustment in the first Contract. In addition, there was a total of \$28,000 available for “professional enrichment”, which in subsequent contracts became conference and workshops funds, faculty development, research grants, curriculum-related activities, and retraining. In the current Contract, more than \$1.8 million is available for these activities.

In the first Contract, evaluation criterion for members

applying for promotion and tenure were (1) eligibility, (2) quality of teaching, (3) service to the college and/or research and publication, (4) professional activity, and (5) years in rank. Professional assessments were conducted every three years, and there was no provision regarding protection of personnel files.

Load credit was only awarded for teaching and department administration in the 1977 Contract. Credit hours for specialized assignments such as independent study direction and thesis supervision had to be agreed upon by Management and CSU-AAUP. Further, faculty did not receive credit for research, faculty development, curriculum, and instructional enhancement.

In terms of leaves and fringe benefits, the 1977 Contract did not contain any provision for adoption, child rearing, educational or professional leave. It also did not contain language suggesting the appropriate number of sabbatic leaves.

In the more than three decades that CSU-AAUP has represented faculty and academic professionals at CSU, the union has made significant progress in securing professional rights and improving the salary and working conditions of its members.

The “GASP” Procedure

By John Kavanagh, Professor of Mathematics (SCSU) and Member of the CSU-AAUP Negotiating Team

“GASP” stands for “Goal-Adjusted Salary Plan”. It is the procedure contained in Articles 12.2 – 12.5.4 and 12.5.7 of the 2007-2011 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) by which pay raises for continuing full-time AAUP members are determined. The GASP formula, used for the past twenty-five years was originally designed by Kerry Grant, a past chief negotiator and President of CSU-AAUP.

The primary purpose for using the GASP formula is to gradually increase a member’s salary through the salary range for his/her rank to the maximum salary for that rank over a reasonable period of time. Over the life of this CBA, the number of years required for an individual to reach the maximum salary for their rank will be reduced from approximately 13 to 10 years.

Under the GASP formula, each member’s pay raise consists of two components. The first component is an equal amount for all members at a given rank; the amount of the increase represents the difference between the previous year’s maximum salary and the new maximum salary for that rank. The second component is the dollar amount that gradually increases a member’s salary closer to the maximum salary for his/her rank. Once a member achieves the maximum salary, this component would be zero.

To help understand how the GASP formula works, let me give you a specific, simplified example. Suppose for the foreseeable future, first component increases will be \$2000 per year, and second component increases will be \$1000 per year. Suppose further that a particular member’s salary is currently \$68900 and the maximum salary for this member’s rank is currently \$75000. Note that this member’s salary is \$6100 less than the maximum salary. For the next six years, this member would receive annual pay raises of \$3000 (=2000+1000). In the seventh year, this member would receive a pay raise of \$2100 (=2000+100), at which this member would receive the maximum salary for his/her rank of \$89000 (=75000+7(2000)). Thereafter, this member would receive annual pay raises of \$2000 (=2000+0), keeping him/her at the increasing maximum salary for his/her rank. The actual GASP procedure is more complicated than this, but all of the complicating aspects are designed to make the actual procedure flexible and fairer to our members.

Now let me give you some specifics of the actual GASP formula. Our new four-year CBA includes eight semi-annual pay increases (one each fall semester and one each spring semester) for continuing full-time AAUP members. Effective at the beginning of each academic year, the total full-time payroll will be increased by 3%. Each spring semester, the total full-time payroll will be increased an additional 2.5%. Correspondingly, you will receive two increases to your salary (one at the end of August and one in February). The salary increase you receive in the fall semester will be for 13 pay periods and the increase in the spring semester will be for the remaining 13 pay periods of the academic year. Pursuant to the compensation article in the CBA, the two semi-annual pay

increases in each academic year also necessitates the minimum and maximum salaries for each rank to be increased according to the same timetable. For the 2007-08 academic year, the maximum salaries for all ranks will be increased by 2% in the fall semester and by 1.5% in the spring semester. The minimum salaries for each rank will be increased by 2.76% in the fall semester and an additional 1.84% in the spring semester. The remaining six semi-annual pay increases in the new CBA will consist of 3% increases in the total payroll each fall semester and a 2.5% increase in the total payroll each spring semester. The maximum salaries for each fall semester will be increased by 2% and an additional increase of 1.5%, 1.6%, 1.7%, and 1.8% respectively for each spring semester. The minimum salaries will be increased by 2.76% each fall semester and again by 1.84% each spring semester.

The range of salary increases for continuing full-time members for 2007-2008 academic year will from: 3.5% (members at maximum salaries) to 7%. Those members who receive percentage increases at the high end of the percentage range, would be those members who have a salary furthest away from the maximum salary for their respective rank.

When a member is promoted, his/her pay raise would consist of their regularly scheduled pay increase, plus a promotional bonus of 2% of the maximum salary for their new rank. Furthermore, if his/her resulting new salary is less than the minimum salary for his/her new rank, then his/her salary would be increased to the new minimum salary for their new rank. Please note, spring semester pay increases for newly promoted members will be calculated in the same manner as fall semester increases, i.e., based on previous rank and years in that rank. However such members will receive the full amount of their promotional bonus, i.e., the 2% of the maximum salary for their new rank, in their fall semester pay increase.

Now let us turn to the issue of how many years is a reasonable amount of time for a member to achieve the maximum salary for their rank. When the formula was first designed the intention was that maximum salary for rank should be achieved between 10 and 12 years (average of 10/maximum of 12). Several years ago, CSU-AAUP learned that there had been a breakdown in the implementation of the GASP procedure. In many cases, members were taking 15 or more years to achieve the maximum salaries for their respective ranks. The primary component in the GASP procedure that determines how long it takes a member to achieve the maximum salary for their rank, is the dollar increment given in article 12.5.3 of the CBA. The second component of an individual’s pay increase is largely based on this dollar increment amount. What had happened for a period of six (or more) years, while maximum salaries and the resulting ranges of salaries were increasing at reasonable and significant rates, the annual dollar increment had been kept fixed at \$1.42 (or less). Thus while ranges of salaries were

(Continued on page 10)

Articulation & Course Numbering

A number of questions and concerns have been raised in regards to *An Act Concerning Public Institution of Higher Education System Transfer and Articulation Process* (see bill language on right). This legislation, which was passed by both the House and Senate, is a study bill, meaning that it will not necessarily result in any significant reform. Commonly, only minor alterations are recommended upon the conclusion of studies performed by way of legislative mandate.

In addition, our lobbying firm has contacted the Department of Higher Education (DHE) regarding their plan for the study, and they have stated that there are no plans to examine the issue beyond what is currently being done, which is routine and minimal at most. In other words, DHE only plans to perform a minimal review of the articulation agreements.

Despite this reassurance from the DHE, CSU-AAUP continues to treat this issue with serious caution and concern, insisting that every step of the process must involve significant faculty input and must provide plenty of opportunities for faculty to contribute their expertise. CSU-AAUP President David Walsh has met several times with Chancellor Carter, who also has concerns about this bill, to examine this issue and come to a mutual understanding before any action takes place. The CSUS Administration will examine system-wide course numbering to comply with the legislation, but the bill only requires the Administration to create a “plan of implementation”, not to execute the plan.

Chancellor Carter had agreed to set up an advisory committee so that the faculty has a means of providing input into this plan. Chancellor Carter met with the AAUP Chapter Presidents and the Presidents of the four Senates, at which time it was agreed that this issue falls under the purview of the Senates. AAUP’s role will be to safeguard against any potential academic freedom violations.

The AAUP will provide more information to the membership on this matter as it is received.

AN ACT CONCERNING PUBLIC INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION PROCESS (Special Act No. 07-7)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 1. (Effective July 1, 2007) The Department of Higher Education, in consultation with the constituent units of the state system of higher education, shall review the status and content of public institution of higher education system transfer and articulation agreements. Such review shall consider: (1) The sufficiency of the agreements, including any agreements modified or made on or after July 1, 2007, (A) to ensure appropriate credit transfer against degree requirements within each constituent unit, and (B) to ensure appropriate credit transfer against degree requirements across the constituents units and identify any disparities between the transfer of credits from the same or similar program from different colleges or universities of a constituent unit to a college or university of the same or of another constituent unit, (2) (A) the status or completion of common course numbering within the community-technical college system, and (B) a plan to implement common course numbering within the Connecticut State University system, and (3) placement test scores for the community-technical college system and the Connecticut State University system that establish specific proficiency levels for all matriculated students entering college level courses. Not later than January 1, 2008, the Commissioner of Higher Education shall report the findings of the review to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to higher education and workforce advancement in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a of the general statutes.

\$1.3 Mil for New Full-time Faculty Lines at CSU

CSU-AAUP’s primary lobbying effort over the previous three years has been obtaining dedicated funding for additional full-time faculty. Our efforts paid off this session: ***the Legislature and Governor approved \$1,000,000 in funding, excluding fringe benefits, for twenty new full-time faculty and \$195,000 in funding, also excluding fringe benefits, for three nursing faculty (one at WCSU and two at SCSU).***

The CSU Administration also put additional funds from their operating budget into hiring additional full-time faculty, **resulting in a net gain of 62 new AAUP lines this fall.**



AAUP Summer Training & Workshops

AAUP Censures Six Administrations, Removes Two From Censure List

Reprinted from National AAUP

Delegates to the Ninety-third Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors voted on June 9 to place four New Orleans universities on its list of censured administrations. The delegates did so as a result of actions each university had taken in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina that were sharply criticized in the published report of an AAUP Special Committee. The universities are Loyola University New Orleans, Tulane University, the University of New Orleans, and Southern University at New Orleans. The delegates agreed to hold over until the 2008 annual meeting a fifth New Orleans institution, the Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center.

At the same meeting, the delegates also voted to impose censure on the administrations of Our Lady of Holy Cross College in Louisiana and Bastyr University in Washington. In other decisions, the delegates removed Tiffin University in Ohio and New Mexico Highlands University from the AAUP's censure list.

Censure by the AAUP informs the academic community that the administration of an institution has not adhered to the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure jointly formulated by the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges and Universities and endorsed by more than 200 professional and educational organizations. With these actions, 47 institutions are now on the censure list.

Hurricane Katrina and Five New Orleans

Institutions

An AAUP Special Committee on Hurricane Katrina and New Orleans Universities found that there was “nearly universal departure from (or in some cases complete abandonment of) personnel and other policies” by five New Orleans institutions—the Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, the University of New Orleans, Southern University at New Orleans, Loyola University New Orleans, and

Tulane University—as they contended with the disaster that befell the city and its universities.

The report identifies several specific areas of widespread dereliction:

- The number of faculty terminations “exceeded the inescapable or minimal needs of the institution, sometimes substantially.”
- The notice and timing of personnel actions “also failed to meet AAUP standards and created needless, even at times unconscionable, uncertainty.”
- Alternative placement of affected faculty “universally fell below AAUP standards, but also fell short of the institutions’ apparent capacity to mitigate the harshest effects of inevitable personnel reductions.”
- The opportunity for internal review of adverse judgments “failed to meet most accepted standards of due process as well as the institutions’ own established review procedures.”
- Faculty tenure (which all these institutions had previously recognized and by and large respected) “received far less deference than AAUP policy and prior practice [on these campuses] would have required.”

To read more about the findings for each individual university, please visit National AAUP’s website at www.aaup.org.

Planning a trip?

As an AAUP member, you are entitled to car rental discounts of up to 20% off regular prices and unlimited mileage. Call AAUP for more information.



National Conference of State Legislatures/Creation of a Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education in CT

By David Walsh, CSU-AAUP President

The 2007 meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) was held in Boston in early August. Once again, higher education had a prominent place on the organization's agenda; the entire plenary session on the first day of the conference was devoted to the topic of "transforming higher education". As in the recent past, business-oriented and conservative organizations pressed the case for the need to reexamine the entire higher education system in the US, with a special emphasis on public universities which are directly subject to control by state legislatures.

Major reports were made by the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, and by President Hank Brown of the University of Colorado (yes, the same Hank Brown who announced the decision to fire Professor Ward Churchill). Spokesmen for these groups stressed the need for new pedagogy, curriculum changes suggested by business and industry, and increased "flexibility in the higher education workforce". For example, in the area of curriculum, speakers advocated a greater emphasis on science and technology and possibly the development of a new degree, a Bachelor of Science degree in (individual discipline) for Industry, which could be achieved with fewer general education requirements. In addition, university professors would be expected to teach twelve months of the year, including the entire summer, to facilitate greater utilization of buildings and equipment.

It is clear that these groups and the foundations which are funding some of their projects (Lumina Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Pew Charitable Trust) are attempting to duplicate the process by which No Child Left Behind was imposed on the K-12 community. In the face of this challenge we must all work to defend the autonomy of the university from forces that would transform it into a public vocational school. Fortunately, the reception to the above proposals was mixed, and it is clear that the support levels for radical transformation will be mediated by each state's specific political culture.

Denise Merrill, Chair of the Appropriations Committee in the CT General Assembly and one of the top legislative experts on higher education in the NCSL, made serious efforts in two long conversations to reassure me that no such sweeping changes are under consideration in Connecticut. In her words, "Connecticut's higher education system is not broken and generally performs well; strategic planning for higher education in the state should be largely limited to a

discussion of the achievement gap between minority and urban students and those of the general population, especially students in suburban schools."

Despite Representative Merrill's representations, we must be vigilant toward the upcoming deliberations of the Commission on a Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut, which will begin this fall. On behalf of CSU-AAUP, I have written to legislators involved, requesting in the strongest possible terms that active faculty members be included on the strategic planning committee. The present legislation, as worded, dictates that only retired administrators and faculty members are eligible to serve on the committee. I have already expressed my concerns about this to Chancellor Carter and the CSU Administration, and I plan to seek the involvement of the university senates on all four campuses to pressure the legislature to include CSU faculty members.

In light of the General Assembly's intention to discuss higher education strategic planning, the work of the co-chairs and members of the CSU-AAUP Blue Ribbon Committee on the Future of Higher Education in Connecticut takes on added importance. This Committee, which was approved by the Council in late 2006, has been studying major national proposals for change in higher education for more than six months. The union will be able to rely on this expertise if a "rapid response" to proposals from the General Assembly is required.

Summer Institute

Amid wildfires burning in the hills and a temperature of 100+ degrees, 17 (check with Steve) participants from CSU-AAUP attended National AAUP's 2007 Summer Institute at the University of Nevada-Reno at the end of July.

The goal of the annual four-day workshop is to provide participants the opportunity to strengthen their skills and knowledge in a number of areas, as well as network with fellow AAUP members. Practical skills such as how to defend a grievant are emphasized in great depth. This year over twenty-five workshops were featured. Workshops vary from year to year so the conference remains valuable to newly elected faculty representatives, veteran faculty leaders, and union staff.

Over 150 AAUP members, both full-time and part-time, from across the country attended the Institute.

“GASP”

(Continued from page 6)

regularly increasing, the second component increases were effectively not increasing at all, and hence, it would take longer to move an individual’s salary through the growing ranges of salaries. There were other aspects of the implementation of the GASP procedure which also contributed to this breakdown. If these patterns were allowed to continue, our members would soon find it taking approximately 20 years to achieve the maximum salaries for their ranks.

CSU-AAUP and Management began to address this issue in the fall of 2005 during the reopener negotiations that determined our pay increases for the 2006-2007 academic year. At that time, the annual dollar increment was significantly increased to \$2.40, which resulted in a major correction of this problem. Other aspects of the salary computation formula that contributed to this problem were also addressed. This matter was further addressed and corrected in the negotiations of the 2007-2011 CBA. The results of these actions on the amount of time it will take our members to achieve the maximum salaries for their ranks are described by Table 1.

The numbers described by this table were computed under the assumption that the annual dollar increments for the years beyond the new CBA will increase by 2% per year. The numbers summarized by this table also need to be taken with some provisos. For instance, if I reported the years in rank in which the maximum salary is achieved, all of the above numbers would be increased by 1 year. On the other hand, considering that for a significant number of our members, their salary in the year before they achieve maximum salary will differ from their maximum salary by a relatively small amount, if I reported the number of years in rank after which the maximum salary is almost achieved, the numbers in the given table would slightly decrease, the means by perhaps .25 years. Noting the decreases in the means from 2005 to 2006, the corresponding numbers for those members promoted between 2007 and 2010 should experience comparable modest decreases in their numbers. For those members appointed or promoted prior to 2005, their corresponding numbers of years in rank to achieve

maximum salary will be significantly less than what they were becoming before the corrections, but not to as small as the numbers given in the above table.

Ideally, if in the future, CSU-AAUP is fortunate enough to negotiate enough money for salaries to allow the GASP formula to operate properly and to have it continue to operate in this manner, we would need to set our priorities to have maximum salaries, minimum salaries and the dollar increment increase by equal percentages. Will we be able to always do this? Unfortunately, no. If sometime in the future, we are only able to achieve a small annual increase in the payroll, say 2%, then to ensure that all of our members receive at least a modest raise, CSU-AAUP and Management would probably agree to allocate most, if not all of the increase, to the increases of the maximum salaries, and consequently have a small increment, if not an increment of zero. But such an act should not be allowed to happen for more than a year or two, before the increment is returned its previous levels.

Finally, please note the fact that with this CBA, we are changing from a system of annual pay increases to a system of semi-annual pay increases. New members in their first year of appointment will not receive a pay raise in the spring of their first year, unless their current salary will be below the new minimum salaries for the spring, in which case, their salaries will increase to the new minimum salaries. The negotiated pay increases are only for members whose appointments are continuing from the previous year.

TABLE 1

Years in Rank after which Max Salary is Achieved

Rank	Yr. Promoted	Min	1st Q.	Mean	Median	3rd Q.	Max
Prof.	2006	7	10	10.13	11	11	11
Prof.	2005	7	10	10.42	11	12	12
Assoc. Prof.	2006	8	10	10.90	11	12	12
Assoc. Prof.	2005	7	11	11.30	12	12	12
Asst. Prof.	2006	n.a	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	13
Asst. Prof.	2005	n.a	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	13

**CSU-AAUP
Officers, Council & Staff**

President
David F. Walsh

Vice President
Arlene Bielefield

Secretary
Martin Levin

Treasurer
Harlan Shakun

CCSU Council Members

Candace Barrington
Anthony Beatman
Guy Crundwell
Michael Gendron
Lois Koteen
Jeffrey McGowan
George Murphy
Paul Pettersen
Heather Prescott

ECSU Council Members

Catherine Carlson
Branko Cavarkapa
Jaime Gomez
Kristin Jacobi
Andrew Nilsson

SCSU Council Members

James Dolan
Debra Emmelman
Pam Hopkins
John Kavanagh
Steven Larocco
Julian Madison
Tony Rosso
Virginia Metaxas
Cindy Stretch
Robert Vaden-Goad

WCSU Council Members

Daryle Brown
Russell Gladstone
Vijay Nair
Patricia O'Neill
Cigdem Usekes
Laurie Weinstein

Director of Member Services
Caryl Schiff-Greatorex

Asst. Dir. of Member Services
Michelle Malinowski

Business Manager
Steve Greatorex

**Communication &
Research Associate**
Ellen Benson

**Member Services
Coordinator at SCSU**
Linda Cunningham

SCSU-AAUP Office Assistant
Gary Holder-Winfield

ECSU Office Staff
Angela Collison

WCSU Office Staff
Elise Silkowski