

Special
Bargaining Update
Rumors about UNF-UFF Intent on the Salary MOU

It has come to my attention that there are rumors being circulated that the UNF-UFF Negotiating team will refuse to negotiate the Administration's offer on salary. NOT TRUE!!!!!! We've been asking for a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on salaries for 2003-2004 for months and, with President Delaney's help in moving his team away from refusing to negotiate a Memorandum of understanding for salaries, the administration has finally agreed. The UNF-UFF Team has finally gotten the Administration team to come to the Table to negotiate salaries in an MOU. It has been our constant stand that we wanted the Administration Team to negotiate the MOU and they have refused until today.

Rumors are just that---and it has always confounded me why people do not wish to work together but would rather cause disharmony through innuendos or rumors! There are those who for whatever reasons---misinformation, misconception, ill-will, too much time on their hands--whatever---would like to see the UNF-UFF team not succeed in protecting and insuring enforcement of benefits and rights of the faculty by trying to raise doubts about what the team is doing in negotiations. There are, also, those who only view the short-run effects (cash in pocket) versus protecting their rights to such things as royalties received for texts written. [The administration proposal in this area did refuse faculty any financial rights to their work unless the Administration agreed on the percentage of the royalties that the faculty would receive (if any)!]

Be that as it may, let me assure you that the UNF-UFF team did not refuse to negotiate the Memorandum of Understanding on Salaries!!!!!! We pushed for months to do exactly this!

As I mentioned earlier, we've been asking for a MOU on salaries for 2003-2004 for months and, with President Delaney's help in moving his team away from refusing to negotiate a Memorandum of understanding for salaries, the administration has finally agreed. However, the Administration wants to roll the two years of salary increase (2003-2004 and 2004-2005) together----- the 3% proposed but not settled for 2003-2004 and the raise for 2004-2005. Therefore the overall 6% proposed by the administration includes the 3% from last year. The UNF-UFF team is not opposed to the idea but some refinements need to be made for faculty not to be hurt financially.

There was a discussion at the Negotiation Table two weeks ago after the UNF-UFF team had, **again**, offered to the Administration a strategy to speed up the negotiations and settle on salaries. This week the administration, thanks to President Delaney moving his team, made an offer to negotiate an MOU on salaries. We **expressed delight** that they had included **all the major components we had been asking for--- cost of living, inversion/compression, and merit.**

We have **NEVER** said we are **against merit** but we are **against discretionary** (the raise is determined by your chair regardless of your evaluation). According to the data provided by the Board of Regents for the 1999-2000 raises at UNF 29.17% was discretionary and the recipients of the discretionary raises received \$1,716 as the discretionary component of their total raise.

At the Table we discussed some issues with the MOU offer on salaries--spending most of the time on inversion/compression. This is the issue that our surveys indicate that most faculty reported concern with and wanted addressing.

The administration in their previous offers for inversion/compression had offered to study the problem and if the funds ever came available.....(you know what that meant!) Our side has finally gotten the administration to commit funds to the inversion/compression. YEA --- faculty will benefit and so will the university!

However, the model for inversion/compression used in the MOU proposal has 50% of the inversion/compression funds being awarded for merit without rank or time being a factor in the merit component. This model was used in 2000--- it has serious flaws which we discussed at the table and both sides agreed to address.

For example in that year one faculty member who earned \$154,200 compared to their adjusted CUPA benchmark of \$89,652---they were 172% above the adjusted CUPA average (72% ABOVE their CUPA adjusted average)---received an inversion/compression raise of \$204.40. Whereas another faculty member whose salary was \$53,639 compared to their adjusted CUPA benchmark of \$69,606----they were 77% of the adjusted CUPA average (23% BELOW their CUPA adjusted average)---received \$142.11. This data is from the Administration's data provided on their 2000 Inversion/compression allocations.

We don't think this model is particularly fair and the administration has agreed to work with us to find a model that addresses the inversion/compression problem.

Both sides will hopefully reach an agreement on each component within the salary MOU offer and we can get on with the business of being educators.