I have walked back to the G train countless times after class, feeling great, that I am becoming a better teacher, that my grasp of the material I am teaching and my ability to communicate with my students grows every year. I know it, the students know it, but I wonder if and how the people in whose hands my professional fate, and my salary, rests—the administration—know it. Will their only insight into the goings-on in my classroom be a handful of hastily filled-out, quantitatively-oriented student evaluations, and perhaps, if I am lucky enough to have been observed, an observation written by another faculty member in my department? Will their only insight into the goings on in my classroom be a handful of hastily filled-out, quantitatively oriented student evaluations, and perhaps, if I am lucky enough to have been observed, an observation written by another faculty member in my department? Will their only insight into the goings on in my classroom be a handful of hastily filled-out, quantitatively-oriented student evaluations, and perhaps, if I am lucky enough to have been observed, an observation written by another faculty member in my department? Will their only insight into the goings on in my classroom be a handful of hastily filled-out, quantitatively-oriented student evaluations, and perhaps, if I am lucky enough to have been observed, an observation written by another faculty member in my department?

By Anonymous

In many ways, teaching is like “women’s work” as Engels analyzed it in the nineteenth century in fact, traditionally low salaries for teachers is historically linked to the fact that in the past most teachers were women. He argued that “women’s work” cooking, shopping, cleaning, mending, child-raising essential to the male worker’s ability to show up at the factory each morning, remained unremunerated by the factory owner. But if this labor was as important as the laborer showing up each morning on the assembly line, shouldn’t she be paid as well? In fact, the factory owner didn’t think about it; the thought of paying for this domestic labor never even entered his mind. All that he had to be responsible for was what took place in the factory, under the watchful gaze of the managers. Ideologies that naturalized women’s work made it easy for this work to be ignored, to be considered “outside production” and therefore ineligible for wages. The danger of the fact that so much of the labor that goes into teaching is hidden from the eyes of management—as well as the fact that we don’t produce tangible commodities ready for market—opens it to this same vulnerability.

What’s required to break down this wall is not a new institutional structure or bureaucracy to be put in place to monitor the work of teachers. These days, there’s more than enough surveillance in this society to go around. What is required is recognition, respect, and fair wages for work done. It is a call for an attitudinal change in the way our performance is perceived and salaries be fairly evaluated and assessed if our performance goes largely unobserved, if our work teaching, preparation, meetings with students and colleagues, curriculum and course development, and grading lays concealed behind a “fourth wall”?

Bertolt Brecht argued that political theater should disrupt the naturalist illusion of the typical bourgeois play by revealing the artificiality of the imaginary fourth wall that separates actors and spectators. In the classroom, the separation occurs between the students and teachers on the one side, and the administration on the other. This separation is positive in that it allows teachers and administrators to focus on doing what they do best. But it becomes nefarious when the issue of faculty compensation is at stake. How can administrators feel good about awarding faculty wage increases when they are less than keenly aware of the labor that goes on behind the fourth wall of the classroom, and, importantly, of all of the effort professors put in outside the classroom in order to make the few hours spent with students as profitable and productive as possible?
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The State of the Union

By Kye Carbone

The Merit Myth

Proclaiming the virtues of merit pay for Pratt’s faculty is akin to pronouncing one’s belief in “academic excellence.” Both empty platitudes if not placed in the proper context. Without a thorough understanding of what is meant by “merit,” it is altogether too problematic for administration more interested in political expediency than in merit.

In other words, the Pratt Administration will invariably insist on assuring what they believe to be their inherent right of control over all faculty actions — including when and if the CCE shall be conferred at all. That said, countenancing an onslaught of adjuncts when the CCE earlier rather than later is being sought is each sincerely believing they are as deserving and “meritorious” as the next, and each citing the administration’s flexibility with the “required” probationary period, would have been much more than they ever bargained for.

Moreover, there were at the time any number of well deserving adjuncts that did not apply, having been told in no uncertain terms, they were ineligible until having satisfied the required five-year probationary period. Had those adjuncts learned that an exception was being made, I can guarantee there would have been cries of foul play, and discrimination. Without any valid analysis, this was never a case about merit. And, therein lies the “loving touch” of the union establishment a seemingly rash decision was, in fact, just the decision, a decision to partition the result, past practice and the faculty. The Administration’s “rejection” acceptance of the union’s challenge notwithstanding, privately, they had to have been relieved.

The CCE is a faculty protection essential to the faculty and the Pratt Administration rescinded the CCE.

Addendum: In 1994, the same adjunct was denied the CCE. How difficult might it ask, if the five-year probationary period was no longer an impediment to the union’s merit and worthiness in dispute? The answer is that in ’94, this adjunct was now victim to the same arbitrary and capricious process experienced by the vast majority of CCE applicants. Unlike in 1991, there were no superiors claiming an exception to the rule — the rules the rest of us are required to live by.

Equity Fees/Fee

Question: How many of Pratt’s eight hundred plus faculty believe they have been recognized for their academic and professional achievements? Consider the following...

In 2002, two faculty members brought legal action against the Pratt Administration on the belief that they were overlooked for their “academic and professional achievements.” When those two faculty members, with the support of their Deans, the Provost, and hired legal counsel, contended their right to the union’s “merit raises” were being denied, two faculty members, with the support of their Deans, the Provost, and hired legal counsel, contended their right to the union’s “merit raises” were being denied.

I can only imagine that in the minds of the plaintiffs there exists a mythical meritocracy. A meritocracy where the buoyant rise to the top, where one is paid what they are worth, where the crème de la crème are awarded the most and where the rest are left behind. Why not instead fight for a contract that ensures a just and equitable pay scale for all? Only then will the great majority of Pratt’s eight hundred plus faculty be recognized for their academic and professional achievements.

Service or Subterfuge

Pratt’s faculty gives of their time freely. In addition to their classroom teaching faculty members meet with students privately to advise them on their academic progress. In some cases, faculty or curriculum directors regularly attempt to steer students to their respective discipline and attend as well participate in departmental meetings and presentations all as a matter of course. The faculty does not complain; understanding that services come with the territory part and parcel of teaching at the college level. Moreover, we give more than we are paid for because we genuinely care about our students’ success. Our decisions and actions are dedicated to the teaching-learning process and as professionals, we are ourselves continually striving to improve and grow.

The full time faculty serves on committees and contributes to the “life” of the program/department/school as required. This service a percentage of the full time salary. However, eighty-five percent of Pratt’s faculty are part-time, and as such, the majority of whom are part-time. When you accept letters to the editor, and artwork. Please send all submissions to the above address.

The chilling effect for those who cannot or do not meet such ‘expectations’ is acute, insidious and palpable. Faculty siding as non contributing members of the department or as direc-t in “participating in the life of the program” have little recourse when denied a promotion or status change for: “lacking a significant record of Institute service” when so called “peer” committees choose to pronounce as “criteria” heretofore amorphously defined “service requirements.” Embedded in these expectations is that if we choose not to do what the administration wants, we will have resiled our fates to those who wish to seal them. When you accept letters to the editor, and artwork. Please send all submissions to the above address.

Standing united, use your Union!

Kye Carbone
administration respects and recognizes the work that all faculty members do. Work that doesn't take the same appearance as administrative work because it is largely invisible. The analogy to “women’s work” is a trope. The factory worker's wife scrubs his shirt for a half hour to get out the oil stains, but when he shows up at the factory, no one—workers or management—think about the shirt or how it got clean. It somehow got clean all on its own.

Time after time, casual discussions with professors about their teaching and related projects have revealed that on the whole, Pratt professors pour tremendous passion and creative energy into their jobs. This is probably so because teachers are passionate about the place where we teach. We are dedicated because we believe that our chosen fields—design, fine art, architecture, library science, and liberal arts—are of crucial importance to the enhancement of the quality of human life, that the importance of what we are teaching transcends the boundaries of the institution, and that our teaching will have a lasting impact on the lives of our students.

We are motivated to teach because we enjoy it, we are dedicated to our fields, and we crave a career characterized by flexibility and independence.

Pratt professors are passionate and motivated, and students are for the most part satisfied with their performance. Case closed, right? Researchers define the type of motivation described here as "internal." If my diagnosis is correct, Pratt faculty members score off the chart when it comes to "internal" motivation, whereas the area of "external" motivation remains cloudy.

Internal motives are those described above, those that emanate from within a person. It is the internal passion and personality of professors themselves, the spontaneous feeling of satisfaction professors get from sharing knowledge they believe to be important with students, and watching their students reap the benefits of that knowledge.

But is purely internal motivation enough, or do faculty and administrators need to take more responsibility for finding ways to cultivate it externally, through recognition and wages?

According to Jim Vander Putten, in a review of ‘Teaching well and liking it: Motivating faculty to teach well’ James Bess, ed., 1996) external factors affecting faculty motivation include "organizational climate, communication processes, and rituals and ceremonies" as well as the setting of clear, attainable goals by the institution itself. According to Bess, while both types of motivation should be present to create a satisfactory work environment, the difficulty with teaching is that most rewards are internal rather than external, this in a professional world that more readily recognizes external rewards. “The most profound difference in professionalizing teaching in higher education is that most of the rewards for teaching are intrinsic while a significant amount of the rewards for research are extrinsic—for example, research grants.” In societies in which the status of occupations and the achievements within them are hierarchically arranged, it is difficult for individuals to be content with intrinsic satisfactions alone cited in Vander Putten 4.

Bess’s statement called to mind the many times I have heard faculty justify their lower than average pay or less than ideal though gradually improving physical working conditions because these were a small price to pay for doing a job they enjoy and in which they are given relative freedom to teach what they think is important. In other words, powerful internal motivational factors are seen by professors as fair compensation for a lack of external, institutional motivators. However, if Bess is correct, purely internal motivation is not enough. For better or worse, we are conditioned by the competitive society in which we live to need external recognition, respect, and rewards for a job well done.

Are professors striving to do their best for external as well as internal reasons, or is the burden at Pratt largely internal to professors, those for which the institution bears no responsibility, which are largely dependent on the professor's personal qualities, and which remain hidden? The fundamental question is what the Institute does to recognize and reward faculty, and whether it needs to develop new, innovative ways to do so. Beyond the recognition of one faculty member each year at graduation and limited amounts of money set aside for grants, which to the administration's credit are being increased, what rewards exist at Pratt for superior teaching performance? How is the faculty's expertise and knowledge deployed to make Pratt a more cutting edge institution? How are faculty achievements, which largely take place behind closed doors, far from the eyes of administrators and faculty peers, recognized, rewarded, and appreciated?

More important than recognizing superior teaching is recognizing faculty work as work. Professors are workers; we sweat in and outside the classroom; we work as hard recognizing the salary increases that have been negotiated in the new contract.

In a professional system of merit pay might seem to be the obvious solution to the motivation conundrum. Indeed, I have heard the Collective Bargaining Agreement blamed for preventing merit pay, for, on the contrary, requiring equality in yearly pay increases and thus implying that all faculty members are equally skilled or accomplished. In my research, I found a number of studies that claim merit pay does not work in institutions of higher learning. A California State University study found that “most, but by no means all, faculty are deeply suspicious of any form of merit pay other than that provided presently through retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP). Faculty also believe that forms of merit pay other than RTP will prove divisive. This is especially true when salaries are so far behind companion institutions.” The authors make a number of compelling points against relying upon merit pay as the primary external factor of insuring faculty motivation, including the fact that “there have been 3,000 studies of merit pay and the overwhelming conclusion is only 100 claim positive results,” that “the farther an organization lags behind the market in awarding compensation, the harder it is to make a merit pay model work,” and finally, “even though merit pay plans do not work, there are universities that think they should.” This informative article can be found at www.calstate.edu/EOa/1997/1997.532Mth.htm.

The gains for faculty, both full and part time, made in the new contract are considerable, and both the union negotiating team and the administrators should be commended for granting establishing increases and equity. This is a major accomplishment which will surely make a Pratt career more liveable for many faculty members, will directly affect their ability to continue to deliver a superior education as well as participate in the growth of Pratt, and will just as importantly enhance their sense of self esteem.

In a sense, this contract recognizes that faculty work, largely hidden behind a fourth wall, is real labor and deserves fair and equitable remuneration, on par with that of other similar institutions.
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The 2003 2007 Contract

On Wednesday March 16th, the UFCT and Pratt Institute Administration signed a ‘Memorandum Of Understanding’ that stated: “Pratt Institute and the United Federation of College Teachers, Local 1460 hereby agree to extend the existing collective bargaining agreement in full force until and including August 31, 2007 with the changes set forth below” the memorandum closing with: “This agreement shall become effective only upon its approval by the Board of Trustees of the Institute and upon its ratification by the Union.”

This signing effectively brought to a close a twenty two month negotiation period. Ratification of this agreement would be contingent on a majority of Union members voting in the affirmative.

Ballots and the full text of the MOU were mailed to every union member all change s and/or amendment(s) to the expired contract clearly enumerated, its cover letter stating: “After a lengthy negotiation, the UFCT Negotiating Committee has arrived at an agreement with Pratt Institute. Upon ratification by the Pratt UFCT membership, this new contract will be in effect from September 1, 2003 to August 31, 2007. This agreement contains many advancements and accomplishments: namely raises in compensation due to a re structuring of full time and part time minimums that finally begin to address endemnic deficiencies and inequities in pay as well as begin to structure a hopeful path for the future. We believe we were successful in moving the Administration in this direction.

In the end, good faith bargaining ultimately produced a strong contract for Pratt’s entire faculty.

The major highlights of this agreement include new minimum rates for both full and part time faculty rates that begin in earnest to correct endemic inequities in pay, the formation of a joint union administration committee to discuss the appropriate use of the visiting category and health benefits for domestic partners.

The text for these issues follows:
The 2003-2007 Contract

### FullTime Faculty Minimums

**Effective September 1, 2004**, the following shall be the minimum salary levels for the full-time faculty:

| Instructor | $35,000 | $32,000 + 9.37 |
| Assistant Professor | 40,000 | $34,000 + 17.94 |

**Associate Professor**

| Term of Service | Up to 5 | 43,000 | 39,000 + 21.79 |
| 6 to 10 | 50,000 |
| 11 to 15 | 54,000 |
| 16 to 20 | 55,000 |
| 21 to 25 | 57,500 |
| 26+ | 60,000 |

**Professor**

| Term of Service | Up to 5 | 51,000 | 45,000 + 15.55 |
| 6 to 10 | 55,000 |
| 11 to 15 | 59,000 |
| 16 to 20 | 62,000 |
| 21 to 25 | 66,000 |
| 26+ | 69,000 |

These minimums shall not apply to faculty on non-tenure track appointments. With respect to faculty participating in the Half-Time Teaching Option or the Pre Retirement Teaching Option, the minimums shall apply to what the faculty member’s salary would have been had she/he been fully loaded.

A "year of service" shall be defined as:

1) **Effective September 1, 2003**, full-time faculty members who were employed as full-time faculty at Pratt in the 2002-2003 academic year and continue to teach full-time, shall receive the higher of:
   - a) the member’s 2003-04 salary plus 2.5%; or
   - b) the applicable minimum rate.

2) **Effective September 1, 2004**, full-time faculty members who were employed as full-time faculty at Pratt in the 2003-2004 academic year and continue to teach full-time, shall receive the higher of:
   - a) the member’s 2004-05 salary plus 2.5%; or
   - b) the applicable minimum rate.

3) **Effective September 1, 2005**, full-time faculty members who were employed as full-time faculty at Pratt in the 2004-2005 academic year and continue to teach full-time, shall receive the higher of:
   - a) the member’s 2005-06 salary plus 2.5%; or
   - b) the applicable minimum rate.

4) **Effective September 1, 2006**, full-time faculty members who were employed as full-time faculty at Pratt in the 2005-2006 academic year and continue to teach full-time, shall receive the higher of:
   - a) the member’s 2006-07 salary plus 2.5%; or
   - b) the applicable minimum rate.

### Part-Time Faculty Minimums

**Effective September 1, 2004**, the following shall be the minimum contact hour rates per contact hour of undergraduate lecture for the duration of the Agreement:

| Instructor | $50 | $53 + $56 |

**Associate Professor**

| Term of Service | Up to 5 | 1,350 | 1,200 + 25.3 % |
| 6 to 10 | 1,420 |
| 11 to 15 | 1,470 |
| 16 to 20 | 1,500 |
| 21 to 25 | 1,570 |
| 26+ | 1,400 |

**Professor**

| Term of Service | Up to 5 | 1,800 | 1,107 + 27.8 % |
| 6 to 10 | 1,375 |
| 11 to 15 | 1,450 |
| 16 to 20 | 1,525 |
| 21 to 25 | 1,600 |
| 26+ | 1,695 |

A "year of service" shall be defined as two Fall or Spring semesters in which the faculty member actually taught part-time the entire semester. Time on paid leave shall be treated as time spent teaching for purposes of the preceding sentence.

For purposes of determining part time faculty minimums for part time faculty only, there shall be a rebuttable presumption that a faculty member has taught part time every semester since his/her date of employment at Pratt. The burden of establishing a faculty member’s years of service shall rest with the faculty member. The faculty member will be given access to pertinent employment records at his or her request.

### Health Benefits Policy For Domestic Partners

1) Domestic partners, who satisfy all of the criteria set forth below, have the same eligibility for Health Benefits (i.e., Article XXVI) as spouses of eligible faculty and librarians. The criteria are as follows:

   i. The persons are not related by blood;

   ii. Neither person is married and the persons have never been married to each other;

   iii. The persons share a primary residence and intend to do so permanently;

   iv. The persons have been living together for at least one year prior to the date of the Affidavit.

   v. The persons are at least eighteen years of age;

   vi. The persons are competent to enter a contract;

   vii. The persons are not in a domestic partnership relationship with anyone else; and

   viii. The persons share the common necessities of life and have agreed themselves to be responsible for each other’s welfare.

2) The faculty member or librarian must submit an Affidavit of Domestic Partnership swearing to the foregoing. In addition, she/he must submit proof of qualifying cohabitation. In the event the relationship terminates or any other change occurs so that the persons are no longer in compliance with all of the above criteria, the member or librarian must inform the Institute within thirty days.

3) Coverage will first be available for a domestic partner who qualifies under the provisions of this Article as of January 1, 2006.

The committee shall also include, in a non-voting capacity, a representative of the Academic Senate selected by the Senate. Other non voting participants may be invited by agreement of the Provost and the President of the Union to participate in the committee’s discussions.

The committee shall be constituted by October 1, 2005. It shall issue a report including any recommendations by December 31, 2006. Recommendations of the committee may result in amendment of the collective bargaining agreement only upon the written agreement of the Union and the Administration.

### The UFCT, use it or lose it!

The 2003-2007 Contract is a manifestation of what is possible when we are required to satisfy those carriers.

Domestic partners, who satisfy all of the criteria set forth below, have the same eligibility for Health Benefits (i.e., Article XXVI) as spouses of eligible faculty and librarians. The criteria are as follows:

1) Domestic partners, who satisfy all of the criteria set forth below, have the same eligibility for Health Benefits (i.e., Article XXVI) as spouses of eligible faculty and librarians. The criteria are as follows:

   i. The persons are not related by blood;

   ii. Neither person is married and the persons have never been married to each other;

   iii. The persons share a primary residence and intend to do so permanently;

   iv. The persons have been living together for at least one year prior to the date of the Affidavit.

   v. The persons are at least eighteen years of age;

   vi. The persons are competent to enter a contract;

   vii. The persons are not in a domestic partnership relationship with anyone else; and

   viii. The persons share the common necessities of life and have agreed themselves to be responsible for each other’s welfare.

The committee shall also include, in a non-voting capacity, a representative of the Academic Senate selected by the Senate. Other non voting participants may be invited by agreement of the Provost and the President of the Union to participate in the committee’s discussions.

The committee shall be constituted by October 1, 2005. It shall issue a report including any recommendations by December 31, 2006. Recommendations of the committee may result in amendment of the collective bargaining agreement only upon the written agreement of the Union and the Administration.
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