

Rider AAUP Members,

In light of President Dell'Omo's communication to the AAUP bargaining unit, the AAUP Executive committee felt that it should send you a response which we believe clarifies our recent interactions with Administration and our position. We have also attached a PDF document which contains this message.

We are disappointed that President Dell'Omo has chosen to violate the long standing practice of negotiating with the elected legal representatives of the faculty and instead has chosen to try to divide us by dealing directly with the AAUP membership. Negotiations are most productive when each side deals with the legal representatives of the other side.

President Dell'Omo's claim that the AAUP chose to "break off" negotiations is simply untrue. What the AAUP negotiating team said was that negotiations require that both sides enter into a dialog and that we were willing to continue that dialog but that the administration had refused to bargain and instead insisted that we simply capitulate to the essence of their demands. We think the words of our correspondence with administration speak for themselves (see below). We also indicated to administration in January that if they indicated a willingness to negotiate and not simply dictate demands, then we were willing to continue discussions.

President Dell'Omo claims that his administration is "open and flexible," but as you can see from our correspondence with administration, the only flexibility they have shown is in subtle variations of the same draconian cuts to our benefits and pay, and a drastic increase in our workload. This lack of willingness to enter into true dialog is now accompanied by threats of refusing to negotiate if an agreement is not reached by a certain date.

We also reject President Dell'Omo's characterization of our last proposal. We believe that a number of the statements made in that communication were based on information from Rider's financial management office, and we believe those statements are simply incorrect.

It is important to note that the "projection" which has been repeatedly referenced by President Dell'Omo is simply a budget exercise, not a fixed, knowable future as he appears to suggest. Only the closed fiscal year of 2016 and accounting data from prior fiscal years represent known facts in this discussion. All other items on the unrestricted fund cash flow budget projection are based on various assumptions, some of which are known, most of which can only be discerned by analysis. Current year spending by administration includes numerous discretionary spending items such as road paving, fire pits, landscaping projects, and hiring of additional administrators. While it is management's prerogative to spend the university's funds as they see fit, it is important to note that for many of these budget items, these are spending choices amongst many alternatives, alternatives which include faculty compensation.

While administration clearly does not recognize the sacrifices faculty has made over the past three years, we do. Each year faculty foregoes a raise it reduces their salary and reduces the

cost of faculty salary to the university. These are savings “to the base” which at a 2 percent rate we recognize as \$780,000 per year. Each year faculty has foregone a wage increase which is commensurate with the rate of inflation they sacrifice that spending power, thus their pay is reduced. These foregone pay increases result in a reduction of faculty labor cost for the university which carries forward to successive years, so the savings accumulate. Our proposal to administration included an additional three years of no raises for faculty. These savings are significant.

The statement from Rider’s financial team that the budget projections included retirements is not correct. The unrestricted fund cash flow budget projections were completed in June 2016 and then revised in October 2016. The total number of retirements was not known until December 2016. The budget projections could not include what was not known. Additionally, the budget projection delivered to the AAUP in the summer of 2016 was delivered with a sheet of “key assumptions.” These assumptions did not identify faculty retirements and identified a series of raises for various labor categories, including the AAUP bargaining unit. These assumptions run contrary to the reality of reduced faculty headcount and a proposal of no raises through FY 2019.

Complete savings from our proposal are identified in the table below. As shown in this table, our proposed savings are significant and given the faculty retirements and faculty willingness to forego raises, the “base budget” would have been reduced significantly. While we question administration’s requirement for approximately 6 million in “base budget” savings, it is clear from this table that our proposal would have provided savings in excess of that amount.

It is important to note that the three year budget exercises being touted by administration are not an unavoidable future which must be managed according to administrative prerogatives. They are a bargaining position. Administration has made it clear that they regard it as something more. We believe their position is based on an ideological assumption that faculty do not work hard enough and are paid too much. A position based on an analysis of faculty pay prepared by the financial team which has persistently pursued this position regardless of facts to the contrary.

We support faculty and their professional status. We believe faculty should be compensated fairly and we believe it is clear the university has the resources to do that even in this difficult financial climate. We believe that what we observe now is a management preference to spend the university’s resources on questionable building projects and increases in the size and cost of administration in lieu of spending on faculty compensation and benefits.

We will continue to try to work with administration in a manner which is fair to faculty. Understand that capitulation to unreasonable demands out of fear of an uncertain future is not the way forward, for us, or for the university. We believe administration must remember that the university exists to pursue an academic mission which promotes a comprehensive education

with practice and liberal arts components. A faculty with a workload which allows for research and service, and which is fairly compensated for its work is a critical component of that mission.

Calculated Savings from the AAUP Proposal from January 2017

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Salary	0%	0%	0%	0%	formula	formula
Pension	5% no clawback	5%	6%	7%	8%	8.50%
Leaves	no change	No leaves	7 leaves	10 leaves	12 leaves	14
Summer fellowships	No change	No fellowships	30 fellowships	35 fellowships	40	45
Travel funds	No change	\$1000 per member	\$1,200	\$1,500	\$1,700	\$2,000
Layoff	No layoff/MOU	Article XV suspended	*Article XV suspended	Article XV in force	Article XV in force	Article XV in force
Retirement	MOU	Negotiated only	Negotiated only	4 ERI/phased	4 ERI/phased	4 ERI/phased
Savings (in thousands)						
No raise	\$780.00	\$1,560.00	\$2,340.00	\$3,120.00		
No Leaves (a)		\$280.80				
No Fellowships (b)		\$561.00				
Pension reduction	\$535.00	\$1,070.00	\$716.90	\$363.80	\$5.35	\$0.00
Retirements	\$1,200.00	\$1,720.00	\$2,680.00	\$6,120.00	\$6,120.00	\$6,120.00
Total	\$2,515.00	\$5,191.80	\$5,736.90	\$9,603.80	\$6,125.35	\$6,120.00

(a) leave reduction savings not calculated for FY 2019-2022

(b) reduction in fellowship savings not calculated for FY 2019-2022

* Article XV of the contract allows administration to institute layoffs under certain conditions

Selected Correspondence with Administration

After putting a large package of concessions on the table in December, the administration rejected it and insisted that we had to make concessions in the range that they had put on the table. Our response was:

"We are very disappointed with your response to our offer to partner with the administration to build the future of our University. The offer we made would involve serious hardship for the members of our bargaining unit but would also offer them hope in the future of the University. Your response to our proposal is not a counter-proposal, but merely a reiteration of your previous position combined with an insistence that all of these draconian cuts must be permanent. It is the view of the Executive Committee that this was not an attempt to find common ground, but simply an attempt on the part of the administration to dictate terms. If this is your position, then the Executive Committee sees no benefit in continuing to meet."

To which the administration responded:

"I am sorry to hear that you are not open to continuing the dialogue around how we can achieve savings in the range that we feel is necessary to make a more meaningful contribution to the fiscal recovery plan."

Our response reiterated our willingness to enter into true dialog:

"As we noted in our response to your earlier communication we are open to continuing a dialog, but we are not open to having an outcome dictated to us. A dialog demands the willingness of both parties to make compromises which we have done and continue to be prepared to do. But it appears that administration is more interested in a monologue where it dictates the outcome of all discussions. We see no point in participating in such a monologue."

The administration combined their demand with a threat that they would refuse any negotiations beyond the end of the summer. A threat that President Dell'Omo has repeated in his missive, along with the absurd claim that a 5 year agreement would be a "concession".

Again we believe that our response to the administration speaks for itself.

"We do continue to believe that a long period of agreement between the AAUP and the administration is in the best interest of everyone but most especially our students. We do not believe it is in anyone's interest are threats of lockouts and one sided actions. The AAUP has always been committed to finding solutions that allow the business of the University, the education of our students, to go forward. The sooner such solutions emerge the better, but we will not be bullied into accepting a bad agreement by threats of lockout or other administrative actions. We completely reject your claim that continuing to talk until mutually agreeable solutions are reached is not in the best interest of the students. What is not in the best interest of our students are disruptions in the educational process because of some arbitrary deadline."

AAUP Executive Committee