

## Burkhart, Kelly

---

**Subject:** Per 3

**From:** [barb.aboen@gmail.com](mailto:barb.aboen@gmail.com) [<mailto:barb.aboen@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, February 03, 2013 8:20 PM

**To:** Gutierrez, Aaron

**Subject:** Per 3

Pers 3 has to be replaced with a retirement plan teachers can actually live on.

I am a physics and math teacher and work an average of 50 hours a week. I get no vacation pay, no overtime pay, no raises (I have over 16 years experience), and few cost-of living increases. When Pers 3 was first offered to teachers, my sister and mother both had breast cancer. The recommendation was for me to change from Pers 2 to Pers 3 because I was a high cancer risk and, if I had to quit teaching because of my health, I would at least have my contribution into the system to live on for the remainder of my life.

The retirement representatives who met with teachers to persuade them to change to Pers 3 were very convincing. Now, of course, I can see the representatives for the retirement system only wanted to move teachers from Pers 2 to Pers 3 for the benefit of the State, not the teachers. We deserve better.

I wondered why the policeMEN and fireMEN are not complaining about Pers 3 and did some investigating. Of course it is because only the teachers (76% women) are subjected to Pers 3. Why would the State determine teachers (76% women) only needed 30% of their pay to live after the age of 65, whereas the fireMEN and policeMEN can have a maximum of 75% of their pay? I wonder if this is because the State assumes the 'little woman' will be taken care of by her husband and doesn't need a 'real' retirement? That's sexual discrimination and that's illegal.

Pers 3 needs to be replaced with Per 4, a retirement system for teachers that compensates them for a lifetime of dedication and financial sacrifice.

Sincerely,

Barb Aboen  
Physics and Mathematics  
Monroe High School