

AAUP

NEWS



Volume XIII No. 12 July 12, 2002

Two bargaining sessions produce little progress toward agreement

At the bargaining sessions on July 8 and July 11, the teams exchanged proposals on compensation, workload, and technology-related issues and conducted some discussion of proposals from previous sessions. Also, the administration team provided some additional information about their health benefits proposal.

Faculty Chief Negotiator John Battistone said, "Both sides now have their entire set of proposals out on the table, and there has not yet been much in the way of give and take—but if the administration is serious about their proposals, we have a very long way to go to resolve a contract."

"The administration's set of proposals seems to diminish our 12-year contractual history of assurance of a faculty role in institutional decision-making," John said.

"Their proposals also seem to remove some of the current incentives for faculty to engage in professional development and to develop distance education courses," John continued. "The proposals seem to degrade cooperative education, and ask faculty to use a good part of

their raises to pay for health care."

"Taken as a whole, their proposed contract would not be acceptable to the faculty," John said.

Compensation

The Faculty Team said the administration's compensation offer is equivalent to a 2% across-the-board raise for each of the next three years. The administration's proposal says faculty members whose annual salaries are under \$50,000 would receive raises of 2.5 percent per year, faculty members whose annual salaries are over \$75,000 would receive 1.5 percent per year, and all others would receive 2 percent a year.

Also, the administration proposed limiting the amount of overload that could be earned by faculty to a maximum of "50 percent of their 'normal' loads."

John said the Faculty Team presented a compensation proposal that focuses on re-establishing a salary schedule as a way to resolve inequities in salaries among faculty members with comparable credentials and years of service.

"For several months, the AAUP has been attempting to develop an effective solution to salary equity issues," John said.

"A while ago, the administration told us they had conducted an equity study, but as it turns out, they did not really examine all the salaries in the entire faculty bargaining unit," John said. "They included only a couple of isolated cases in their so-called study."

"The AAUP Compensation Committee, with the assistance of two faculty members who are qualified statisticians, conducted a comprehensive study of all faculty salaries," John said.

John said the faculty equity study identified many examples of cases where faculty members with the same credentials and years of service have very large differences in their salaries.

John said, "The Faculty Team has proposed a two-year contract that is affordable for the administration and is fair to faculty members in resolving these discrepancies once and for all."

see Bargaining sessions/ 2

Bargaining sessions/ continued from 1

The faculty compensation proposal includes re-establishing a salary schedule, which is the typical compensation approach used in two-year colleges.

In the first year of the proposed two-year contract, the salary increase for the entire bargaining unit would be equivalent to slightly more than 7 percent. Those whose annual salaries are inequitably low would be raised to the appropriate position on the salary schedule, based on their academic credentials and years of service.

Under the faculty compensation proposal, in the first contract year no faculty member would receive less than a 3 percent raise. In the second year of the contract, every faculty member would receive a 4 percent raise.

John said that each faculty member's location on the re-established salary schedule would be based on a statistical linear regression model of projected salaries. The statistical analysis takes into consideration the actual salaries of all of the current members of the bargaining unit and then uses a computer model to predict the

appropriate salary that each faculty member with the same credentials and years of service should be earning.

Workload

In the workload article, along with limiting overload for all faculty members, the administration proposed significant increases in the workload for co-op coordinators, and significant changes to the way workload is calculated for all Health Technologies Division program chairs and clinical and co-op coordinators.

Faculty Team member Maggie Davis, who is also the Chair of the College-wide standing committee on Cooperative Education, said, "The administration team's proposals for changing coordinator workload show that they are totally out of touch with how the co-op coordinators do their work."

Maggie said the administration's proposals would increase by 20 percent the number of placements in a co-op coordinator's load, and would decrease the compensation for coordinator overload. Co-op coordinators also would be required to schedule 16 office hours a week.

"The administration team told us that they thought coordinators' loads should increase because we have technology like PlacePro and the College website helping us do our jobs more efficiently," Maggie said. "Obviously, they don't know about the shortcomings of that technology."

"The administration team also doesn't seem to know that coordinators already have increased our own efforts to provide even more meaningful learning as a component of co-op, such as the Business Tech Division's "Working for Success Experience" and other new initiatives," Maggie said.

According to Maggie, the administration team also said that coordinators did not need to receive workload credit for placing students in co-op positions at Cincinnati State because those assignments are not meaningful jobs that lead to full-time employment.

"I think a lot of current employees who started as co-ops in the College might disagree with the administration team's view," Maggie said.

The Faculty Team proposed that the base workload units

see Bargaining sessions/ 3

Faculty can review health benefits proposal on Anthem website

The Faculty Team said the administration proposed in the July 1 bargaining session that all faculty members currently using Choice Care HMO coverage move to a similar program offered by Anthem called "Anthem Blue Preferred."

The administration also proposed faculty contributions to health benefits costs of \$15 per paycheck for family coverage or \$6 per paycheck for single coverage. Costs for some prescription drugs would increase because of the Anthem program's three-tiered approach to co-payments.

Faculty members currently using the "Anthem HMP" program would move to a new plan called "Blue Access PPO" and would pay about \$90 per paycheck for family coverage or \$35 per paycheck for single coverage.

"The Faculty Team will be studying the details of the administration's health benefits proposal," John Battistone said. "All faculty members need to take a look at the impact of this change on their own health care activities and costs."

To review the proposed plan, go

to the website www.Anthem.com.

- The "Anthem Provider Directory" lets you search for names of doctors who participate in the administration's proposed programs.
- The "Prescription Formulary" lets you search for prescription drugs by name. In the administration's proposed plan, drugs listed as "generic" would require a \$5 co-payment, "brand name" drugs would require a \$12 co-payment, and "formulary" drugs would require a \$22 co-payment.

Bargaining sessions/ continued from 2

assigned to every degree program should increase from 4 to 6, to reflect the increased work all program chairs have experienced because of growth in College enrollment, and because of technology issues such as lack of efficient access to student data in the Colleague system.

Faculty Team members said they will need to study the administration's proposed changes to Health Technologies Division workload, and seek input from the program chairs in the Health Tech Division.

"In the last contract, we had an agreement that the FACT committee would examine Health Tech program management issues," John said. "After a number of FACT meetings and discussions, the administration said they wanted to stop working on changes to Health program loads."

"Now they have proposed a different way of calculating Health Tech program units," John said. "The Bargaining Team asked the administration to provide more details about how their proposal would change the allocation of Health Tech program units."

"The AAUP Executive Committee will need to examine and discuss this information with Health Tech faculty before we can respond at the table," John said.

John said the administration's proposal would give 6 base units per term to each HTD program area (associate degree plus related certificates) for the overall program coordination, including the clinical and co-op coordination, for up to the first 30 FTEs. The program would earn 3 additional units for FTEs 31 through 50, and an additional 3 units each time the threshold

of 20 additional FTEs is crossed.

According to the administration's proposal, the program chair, in consultation with the Dean, would allocate the program units among the applicable HTD program faculty.

Electronically purveyed methods of instruction

The Faculty Team members said that the administration's final non-economic proposals continued the pattern of previous proposals by removing most of the existing contractual structures for faculty decision-making, and by increasing administrative authority in some areas of faculty work.

Faculty Team members said the administration's proposed changes to Article IX, "Electronically Purveyed Methods of Instruction," would give the administration ownership of distance courses developed by faculty, unlike the current contract which says faculty members own the content of the courses they create.

The administration's proposal also would decrease the workload units assigned to faculty members who develop distance courses, and would set contractual limits on faculty member's choices about how to design and deliver course content.

According to the Faculty Team, the administration team said they proposed changes because the original purpose of Article IX—to provide incentives for faculty members to get involved in distance education—was not working.

"The administration's proposals for what they want to call the 'Distributed Education' article provide no incentives at all for faculty members to develop

technology-enhanced teaching materials," said Faculty Team member Debbie Bogenschutz.

Debbie said that according to the administration's Distributed Education proposals, faculty members who want to develop brand-new courses, not already included in the College catalog, might be given additional workload units, but only if the Academic Vice President approved.

Faculty members who converted existing courses to a distance education format would earn two workload units for the conversion, which is less than the current contractual assurance that all distance course development is compensated at a minimum of the contact hour value of the course plus one additional unit.

Debbie said the administration's proposal also would require faculty members to participate in training before being permitted to develop Distributed Education courses.

Debbie said a particularly disturbing part of the administration's proposal is language that prescribes materials and methods for teaching technology-enhanced courses.

"Never before has the administration written proposed contract language that tells faculty how to teach their classes, but that kind of detail is included in the administration's Distributed Education proposal," Debbie said. "That's a really shocking invasion of our academic freedom."

Debbie said the administration's proposal also ignores existing APCC policies and procedures by stating that a new Distributed Education course would be required to be "piloted" with a group of 5 to 12

see Bargaining sessions/ 4

Bargaining sessions/ continued from 3

students, and modified based on student feedback, before the course would be included in the College catalog.

Other proposals

At the bargaining session on July 11, the teams reached tentative agreement to add contract language that would clarify eligibility and procedures for using the Family Medical Leave Act.

According to John Battistone, the teams seem to remain very far apart on governance, tenure, and other non-economic articles that were discussed during the July 11 session.

Faculty Team member Joyce Rimlinger said the administration team asked questions about the faculty governance proposal, which includes faculty-proposed changes to the procedures for selection and appointment of faculty members and academic administrators.

According to Joyce, the administration team revised their initial governance proposal by proposing to recognize the Faculty Senate, but not the

standing committees or the proportional representation of faculty on College-wide committees, as is currently described in Article VI.

"The administration's team seems to believe that if faculty members have a contractually-designated role in decision making, it interferes with their management rights," Joyce said.

Joyce added that the shared governance language currently in Article VI is based on the national AAUP policy statement on "Government of Colleges and Universities," which was jointly created in 1966 by the AAUP, the American Council on Education (representing college presidents), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (representing boards of trustees).

"The basic ideas about shared governance that are described in our current contract language have been the standard in higher education for 35 years," Joyce said. "We simply want the administration to continue to affirm that those principles are in effect at Cincinnati State, too."

Faculty Team member Ken Stoll said, "The bottom line of the administration's current governance proposals seems to be that the President can do whatever he wants, when he wants to."

"Their proposals for governance, tenure, and some other areas seem to eliminate the checks and balances built into the current contract that stop the fostering of cronyism," Ken said.

Ken said the administration has proposed changes to Article II, "Non-Discrimination and Affirmative Action," which would limit the list of categories of non-discrimination.

"They said they want the article to be more 'streamlined' and more in keeping with other legal statements," Ken said. "The Faculty Team is concerned that changing Article II sends a bad signal and implies that the administration might want to discriminate in the future regarding some of the groups that are now included in our non-discrimination Article."

The next bargaining session is scheduled for Monday, July 15.

CINCINNATI STATE CHAPTER AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS 3520 CENTRAL PARKWAY CINCINNATI, OHIO 45223-2690

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT

PAM ECKER
PHONE: 513/569-1722

VICE PRESIDENT

JOYCE RIMLINGER

GRIEVANCE OFFICER

JOHN BATTISTONE

SECRETARY

GEOFFREY WOOLF

MEMBERSHIP CHAIR

KEN STOLL

TREASURER

PAUL DAVIS

MEMBER-AT-LARGE

CINDY KIEF

BARGAINING COUNCIL

CHAIR AND PAST PRESIDENT

BOB EVESLAGE