

AAUP

NEWS

Volume XIII No. 14 July 24, 2002

Where have all the hiring policies gone?

—by the Cincinnati State
AAUP Executive Committee

In this year's negotiations, the faculty have proposed some changes to help streamline and clarify the processes used to hire faculty and some administrators. We believe that the current system does not work and is, at least in some cases, arbitrary and capricious. The faculty proposals have met with administrative resistance at the bargaining table.

The administration accuses us (erroneously) of attempting to "effectively hire," thus taking control from the administration and the Board of Trustees. Nothing could be further from the truth. The faculty proposals do make the input of the faculty in some hiring decisions mandatory, unlike the current policies—but the input remains a "recommendation," not a decision.

The current Cincinnati State *Administrators' Manual of Policies and Procedures* has 15 pages of

rules and guidelines for the selection and appointment of personnel. Some of these rules and guidelines make sense, many do not, and all of them can be circumvented by the College President if he feels like ignoring them.

The result is that sometimes it takes years to hire a new faculty member and just seconds to appoint a new administrator.

When last year's budget was approved (for the budget year that just ended this June 30), there were great administrative flourishes and alarums at the news that 18 new faculty positions had been approved. Set aside for the moment the fact that many of the so-called "new" positions were really replacements for faculty who had retired or resigned, and focus on how many of those 18 approved faculty positions were actually appointed. By our count, several of the positions approved a year ago are still unfilled. Why would needed faculty positions not be filled as

efficiently as possible? Consider just one of the examples we're aware of:

How new faculty get hired—or not

It was decided that we needed, and a position was approved, for a new Faculty Unit 1 counselor. There's no argument that at least one more professional counselor is needed at Cincinnati State, since we have the same number of counselors we had a decade ago, but triple the number of students.

It was clear from the beginning, however, that this counselor position was to be different. A "piece" of the job was to be devoted to counseling the student athletes.

A description was created and the position was advertised externally (even though our contract suggests that internal searches should be conducted first, and preference given to internal candidates). There were 54 applicants for the job.

The standard, contractually-described committee of three faculty members and two administrators was appointed. This committee followed the rules and policies written in the *Administrators' Manual*.

see Hiring policies/ 2

**"No substantive progress"
at July 22 bargaining session.
See story on page 5.**

Hiring policies/ continued from 1

Applicants were screened and six candidates were selected to be interviewed by the committee.

At each step along the way, the official Human Resources liaison approved the process and the pool of candidates. One candidate dropped out, and the other five were interviewed.

The interviews followed the process mandated by Cincinnati State policy. There were nine questions asked of each candidate and each was rated on a scale of 1 to 10. Scores were tallied and compared.

One candidate—a long-time Cincinnati State adjunct, who has worked faithfully, and presumably effectively, for the College for over a decade—earned a 95 percent score. A second candidate, an AAUP-Unit 2 faculty member with 14 years of service, scored about 84 percent. A third candidate, an individual who had served a brief internship with the College, scored about 71 percent. The other two candidates scored in the 60s and 50s.

Applying the perspective of educators, some of the committee members regarded the results like grades: there was an A candidate, a B candidate, a C candidate, a D candidate, and an F candidate.

Here is where the “official hiring process” ceases to make sense. According to current policy, after hiring committee members tally their scores, the committee’s judgement is no longer necessary. The committee is simply supposed to forward to the hiring manager (in this case, it was the assistant dean) the names of all of those “qualified” for the job. No ratings. No recommendations. Nothing else. The tedious process of tallying ratings

seemingly had no purpose.

Several committee members decided to make recommendations anyway. Three people recommended the obvious: appoint the “A” candidate, and if that candidate turns us down or is unacceptable for some other reason, then appoint the “B” candidate.

A recommendation was made to afford a second interview to the “C” candidate, because that candidate’s interview took place on September 11, 2001, and the candidate was worried about some friends who might have been affected by the events of the day. The committee thought that candidate should get another chance to interview. Of course, the decision was that the “D” and “F” candidates should not be forwarded. Seem reasonable?

The assistant dean, after receiving the committee’s recommendations, conducted interviews and forwarded on to the President only one candidate—the “C” candidate. The reasons for this decision were never communicated to the committee.

The President apparently didn’t like the “C” candidate, and—several months later—the whole process was started again. This time, the advertised position description included more specific details about the athletics-related aspects of this counselor position.

The entire process was conducted again, this time with some different committee members, since several of the original members believed it was a waste of their time to engage in a process where their input was not valued.

This time the process produced no one who met the advertised description.

The committee members have been told that a faculty hiring process will be commenced, yet again. Over one year later, no new counselor has been appointed. (By the way, the original “A” candidate continues to work for the College, as an adjunct.)

It’s not clear if any faculty members will agree to serve on a future hiring committee for this position.

Faculty members are, in general, disgruntled about their experiences on selection and appointment committees, where inconsistent procedures and overruling of committee recommendations seems to be the norm, not the exception.

While listening to the faculty feedback used to prepare the proposals our team has taken to the table, we’ve heard story after story about inconsistencies, anomalies, and even some logic-defying idiocies that have occurred as part of “official” hiring processes. We made proposals that we believe will clarify and improve a process that affects all of us, and ultimately, our students.

Now consider the alternative:

How new administrators get hired

The Administrators’ Manual of Policies and Procedures has a gaping loophole in its 15 pages of guidelines for selection and appointment: “*The methods used to fill positions will be those outlined in this manual. If special and/or extraordinary circumstances pertain, the President... will determine special method(s) and procedures to be used to fill such positions*”

So, according to the Policy Manual, the President can do what he wants, whenever he wants.

see Hiring policies/ 3

Hiring policies/ continued from 2

This President seems to like the “Interim-to-Anointment-to-Appointment” method. A person is unilaterally appointed as “Interim Administrative Something,” waits a while, and then is magically anointed by the Board of Trustees in a “change of status” action, making the administrative position permanent. No fuss, no muss. No search, no competition. Easy.

Consider these anointments:

- In July 1998, Denise Crews went from Jump Start Coordinator to “Temporary Director of Continuing Education.” In February 1999, she was anointed “Director of Continuing Education.” She has since been non-renewed.
- Remember Dr. Carolyn Pike? She was a consultant (paid at the annual rate of about \$150,000), who in September 1999 became “Interim Executive Director of Organizational Development and Human Resources,” a position which had never before existed. She resigned while still “Interim.”
- In November 1999, the then-Director of Multicultural Affairs, Dr. Marian Wilson, became the “Interim Director of Organizational Development and Institutional Equity,” a position title which had never before existed. In July 2000, having undergone no search process, she was anointed “Director of Organizational Development and Institutional Equity.” Ironically, one of her jobs was to be the “Human Resources Liaison” to selection and appointment committees, to make sure that everyone else follows the policies in selecting and appointing personnel. (Most recently, of course, Dr. Wilson has been appointed to the position “Acting Director of Corporate and Community Services,” and it’s not yet clear if her previous position will be filled with another “actor.”)
- Consider another Human Resources Liaison, who helps us to follow the College rules for selection and appointment of personnel. Gene Breyer went in November 1999 from being the “Labor Relations Manager” to a position as “Interim Director of Human Resources.” In July 2000, having gone through no search process, he was anointed “Director of Human Resources.”
- In April 2001, then-Assistant Dean Dr. Jan Donley was appointed “Interim Director of Organizational Effectiveness.” (Whatever

that is in relation to Dr. Wilson’s position as “Director of Organizational Development, etc.” was not made clear.) In January 2002, Dr. Donley, having undergone no search procedure, was anointed “Director of Organizational Effectiveness.”

- Now consider the meteoric rise of Gary McDaniel, who went in July 1998 from a position as a “College Representative-Recruiting” to “Temporary Special Assistant to the Dean of Health Technologies,” an academic position which had never before existed and which the Dean had not requested.

The AAUP grieved this action, and when it came time to arbitrate, suddenly the position was no longer academic: it had become a “promotion” to “Assistant Director of Student Activities,” a position which had never been requested by the Director of Student Activities.

Mr. McDaniel has since been anointed as “Director of Student Activities,” which the former Director learned by reading the “change of status” in the Board’s agenda. All of this of course is separate from Mr. McDaniel’s responsibilities as director of one of the nation’s outstanding two-year college women’s basketball programs.

Nice work, if you can get it.

Of course, sometimes it makes sense to have “interim” appointments. An employee may resign or die or be fired, resulting in an open position. It’s reasonable to think that a supervisor might ask a trusted, qualified person to act in an

More Nice Work If You Can Get It

Cincinnati State pays the monthly rent (\$615) for one person to act as the “Resident Coordinator” for the women athletes who live, at College expense, in an apartment building in Clifton.

There is no official written position description for a “Resident Coordinator” job in the Human Resources Office, but according to Coach Gary

McDaniel, this is a real College position which he evaluates and supervises. As far as we know, there was no search or competition before the job was filled.

We’ll award a chocolate Froggie to the first administrator who guesses accurately the name of the person who holds this position.

see Hiring policies/ 4

Hiring policies/ continued from 3

“interim” capacity, while the organization conducts a legitimate search for a permanent candidate. Of course, the interim appointee might choose to compete for the permanent position, and might even be selected for that position.

But that’s not how we do it at Cincinnati State.

Until this week, our most recent “interim” deal involved

the Director of Financial Aid, a position that had been vacant for some time. What did we do? Apparently someone went down south into the Carolinas and then brought back and introduced to our Board of Trustees a new “Interim Director of Financial Aid,” Ms. Dawnia Reck.

Twice, when asked about this “interim” appointment in public meetings, the President responded by asking other

administrators, “Are we calling that an interim position?” (Presumably the President could not recall the action taken at the Board meeting.) When asked by the Faculty Senate the reason for this “interim” appointment, the immediate supervisor, Dean Bill Russell, said, “We didn’t have time to go through a search.”

We’re thinking of starting a pool to guess how many months will pass before this position is anointed as permanent.

see Hiring policies/ 5

A statement from the Executive Board of the Cincinnati State Chapter, District 1199, Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO

The lack of consistent, quality-driven hiring practices is affecting not just employees, but students, too.

The Interim Financial Aid Director was hired with no input from any employee that we know of, with the exception of her supervisor. When questioned, President Wright said he could think of no precedent for an Interim position being filled by someone from outside Cincinnati State.

After only a few weeks on the job, this Interim Director has filed eight disciplinary actions against her employees. At the moment, she has four pending suspensions and one pending termination.

Yet these five “problem” employees are the very same people who carried the load through the entire Colleague R-16 conversion, and they are the employees who are preparing for the R-17 conversion, which will affect the Financial Aid module more than any other part of Colleague.

These same five “problem” employees are carrying the load that a few years ago was carried by almost twice as many Financial Aid employees, in spite of record growth in College enrollment, which of

course means record growth in students who need the assistance of qualified Financial Aid Advisors.

At the busiest time of year for Financial Aid, when more students than ever need efficient customer service, more time is being spent on persecution of “problem” employees than on actual work on behalf of students. Guess who is suffering most?

SEIU has filed one grievance already on behalf of these employees, and several more grievances are anticipated if this situation is not resolved equitably and appropriately in the next few days.

Now it appears that a new Executive Vice President is about to be hired with no participation by SEIU. When Dr. Dorsey was hired, SEIU members were fully involved in the hiring process, and we think the results were good. Members of the SEIU Executive Board were given less than 24 hours notice of an invitation to meet Dr. Carolyn Anderson, who is apparently the only candidate Dr. Wright is considering for this important position. We were told last Thursday that the SEIU President had been scheduled to meet Dr. Anderson on Friday at 11 a.m. Two

members of the E-Board, including the President, were already scheduled to attend an SEIU workshop in Columbus and another was on vacation. We asked Thursday afternoon if we could send another E-Board representative to meet Dr. Anderson and were told “no.” We asked Dr. Wright on Monday if an SEIU rep could meet Dr. Anderson and again we were told “no.” Few employees have met this person, but apparently she will be hired anyway.

It is essential that the President and the Board of Trustees recognize the damage that is being done. The membership of SEIU has been trying to learn about and to participate in the College’s quality improvement initiatives. We think quality improvement is more likely to happen, for real, if employees at all levels trust each other and are willing to work together.

Real quality improvement takes time—including the time it takes to thoroughly and sensibly hire good employees who understand what it means to work at Cincinnati State.

And that means taking time to do it right when it comes to hiring supervisors, as well as the rest of us.

“No substantive progress” made at July 22 bargaining session; SERB-appointed mediator joins the process

The Faculty Team said there was “no substantive progress” at the bargaining session on July 22; however, the teams were joined by Earl Leonhardt, an official mediator appointed by the State Employment Relations Board (SERB).

Mr. Leonhardt served as the mediator for faculty contract negotiations at Cincinnati State in 1999, when the Unit 1 contract was settled without going to fact-finding.

According to the Faculty Team members, both sides spent time at the July 22 session explaining to Mr. Leonhardt the proposals and the unresolved issues.

“Our team made Mr. Leonhardt aware that after several weeks of bargaining, the faculty and the administration are still far apart on many issues,” said Faculty Chief Negotiator John Battistone.

In addition to reviewing the issues with the mediator, the teams discussed some aspects of compensation, workload, and distance education.

Compensation

The Faculty Team said there was additional discussion on

Hiring policies/ continued from 4

And then just this week the College gained a number of Acting administrators, a permanent “Special Assistant for Strategic Planning” whose previously non-existent position was filled without a search, and is on the verge of gaining a new Executive Vice President who apparently will be appointed permanently without the usual search and without substantive involvement by most employees.

The way this College goes

July 22 of the administration’s revised compensation proposal, which was presented to the Faculty Team last week.

According to the Faculty Team, the administration’s most recent compensation proposal, like their original proposal, includes a raise equivalent to 2.5 percent for the entire faculty bargaining unit.

In the latest version of their proposal, the administration proposes across-the-board raises of 2 percent a year for every faculty member, with a small portion of the total compensation package (equivalent to about one half of one percent) set aside in a “pool” to be used to make equity adjustments to individual faculty member’s salaries.

“It’s encouraging to see that the administration has recognized the fact that inequities in faculty salaries exist,” said Faculty Team member Ken Stoll. “However, the administration’s current proposal says that the way to fix past mistakes is to balance the cost on the backs of all of the faculty, and that’s not fair.”

about selecting and appointing personnel is sometimes kooky. The AAUP has proposed some reasonable changes, which will provide for consistent and appropriate faculty input into the selection and appointment process.

We hope that the members of the Board of Trustees, in exercising their responsibilities as overseers of Cincinnati State policies and processes, will come to see the value of these proposed changes.

“The raises that all faculty members deserve should not be reduced in order to pay for past mistakes and inequities created by administrative policies,” Ken said.

The Faculty Team said that the administration’s current proposal does not describe the procedures that would be used to apply for or to receive an equity adjustment.

“When we asked them to clarify how the equity pool money would be awarded, they said the Human Resources Director would be the person faculty members would go to to make their case,” Ken said.

Chapter President Pam Ecker said the AAUP Executive Committee is studying the administration’s proposed “pool” concept for dealing with salary equity concerns.

“The AAUP Exec has had a considerable amount of discussion over the past several months about how to resolve equity issues,” Pam said. “We will continue to examine the administration’s ideas as well.”

Health Technologies Workload

The Faculty Team said the administration team presented a “corrected” version of the administration’s proposal to change the way program workload units are calculated in the Health Technologies Division.

According to the Faculty Team, the administration team said this was not a new proposal, but a correction to their own proposal, which apparently did not say exactly what they meant to say.

see Negotiations/ 6

Report on July 22 negotiations/ continued from 5

The corrected proposal was explained by Health Technologies Dean Marianne Krismer. According to the Faculty Team, Dean Krismer said that the administration team's originally-proposed changes to Health program chair workload were presented "without her knowledge."

The Faculty Team said the "corrected" proposal decreases the workload units assigned to cooperative education coordination in Health Technologies (as well as co-op coordination in all other College divisions), and changes the way workload units are assigned in the Health Tech Division for program management and clinical coordination responsibilities.

The Faculty Team said the "corrected" proposal will need to be examined by Health Division program chairs. A meeting for this purpose is scheduled for Wednesday, July 24, at 2 p.m. Faculty members who need more information about this meeting should get in

touch with Bargaining Council Chair Bob Eveslage.

Distance Education

The Faculty Team said the administration team offered a revised proposal for changes to the contract article on Electronically Purveyed Methods of Instruction.

According to the Faculty Team, the administration's latest proposal, like their previous proposals, completely reverses the current contract presumption that faculty members have ownership of the materials they develop for their distance education courses.

"We have discussed distance education concerns at several bargaining sessions," said Faculty Team member Debbie Bogenschutz. "We modified the original Faculty proposal to address some of the administration's key concerns, but their latest proposal still turns the language of the current EPMI article upside down when it comes to defining ownership of course materials."

"The current contract language says that, unless there is some other written agreement up front, faculty members own the course materials they create. The administration's proposal says that they should own the distance education course materials we create," Debbie added.

"The financial compensation they are proposing for distance course development seems to be less than what the current contract provides," Debbie said. "And they still can't explain to us why they think faculty members should be willing to accept contract language that takes away far more than it gives back."

The next bargaining session is scheduled for Thursday, July 25.

The mediator is not expected to attend the session on Thursday, but he is expected to attend negotiation sessions during the week of July 29.

**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

GEOFF WOOLF

MEMBERSHIP CHAIR

KEN STOLL

TREASURER

PAUL DAVIS

MEMBER-AT-LARGE

CINDY KIEF

BARGAINING COUNCIL

CHAIR AND PAST PRESIDENT

BOB EVESLAGE