

AAUP resolves one workload/compensation issue with MOU; other problems continue

On April 29, the AAUP and the College administration signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) concerning when overload compensation is paid.

According to Chapter Grievance Officer John Battistone, the agreement to sign the MOU eliminated the need for the AAUP to file for expedited arbitration of a workload grievance. (See *AAUP News*, April 22, 2004.)

"In at least one of the disputes related to faculty workload and

compensation, the administration recognized that long-standing College practices support the contract interpretation the AAUP would have taken before an arbitrator," John said.

"Overload incurred during a term has always been paid during that term," John added.

The MOU describes three specific overload situations, covered in contract Article VIII, sections (A) and (E), where full-time faculty members are to be paid within the term in which

overload is incurred.

- A faculty member whose work is measured in units is teaching one or more courses above the term maximum of five. A sixth course is overload to be paid within the term.

- A program chair, cluster chair, department chair or area chair is teaching one or more courses above the term maximum of four. A fifth course is overload to be paid within the term.

see MOU signed/ 4

President Wright says College will end FY04 without fiscal watch, but new budget is "a guesstimation"

President Wright told faculty and staff who attended the April 28 "Budget Forum" that he is confident the College will finish the budget year that ends June 30 with a financial status strong enough to keep the College from being placed on fiscal watch.

Dr. Wright said he is certain the College will complete Fiscal Year 2004 (ending June 30, 2004) with a 2.0 composite score from the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR).

A score of 1.75 or below for two years in a row would place the College in the first stage of fiscal watch. The College composite score for Fiscal Year 2003 was 1.3, well below the OBOR requirement. (See *AAUP News*, March 11, 2004.)

Dr. Wright told the Faculty Senate on April 28 that the College's request for an adjustment of the low composite score for Fiscal Year 2003 has been rejected. He said the appeal process is "over and done" and

that the below-standard composite score for FY03 will remain.

[Note: According to statements made by President Wright at previous meetings, several College administrators and some Board members met with representatives of the Board of Regents and the State Office of Management and Budget to seek support for using

see Wright discusses budget/ 5

A look at deficits, excesses, and the budget process

--The Cincinnati State AAUP Executive Committee

For several months, all members of the College community have been concerned about the fiscal stability of our institution.

Many attempts have been made to analyze and to explain the factors that have contributed to deficits so severe that the College is at risk of being placed on "fiscal watch" by the State of Ohio.

At the March 23 meeting of the Board of Trustees, President Wright described the projected budget deficit for Fiscal Year 2004 (which ends June 30, 2004). Then he took a historical look at what he called "What events led up to the fiscal watch situation."

One of the contributing factors that Dr. Wright identified was faculty overload, which he said cost \$630,000 for the 13 pay periods from September 2003 through February 2004.

Dr. Wright called this number "excess earnings," meaning money that faculty earned over their base salaries in overload pay.

Dr. Wright did not show the revenue side, however. He did not show that tuition, fees, and state subsidy provided total "excess" revenue which were more than the cost of faculty overload compensation--a concept known in the business world as "profit."

To get a little perspective on things, let's take a look at another of the College's budgetary line items. Let's look

back at the last five years' budgets for a line item called "Intercollegiate Athletics." This is the budget associated with the variety of sports programs the College offers. The lion's share of this budgeted money goes to the costs associated with men's and women's basketball.

- In fiscal year 1999, the budget for Intercollegiate Athletics was, in round numbers, \$204,470.

- In FY 2000 it grew by 214 percent to \$641,101.

However, what was actually spent by year-end in FY 2003 was \$777,531. This budget line item was overspent by 33.8 percent, amounting to \$196,394.

Overspending in athletics was 21 percent of the College's total FY 2003 budget deficit of \$941,528 (the first significant deficit in the College's history).

This year's Intercollegiate Athletics annual budget is \$587,594. As of the end of March it was already overspent by \$27,888 (4.75 percent), with

another financial quarter left to go before we can see whether the College's composite rating will be above the 1.75 mark needed to avoid fiscal watch for Fiscal Year 2004.

The total of \$615,482 already spent on sports this year is not too far under the \$630,000 that Dr. Wright said was spent on "excess earnings" paid to faculty who carried out overload assignments.

But unlike overload teaching, which also helps the College

generate revenues, sports at our College do not generate "excess revenues" over costs.

It is important to remember that the line item for Intercollegiate Athletics is associated with directly serving fewer than 100 of the College's 8,000-plus students (1.2 percent). Yet it represented 21 percent of the College's FY 2003 deficit.

And, unlike basketball and other athletic programs at major university sports powerhouses,

• Excess spending on faculty overload in FY 2004: \$630,000

• Excess spending in the Intercollegiate Athletics budget in FY 2004: \$615,000

Which of these "deficit spending" items brought revenue back to the College?

And which ought to be a priority in the FY 2005 budget?

- In FY 2001 the sports budget grew by another 37 percent to \$879,808.

In FY 2002, some sports were cut, so the athletics budget was reduced to \$570,782.

In Fiscal Year 2003, the year that the College's composite rating dropped from 4.0 to 1.3 (below the 1.75 needed to avoid fiscal watch), the annual "allocated budget" for Intercollegiate Athletics was \$581,137.

continued on 3

A look at deficits/continued from 2

Cincinnati State's sports programs earn no percentage of the "gate." Since we don't charge for tickets, there is no gate.

We earn no fees from television rights, since our games are not broadcast on commercial television.

We might get a percentage of revenues from concessions, but it's highly doubtful that the popcorn and soft drinks sold at basketball games cover more than a tiny fraction of the costs of running these programs.

When the men's and women's basketball teams both held junior college Division I status, the College didn't even earn tuition and fees from the players, since tuition, fees, and books, plus room and board, were all paid for by the College. Presently, only the women's basketball players continue to be subsidized so royally, since men's basketball has returned to Division II status.

It is important to note, as well, that many of the athletes are out-of-state students, so the College does not even receive FTE subsidy for them.

At the April Board of Trustees meeting, we were all asked to tighten our symbolic belts and do our part to fix this fiscal crisis.

Since the College's budget for supplies has been decimated, some faculty have been going to

Staples to purchase their own dry-erase markers to write on the classroom whiteboards, or buying other needed classroom supplies.

These faculty members get a symbolic stomach ache when they go to the cafeteria to purchase a cup of coffee and wait in line behind a basketball player who is checking out with six jumbo soft drinks and a pile of food to pass out to her friends, all paid for on the College's dime.

Is it a good idea to continue to fund sports at our College? Perhaps. Is it a good idea to maintain Division I sports programs? Possibly. But how should the decision be made, in light of our fiscal crisis?

Our collective bargaining agreement calls for the Faculty Senate to be participants in the annual College budget-building process.

For several years in a row, the administration has attended three perfunctory meetings with the Senate, in essence, to "brief" the senators on the state of the budget. Sometimes, the Senate members have received a 10-item "budget" document and, sometimes, they have received a list of "budget assumptions" being used to make decisions.

This year, the assumptions and preliminary numbers were distributed to all members of the College community, via the e-mail *Daily News*.

For the past two years, the Senate has submitted to the President and to the Board specific suggestions for adjustments to the budget, and has made recommendations for process changes. The majority of the Senate's recommendations have been, in essence, ignored.

This year, the President has already had one "briefing meeting" with the Senate, and has provided no specific information to be used to make budget assessments or adjustments. The *Daily News* data was the only data.

The President also conducted a "budget forum" attended by a handful of faculty and staff which focused primarily on the state of the current budget. The President also offered a few comments about plans for ensuring future financial stability, and he stated repeatedly that budgeting is only a futile "guesstimate." Another of these "forums" is scheduled for this week.

Perhaps it would be better if the Senate and all other stakeholders would receive copies of the *complete* College budget—with all of the line items described in detail.

Then, it might be possible for all constituencies to participate in making informed and meaningful recommendations on what this College's financial priorities should be.

MOU signed/ continued from 1

• A faculty member who works 180 days annually (counselors, admissions advisers, librarians, co-op coordinators) is teaching a course in addition to their regular responsibilities. The teaching assignment is overload to be paid within the term.

John said that the AAUP and the administration still have disagreements about the interpretation of other portions of Article VIII, and the determination of when overload compensation is earned.

John explained, "One of the areas of dispute concerns faculty members whose loads are primarily instructional duties but have other 'special' work assignments as well."

"For instance, a faculty member who teaches five 3-hour classes has a maximum workload of 15 units under the contract," John said. "If, instead of a fifth class, the faculty

member gets some workload units for what used to be called 'released time,' the AAUP believes that the faculty member still has a maximum workload—even if the total for the term is less than the contractual maximum of 20 units."

"If that faculty member then takes on an extra class, the AAUP believes that class should be considered overload," John continued. "However, the administration feels that the extra class doesn't have to be compensated during the term, since the total term load is still under the contractual maximum of 20 units. And if the faculty member has less than 64 total units for the year, the extra course will not be compensated at all."

According to John, the past practice of the administration has been to compensate fully the faculty member in this situation.

"Since the administration is

now saying they don't necessarily have to pay overload to faculty who have fewer than 20 units in a term, this is an issue which we may still have to arbitrate," John said.

AAUP Chapter President Pam Ecker said that faculty members who expect overload compensation in Spring Term should examine their May 7 paycheck carefully, and inform the AAUP if the compensation appears to be incorrect.

"Faculty members who believe their pay or workload calculations are in error should get in touch with the AAUP immediately," Pam said.

"We are aware that since the 'financial crisis' began last term, the administration's interpretations of long-standing workload and compensation practices has been changing," Pam added. "The AAUP will continue to do what is needed to resolve these problems."



To the Editor:

I was thrilled to learn from the April 28 *Cincinnati Enquirer* that Cincinnati State finally is raising tuition by nearly 10 percent, to \$71.40 per credit hour. However, after reading how the story was spun in the *Enquirer*, I thought about how it could have been spun, based on a different scenario.

I did the math to see what sort of yearly increase over the past seven years would have resulted in the same \$71.40 tuition for 2004-05. The answer is 1.35 percent. That is, if we would have raised our tuition **only 1.35 percent** per year in each of the

last seven years, our tuition for 2004-05 would still be \$71.40 and we would have been heralded for working hard to keep tuition low.

A 2 percent increase per year would have resulted in \$74.66 tuition today. A 3 percent annual increase would have put us at \$79.94. Four percent a year would be bringing us to \$85.53. And if Cincinnati State had been raising tuition at a rate of 9 percent each year (as seems to be the average for everyone else in higher education), our tuition would be changing to \$118.82—maybe higher than we want, but at this point still a "bargain" compared to the others.

I don't have the data to do this calculation, but perhaps someone would like to calculate the total revenue stream that would have come from a 1.35 percent annual increase, since each year we would have had more tuition monies. It's revenue that we missed out on earning for the last seven years.

So we could have had more money, presumably no fiscal watch problems, and plenty of positive spin over the past seven years, rather than the negative story that the *Enquirer* had to tell.

I hope that our Board members are thinking about these scenarios, too.

John Buttelwerth,
Engineering Technologies

Wright discusses budget/ continued from 1

a different method to calculate the composite score. The alternative method proposed by the College would have taken into account the State-recommended approach to funding the costs of constructing the Advanced Technology and Learning Center.]

Dr. Wright said at the Budget Forum that cost-saving measures put into effect recently ensure that the College will “have enough money on hand” on June 30 to achieve the needed composite score for FY04.

Dr. Wright also said that “we will cut more if it is needed” during the next two months if financial indicators show a problem emerging.

“In dealing with this financial crisis, I’m amazed and pleased at the cooperation in slowing down spending,” he said.

Budget is “guesstimation;” some additional controls are possible

Dr. Wright said several times at the Budget Forum and at the Senate meeting that developing the College budget is “a guesstimation.”

“There’s no science to college budget development,” Dr. Wright said. “We can’t predict all of the changes that could affect enrollment, and we can’t predict what the State will send us in subsidy, or whether they’ll let us keep everything we earn.”

“If we make a mistake in our guesstimates, it affects a lot of people,” Dr. Wright said. “There’s really only one budget,

with a lot of pieces, so anything that happens around money affects everyone in the College.”

Dr. Wright answered a number of questions at the Forum and at the Senate meeting concerning what changes are being put into place to ensure that the College avoids future financial problems. Dr. Wright’s responses included these points:

- Better controls are already in place that will lower the amount of financial aid reimbursements the College must pay to the U.S. Department of Education for students who do not successfully complete their courses.

Dr. Wright said the College paid more \$900,000 this year to cover financial aid problems for 2002 through 2004. “We have erred in the past on the side of giving students their money up front, and we have suffered as a result,” Dr. Wright said.

- Better controls will be put in place to ensure that College cost-center managers watch their budgets throughout the year. “Until now, we always had enough money somewhere to cover anything that anyone wanted,” Dr. Wright said. In the future more “snapshots” of the total budget situation will be taken more often, he said.

- In planning the budget for Fiscal Year 2005, administrators will examine the areas where cuts have been made recently, and decisions will be made concerning “what is essential to be restored.”

Dr. Wright made several comments to the Senate concerning academics. He said that the Program Review process being developed by Dr. Posey will “help us decide what is of no value to the College.”

In response to a question about whether faculty who are off in Summer Term would be scheduled to teach overload classes, President Wright said, “We could just use all adjuncts.”

Dr. Posey, who attended the Senate meeting along with Dr. Wright, told the Senate she would be meeting with the Deans soon to discuss Summer course scheduling.

In response to a question from the Senate about generating revenue, President Wright said he is becoming convinced that “modest increases in tuition each year may be the way to go” in the future. He also said that Dr. Posey will be making recommendations concerning increases in lab fees, and possible differential tuition for programs that are very expensive to operate.

President Wright reiterated in the Forum and at the Senate meeting that the College administration needs an integrated data management system in order to accurately forecast and track organizational revenues and expenses.

“With the constraints of the data systems we have, we do a moderately adequate job of tracking information,” Dr. Wright said. “We could do better.”

Cinti State faculty giving 110 percent. . . so what else is new?

--Geoffrey Woolf,
Humanities Division

After the March meeting of the College Board of Trustees, where several trustees commented disparagingly about tenure and the President described faculty overload work as “excess earnings,” I felt certain that the relationship between the trustees and the faculty had reached an all-time low.

And while I’ve been saddened by the tone of recent Board meetings, I was comforted in my belief that things could only get better.

And then the Board had its April meeting.

I expected the 9.9 percent tuition hike to be approved by the Board, so I wasn’t surprised by that. A tuition increase has been delayed for an irresponsibly long time.

What surprised me was that the Board used this moment as another opportunity to demonstrate a lack of understanding, when Board member Lisa FitzGibbon asked if it was possible to “challenge our faculty to give 10 percent more.”

Even if this statement was meant in a spirit of fun and collaboration, it shines a light on how out of touch the Board is with the faculty of the College.

Dr. Wright said at the March Board meeting that our current budget problems have a “distinctly administrative flavor to them,” but the faculty appear to be taking the brunt of the blame.

At recent Board meetings, the President and the Board alike have insinuated that faculty are greedy and lazy and, therefore, in large part responsible for the budget crisis.

I wonder if the Board is aware that the Cincinnati State faculty annual load is already more than what other institutions require.

We have 180 teaching days, followed by two days to complete our grading. Full-time faculty members do this four times a year, so we really work 188 days per year.

No other two-year college in Ohio has that many faculty working days. According to the data I’ve seen, the most anybody else works is 180 “contract days”—referring to all of the days worked, not just days in the classroom.

The average annual load for other two-year college faculty is 176 contract days, and only 166 teaching days. Others have exam weeks, recognized grading days, and in-service days that are included in the total annual load.

No other two-year college faculty members work more than three quarters a year as their standard load, while Cincinnati State faculty do four.

Examples of how hard individual faculty members work could be addressed from dozens of different angles, but as an English teacher, let me give an example from my own field.

According to the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) *Statement of Principles*

and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing, the most relevant source of guidelines for my field, “No more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class. Ideally, classes should be limited to 15.”

This recommendation for class capacity is meant to ensure that all students have a rigorous workload and repeated feedback. English Composition courses place value on the volume of work created by students and the meticulous process involved in creating it. When class sizes get too large, instructors are forced to reduce both of these elements to accommodate all students.

Yet, I began this term—like most terms—with three composition classes enrolled with 26 students or more.

Depending on how one looks at it, I am already working from 30 to 72 percent harder than my professional organization believes is healthy for me or my students. In addition, I’m teaching two other courses this term, currently enrolled at 17 and 18.

According to the NCTE, “No English faculty members should teach more than 60 writing students a term. In developmental writing classes, the maximum should be 45.”

In five classes this term, I have a total of 115 students, a full 92 percent higher than what my professional organization suggests is effective. Put in more concrete terms, it means that this term I’ll carefully read,

continued on 7

Giving 110 percent/ continued from 6

comment on, and grade 2,177 pages of student writing—and that’s if my students produce only the minimum essay length allowed in my assignments.

As far as English loads are concerned, I am actually one of the better-off instructors. My load is mitigated a bit by two sophomore-level courses with slightly lower enrollments.

But consider the load of the composition specialist who teaches only freshman-level courses. She teaches five sections, maxed-out at 25 students each. That’s a whopping 125 writing students, a full 208 percent of what the NCTE recommends.

It’s not just in the English

Department that faculty are working hard. Plenty of faculty members have been working at full capacity and beyond for a long time prior to the current budget crisis. Class caps have been creeping upward for a while, in every division of the College. We have the same number of full-time professional counselors that we had when the College had half as many students.

The examples could go on and on.

What the Board needs to realize is that faculty and staff are nearing our breaking points.

Entreating us to work even harder than we do already carries with it an implication

that the Board is comfortable sacrificing quality and service in carrying out our mission for our students, if that is what it will take to “save” the College from financial problems.

Certainly, faculty are not surprised to be called upon to solve the College’s fiscal problems even though we weren’t responsible for creating them.

Certainly, we will all work hard because we know that is what it will take to save this College.

But, then, we’ve been working hard all along.

Letters



To the Editor:

Often, I seem to be in the cafeteria line at the same time as some of our women’s basketball team members, and I get a chance to observe how they spend their food allowance (at least \$25 a day, I’m told) that is provided as part of their “scholarship” to the College.

So while I was attending the Board of Trustees meeting on April 27, and while Dr. Wright was recommending to the Board a 9.9 percent tuition increase, I’m confident that some member of the women’s basketball team was probably in the cafeteria purchasing dinner for herself—and a few of her friends.

Based on my observations, it’s likely that in addition to obtaining multiple meals and a large quantity of beverages, she

might even have been arguing with the cashier about the portion size of her “free” food.

While Dr. Wright was explaining how difficult it was to decide to increase tuition, and how hard he had tried to keep tuition at an affordable rate, it’s quite possible that a student athlete was deciding that her food allowance should be given as a gift to her friends, in as large a quantity as she wants to, and as often as she wants to.

While I was sitting in the meeting, I was told by a Board member that I should now be willing to give at least 10 percent more of myself because the tuition was being raised, or that I should at least be willing to smile 10 percent more of the time.

I got up and left after that comment. While I am expected to do more work and smile more often, student athletes are apparently being taught that it’s all right to steal from the institution that is trying to offer them an education.

While all other students are being told to dig deeper into their pockets for their education, the athletes are seemingly being told to spend their daily food allowance any way they see fit.

What a sad state of affairs.

Sandy Speller,
Health Technologies

Paul Davis to become State AAUP President

Paul Davis was elected as Vice President - Public Chapters at the Spring meeting of the AAUP Ohio Conference.

Paul will become President of the AAUP Ohio Conference in 2006.

This will be the first time for a Cincinnati State AAUP member to serve as the leader of the statewide AAUP.

The Ohio Conference includes AAUP chapters at public and private higher education institutions throughout the state, and is one of the largest state AAUP organizations in the nation.

At ten Ohio institutions, the AAUP also serves as the collective bargaining representative for faculty.

"I'm proud and honored to be elected to this position," Paul said. "I look forward to continuing to represent Cincinnati State AAUP while working on behalf of AAUP members throughout the state."



Save the date!
Tuesday, May 27



AAUP Chapter Meeting - 3:30 p.m.
Pre-BOT Meeting Pizza Party - 4:15 p.m.
BOT Meeting - 5:30 p.m.

**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
DAVID SIMMERMON

TREASURER
PAUL DAVIS

MEMBER-AT-LARGE
RON CRAIG

PAST PRESIDENT
BOB EVESLAGE