Faculty Senate to be briefed on College budget only one day prior to BOT meeting

The Faculty Senate will be briefed on the College budget for Fiscal Year 2005 at a special Senate meeting scheduled for Monday, June 28.

The FY 2005 budget is scheduled to be approved by the College Trustees at the Board meeting on Tuesday, June 29.

The one-page budget that is included in the Board of Trustees’ agenda for June 29 shows a balanced budget with total revenues and total expenses equaling $52,507,420.

Faculty Senate President Diane Stump said she received a message from Human Resources Director Gene Breyer on June 21, during the term break, asking if the Senate could meet with the Chief Fiscal Officer “to discuss the final draft of the FY 2005 budget before it is submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval on June 29.”

Diane said she phoned the Senate members and determined that a quorum of the Faculty Senate could attend a special meeting on June 28, the first day of the Summer Term.

The meeting is scheduled for 11:30 a.m. in the Library Conference Room.

The new Chief Fiscal Officer for the College, Sandra Simpson, is expected to present the budget information to the Senate.

“This last-minute briefing certainly is not the kind of involvement in planning and building the budget that the Senate has requested,” Diane said. “It appears that the only reason for this briefing is so the administration can claim they are fulfilling their contractual obligation.”

“However, the contract says the Faculty Senate should ‘participate’ in the budget development process, and also says the administration should ‘seek the opinion of the Faculty Senate’ on a number of specific items,” Diane said.

“Dr. Posey met with the Senate a few weeks ago to tell us about assumptions used in building the academic portion of the budget,” Diane said. “Obviously, a briefing for the Senate about the final budget, on the day before the Board approves the budget, is a long way from meaningful participation.”

Diane added, “In May, I reported to the Board about the concerns faculty have regarding the need for effective, continuous strategic planning and sound financial management at our College.”

“I also discussed the willingness of faculty to contribute to effective problem-solving and decision-making regarding institutional issues,” Diane said. “I hope that in the future, our offers and requests to contribute will be taken seriously, so faculty and other key stakeholders will no longer be isolated from these important activities.”

Senate member Michele Geers, who heads the Senate’s Task Force on Institutional Finances, said that the Senate has never been involved in “big picture” financial planning.

“We need budgeting procedures and plans that all stakeholders can understand,” Michele said. “You can’t expect stakeholders to have ‘buy-in’ for a budgeting process that is accomplished only through directives and secrecy.”
To the Editor:

Recently, I had an occasion to take a new route to the College, down Hamilton Avenue. At the bottom of the hill, all of a sudden, I encountered the unexpected view of the new building. It was grand.

Unfortunately, after only a few seconds I felt sad as I considered what was happening inside our College buildings.

I am very concerned about what I am experiencing at Cincinnati State. I find it more and more difficult to accept what is being communicated, and to accept the tone and manner with which information is communicated.

I hear rumors, some of which are quite worrisome. And I see inconsistencies that deeply concern me.

A rumor which has been widely dispersed recently is that the women’s basketball team caused significant damage to the rental units where they are housed, and that the College is picking up the cost of repairs.

My understanding is that the athletes get the free housing as part of their scholarship, but I don’t know what the facts are concerning this serious accusation. If the rumor is not true, then the facts need to be clearly communicated so rumors can be put to rest. If the rumor is true, serious questions need to be asked, like: Why is the College paying for damages done by students? And why were the students not appropriately supervised, and who was supposed to be performing the supervision?

And what consequences are the athletes experiencing?

I have personally stood in the cafeteria line behind some of our athletes. I have watched them sign the forms for their free food and drinks, and then watched with some amount of disbelief as they passed large amounts of food and drinks to their friends who are not scholarship athletes. This is not a rumor; it is part of my reality.

The numbers I have seen seem to show that about $8000 is budgeted for each athlete on scholarship at Cincinnati State. I calculated this by simply taking the published budget for athletics for 2004 and dividing by the approximate number of athletes served by the intercollegiate athletic program.

I don’t believe that each athlete individually gets $8000, but even if the total budget covers things like conference fees and recruiting trips by coaches, it still seems like a very large allocation for a very small number of students.

If my calculations are wrong, I welcome clarification from those who can explain why we spend such a large amount of College funds on so few. I welcome an answer to the question of how the rest of our students benefit from these athletics expenditures.

A few weeks ago, Dr. Wright encouraged employees to help the College achieve financial stability by considering taking an unpaid day of leave. For me, it is impossible to reconcile asking employees to take unpaid leave while College funds are used to support questionable expenditures related to the athletics program. Requests for my help lose their impact when I’m constantly hearing about how athletes get more, while others are told they need to give more.

I am more then willing to consider and discuss reasonable suggestions on how I can help the College succeed—but in the current environment I cannot simply dismiss and ignore the rumors I hear. And that fact saddens me.

I have been employed in the past by companies having economic difficulties. In every case, when the management was serious about seeking extra help from employees, they first publicly did what they were asking others to do.

In the past few weeks at Cincinnati State, I have not heard of any administrator who voluntarily took unpaid leave. Why should I sacrifice when the administration has not? And if the administration has, then let me know! That would encourage me to follow.

Don’t ask me to do as you say, ask me to do as you do.

At Commencement last week, Dr. Anderson (a College administrator I was seeing for the first time, even though she is not new to the College) praised several student endeavors of the past year. One item she mentioned involved students in my department, Civil Engineering Technologies.

Dr. Anderson specifically mentioned the ASCE Student Chapter competition, where a team of students from my department did very well in competition with 2-year and some 4-year schools, in events that required our students to put into action the skills they are learning in the classroom.
Dr. Anderson’s graduation remarks did not mention that our praiseworthy technology students could not get enough money from the College to travel to their competition. The faculty members in my department reached into their own pockets to make it possible for our students to participate in regional competition.

I do not apologize for finding it inconsistent—and inappropriate—that the student athletes get a lot, while other students who bring genuine recognition to the College get very little. Anyone who wishes to lecture me about “giving more” to the College should remember this story the next time you wish to give such lectures.

Other inconsistencies that cause me to be less inclined to “give more” include the fact that Engineering Technologies faculty were allowed virtually no overload opportunities in Spring Term, while faculty in other college divisions were assigned some. My concern is not the overload per se, but rather the inconsistent way in which it was administered.

I believe Cincinnati State has a huge elephant in the middle of the room. And as is often true in dysfunctional organizations, many people are pretending it is not there.

The longer the problems are ignored, the larger they get, and the more elephant dung is left behind to clean up, even if the elephant does eventually leave.

To the Editor:

In light of our administration cutting back or eliminating overload for full-time faculty, it is important to point out that while full-time faculty are more slightly more expensive (about $125 per “unit”), our adjuncts are grossly underpaid.

In academic year 2004-05, the full-time faculty who teach overload courses will earn about $490 per unit. At UC, adjunct faculty earn about $500 per unit.

Our full-time faculty overload rate is less than the adjunct rate at many area colleges and universities and substantially below that of full-time faculty at these institutions, who are typically paid pro rata based on their salaries.

In fact, many of our full-time faculty are being offered and are accepting part-time teaching opportunities at other institutions where the rate of pay is higher.

Excluding full-time faculty from overload assignments may save a little money, but there are also increased costs. Someone must hire, train, mentor, and evaluate the adjuncts. That costs money. Dealing with personnel issues for an increased number of instructors costs the time of many employees, including both academic division and Human Resources department personnel.

The Humanities and Sciences Division currently employs over 200 adjuncts. The Communication Skills department uses the most. As a member of this department, I have been proud of the well-qualified, caring instructors we have been able to employ. However, we have also lost many great adjuncts because they simply couldn’t afford to keep working here. Many of these instructors didn’t want to leave Cincinnati State even to take one-year contracts at other institutions. Why? For the same reason full-time instructors remain at this College—we are dedicated to the mission of Cincinnati State and to our students.

This year, the disparity of pay between adjuncts at Cincinnati State and other area institutions will increase. Since all colleges are competing to hire from a limited pool of qualified adjuncts, we should not be surprised to lose even more of our excellent adjuncts. Creating more adjunct positions because full-time faculty are denied overload will only exacerbate the problem.

Using full-time instructors to teach overload assignments is often an academic necessity, not a luxury for the benefit of the instructor. Many academic areas cannot find qualified adjuncts. Cutting back overload may save some money in the short-run, but in the long-run, the College and our students will pay.

Catherine Rahmes
Humanities
Join AAUP for Pre-BOT Pizza and Conversation
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5:30 p.m. - Conference Center
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