Short session kicks off 2005 contract negotiations

The initial bargaining session for Faculty Bargaining Unit 1 focused on establishing guidelines and a schedule for future sessions.

According to Faculty Chief Negotiator John Battistone, the meeting on June 17 lasted about 30 minutes. John said that the teams reviewed guidelines for how bargaining sessions will be conducted, and set a tentative schedule for future meetings.

John said that both teams said they shared the goal of trying to resolve contract negotiations without the need for external mediation or fact-finding.

“We were able to accomplish this goal the last time we bargained the Unit 1 contract,” John said.

All six members of the Faculty Bargaining Team attended the Friday 3:00 p.m. bargaining session. In addition to John, the Faculty Team members are Jason Caudill, Ron Craig, Joyce Rimlinger, Ken Stoll, and Geoff Woolf.

John said that three members of the administration team attended the session: Chief Spokesperson Gene Breyer, Vice President for Advancement Doug Heeston, and Chief Fiscal Officer Sandra Simpson.

The next bargaining session is scheduled for Friday, June 24. The topic for discussion will be the Workload article of the contract.

AAUP Scholarship recipient announced

Antoinette (Toni) Vogelpohl is the recipient of the Cincinnati State AAUP Scholarship for 2005. Ms. Vogelpohl is pursuing a degree in Diagnostic Medical Sonography, and has a 4.0 GPA after completing about half of the program. She will begin her clinical rotations in Fall 2005.

Toni, her husband David, and their three children live in Monfort Heights. David is a member of Local 392 of the Plumbers, Pipefitters and Mechanical Equipment Servicemen’s union.

In her scholarship application, Toni said she became interested in a medical imaging career after observing the medical care provided for her youngest daughter at Children’s Hospital.

“I would like to be part of a healthcare team that gives quality patient examinations with discretion and empathy,” she said. “It is only when we ‘give back’ that we ‘get back.’”

The AAUP Scholarship provides $2,000 to be deposited into a College account which the recipient can use for tuition, lab fees, and textbooks.

The AAUP Scholarship funds are disbursed under the auspices of the College-wide Scholarship Committee, using the standard guidelines for all College scholarships.

Ron Craig, AAUP Scholarship Committee Chair, said 17 students applied for the scholarship this year. The applications were evaluated by a committee including Crystal Dunlevy, Ann Fox, Noelle Grome, David Hoctor, and Nancy King.

Paul Davis, AAUP Treasurer, said three faculty members made donations, totaling over $1,000, to the AAUP scholarship fund. “We appreciate those who supplemented the Chapter fund with their personal contributions,” Paul said.
To the Editor:

The last three issues of the AAUP News have included letters on the subject of salary equity. I’d like to share some thoughts on the subject also.

Tom Grogan’s letter (May 20) advocated the return to a salary schedule—a system whereby those at the bottom of the pay schedule receive larger increases than those at the higher end (Tom suggested 8 percent and 2 percent respectively). Other colleges use such an approach, and we once had a salary schedule here, too. Does this approach provide fairness? Let’s take a look.

As I understand Tom’s model, it assumes that all new hires start at about the same salary, on step one of the salary schedule. Then each year, the faculty members would proceed step-by-step to higher salaries.

But sometimes the College hires someone with considerable experience or special qualifications, and that new faculty member is compensated at a higher rate than others starting about the same time. Or maybe the new hire, even with less experience, is more “desirable” for particular reasons, including diversity: a female engineer, or a male nurse.

The job market is more competitive for some people, and it requires a higher salary to bring them to Cincinnati State. So maybe one of these faculty members would start on step 6 or 7 or higher on the schedule.

As I understand the model, these higher-paid faculty members would immediately be put on a schedule of diminishing annual raises.

While their cohort is getting raises of 8 percent (for instance), they would be reduced to maybe 5 percent raises. Is this fair to them? Were they only temporarily more valuable to us?

Most salary schedules have plateaus. For instance, those moving through steps 11 to 16, or maybe steps 21 to 25, would not receive annual step-related raises. Their raises would come only when the union negotiated an across-the-board increase that applied to the entire schedule.

Some of our senior faculty remember this situation, in the years before collective bargaining. Across-the-board raises were not given and they experienced nearly five years without any increase in salary. Since their bills continued to get higher, they lost ground during this period.

Tom also stated, “The AAUP should be concerned by the fact that the group most favored by across-the-board percentage raises found in all of the previous contracts is getting smaller, and is already smaller than the disadvantaged group, which is growing.”

If this “most favored” group (mostly former administrators who retained their administrative salaries when they returned to faculty assignments—the result of an administrative policy, not an AAUP action) is indeed shrinking, doesn’t that leave more money for the disadvantaged group, and contribute to a leveling effect? Isn’t time taking care of part of this problem?

In the May 27 and June 16 newsletters, longevity was debated, with Gary Webster arguing the value of long-time employees, and Catherine Orsini asserting that an employee’s productivity decreases with age. I’d have to say I’m on Gary’s side on this one. I know my value to the College has increased as I’ve come to know more and more about our students, our curriculums, and our values. And I bet Catherine, Tom, and Gary are all more valuable now than when they started as well.

Yes, the first AAUP contract did eliminate the salary schedule. But subsequent contracts have added many step increases (you may be more used to calling them “longevity bumps”), and many of these negotiated step increases were of the most value to the newer hires. Many of us “old timers” had already passed through those steps before they became contractual guarantees. I’ve been here 25 years now. If the next contract includes an across-the-board raise, I’m sure mine isn’t going to be three times larger than the lowest-paid faculty member’s raise. It’s not even going to be twice that.

Is the faculty compensation system perfect here at Cincinnati State? No, of course not. But the members of Cincinnati State AAUP need to keep working hard to be part of the solution, not part of the problem.

Debbie Bogenschutz, Library