Faculty team seeks budget info from administration team & offers new proposals

At the bargaining session on July 28, the Faculty Bargaining Team asked the administration team to provide clarification about the College budget.

The Faculty Team also provided new proposals on compensation and benefits, but the administration team did not respond to these proposals.

At the session, Faculty Team member Linda Schaffeld, who is a Certified Public Accountant, asked a series of questions to the College’s Chief Financial Officer, Mike Geoghegan, regarding details of the College financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2011, and the budget for Fiscal Year 2012, which began July 1. The Board of Trustees approved this budget at its June meeting.

“The College budget for the coming year shows $5.7 million in revenues over expenses,” Linda said. “If we were a business rather than an educational institution, that figure would be the company’s profits.”

“We know that part of that ‘profit’ has been allocated for uses such as paying for deferred maintenance needs and paying off the debt on the ATLC,” Linda continued.

“But that still leaves funds available to support the reasonable and responsible proposals made by the Faculty Team for compensation and benefits.”

Linda said the Faculty Team has requested additional information from Mr. Geoghegan to explain the Auxiliary Services component of the College budget.

The Auxiliary Services include budget areas such as the Midwest Culinary Institute, the cafeteria, and parking services.

The College budget for Fiscal Year 2012 projects no growth in enrollment, and also assumes that seven currently-vacant faculty positions will not be filled, or will be filled at a lower salary than that of the retiring faculty member.

Following the discussion of the College budget, the Faculty Bargaining team offered new proposals for compensation and benefits.

“We recognize that the College faces some challenges as we make the change from terms

Fact-Finding scheduled for Aug. 13 & Aug. 29

A meeting with the fact-finder appointed by the State Employment Relations Board (SERB) has been scheduled for Saturday, Aug. 13.

Faculty Chief Negotiator Geoff Woolf said the purpose of the meeting on the 13th will be to narrow the list of issues that will be considered during the formal fact-finding hearing, which is scheduled for Aug. 29.

Geoff said the dates were established in a conference call with the fact-finder. The participants were Geoff, Don Mooney (the AAUP’s attorney), Gene Breyer, and James Lawrence (the administration’s attorney and chief negotiator).

Although the collective bargaining law requires fact-finders to hold a hearing and write a report within 14 days after being appointed, there is no penalty when fact-finders take more than the
Members of the Faculty Bargaining Team have told me that whenever workload is discussed at the bargaining table, the administration brings up overload.

Evidently, the administration believes that all faculty who teach overload consider it to be some sort of money grab.

I’m also told that the administration’s position on workload frequently takes the form, “If faculty have time to teach so much overload, then the ‘standard’ load ought to be bigger.”

Certainly, that view is evident in the administration’s proposal that our instructional load on semesters should be 43 units a year, which is far above the 30-unit norm for Ohio community colleges on semesters.

For me, overload is a necessary evil, not a choice. Let me explain what that means, from where I sit.

The facts: I teach overload. That is no big secret. And teaching overload is hard work. Again, this should be no big secret.

I have taught a considerable amount of overload each term. At a few critical times, I’ve had a load of as many as 32 contact hours in a single term. I’ve done this out of necessity, and believe me, this load is in no way a luxury.

In seven years, I have had only one “term off” when I didn’t teach at least one class and didn’t do any program advising.

Note: My streak of “on duty” terms probably would have been unbroken, but last year I was diagnosed with Lymphoma. With the help of many others, I actually was able to take a term off to go through chemotherapy and radiation treatments.

Yes, you read that right—it took cancer for me to find a way to take some much earned time off.

Now back to the facts: I do not teach overload because I “want to” or, for that matter, to “get rich.” I teach overload because I have no choice.

Well, maybe that is not exactly true.

• I could recommend cancelling classes when it’s impossible to find a qualified adjunct instructor who is available at the needed time—but in my mind, that is not OK.

In the end, the students who can’t make progress toward their academic goals are the ones who would suffer.

• I could ask for help, in the form of at least one more full-time faculty member for my program. And, I’ve done that, many times.

The response from administrators was “This is not the time to ask for faculty hires” or “The only way you’ll get more faculty is if you split the Audio/Video major into two separate programs.”

Given what I know about the job market, taking that direction would be a disservice to our students’ interests and would not help them get jobs after graduation.

So it’s a fact that no full time faculty help for my program will be coming any time soon. I will, however, keep trying.

I said earlier that do not teach overload to “get rich.” Except for Cincinnati State teaching, I have never been involved with a system or institution that pays me less when I work more.

When I worked in the media production industry, overtime was “time and a half.”

A few weeks ago, I needed a plumber to come to my house on a Sunday, and I was charged triple time!

Overload takes and takes and then takes some more. It takes my time and attention away from campus and community involvement. It takes time from professional development. It takes me away from my own family.

So why on earth would I do it? Because I have no other acceptable options.

• My students work hard and they ought to be able to take the classes they need to graduate.

• I have the best adjunct teaching staff in the region, but they have other jobs, and each one can teach only a limited number of sections per term.

I won’t put just anyone in front of my students, so if the adjuncts can’t cover the needed sections, I will try to do more myself.

And because I make those choices, I’m penalized by administrators who think I’m in it for the money.

In February, when I returned from my medical leave term off, I said “No More Overload.” I had to put my health first.

But this summer, my teaching and advising load is 26 units.
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To the Editor:

Well, we’ve reached the end of July in a collective bargaining year, and the AAUP and the College administration appear to be miles apart as we head into the last month of Summer term.

When I read the Daily News, I see a lot of positive things happening around campus. The storm water project is nearly complete, the College is heavily involved in a new local television program, and we are going to inaugurate our new President in September.

I wish I could also read some positive news on the negotiations front.

I am beginning to wonder how we will be able to continue celebrating our accomplishments if we don’t have a workable faculty contract by September 6.

I recall that our Commencement speaker in June was the man from the Board of Regents charged with planning how to establish charter colleges and universities. He was introduced by Dr. Owens as a friend and politician who was uniquely qualified for such a task.

Given the number of faculty opposed to a charter school system in higher education, it was an insult for this person to be our event speaker. His selection as Commencement speaker gives the appearance that our College President supports this model for Ohio.

Also, it appears that Dr. Owens is unable to foster the relationships between faculty and administration that he spoke of at the Convocation last fall.

Where is the spirit of cooperation we heard about?

As I talk to faculty and staff around the College, I keep hearing about “buyer’s remorse.”

If we don’t have a new contract when Early Fall term begins, I am beginning to think that faculty may want to forgo participation in the President’s inauguration.

I enjoy some good pomp and circumstance as much as (or more than) the next person. I would love to put on my academic regalia and proudly march with my colleagues to celebrate our new President.

I just don’t know that I’m ready to do so if the President is not able to demonstrate the positive influence we had so hoped for last fall.

I encourage my fellow members of the faculty to consider the same.

Jon P. McKamey, Ph. D.
Instructional Designer

Why Overload? / con’t from 2

For Early Fall, I’m currently looking at a 25-unit load—and hoping that an adjunct who hasn’t yet committed will come through.

If the adjunct isn’t available, I could make a group of students wait two more terms… or I could step in, carve out time and make sure students get what they need.

I’d be pleased if the administration’s bargaining team could understand that what I need is respect for the work I do for this College—not accusations that the choices I’m making represent laziness, or greed.

Where is the new way of doing business that we thought we were getting? Where is the trust and goodwill that we thought would be part of this new administration?

As I talk to faculty and staff around the College, I keep hearing about “buyer’s remorse.”

If we don’t have a new contract when Early Fall term begins, I am beginning to think that faculty may want to forgo participation in the President’s inauguration.

I enjoy some good pomp and circumstance as much as (or more than) the next person. I would love to put on my academic regalia and proudly march with my colleagues to celebrate our new President.

I just don’t know that I’m ready to do so if the President is not able to demonstrate the positive influence we had so hoped for last fall.

I encourage my fellow members of the faculty to consider the same.

Jon P. McKamey, Ph. D.
Instructional Designer
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to semesters,” said Faculty Chief Negotiator Geoff Woolf. “However, those challenges can be met while also appropriately recognizing the valuable work performed by our faculty.”

“We have made changes to our proposals for workload, compensation, and benefits, but we have not heard a substantive response from the administration team,” Geoff said.

“On July 28, the administration said they did not have a response to our most recent proposals, and that they didn’t expect to be ready to talk until our next scheduled bargaining session, on August 11,” Geoff continued.

“Our newest proposals cut pretty close to the bone,” Geoff said. “We don’t have a lot of room left to make additional changes to our proposals, so the ball is in the administration’s court.”

“The administration team has told us more than once that they want to work out an agreement at the table,” Geoff added. “We hope they are working on counter-proposals that will help us reach a settlement.”
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allotted time to carry out their responsibilities.

Geoff said, “Mr. Lawrence told the fact-finder that the number of issues presented at fact-finding would be around 60, and the fact-finder said she couldn’t hold a hearing on that many issues on the 13th, and also prepare a report in the allotted time.”

“We think the number of issues that will go to fact-finding is much smaller, and during our conference call I raised questions about how Mr. Lawrence reached his number,” Geoff added.

“If the administration is prepared for good faith negotiations during the two bargaining sessions we have scheduled for Aug. 11 and 12, we ought to be able to narrow considerably the set of issues that need to be examined by the fact-finder,” Geoff said.

“The AAUP Executive Committee discussed whether we should possibly ask the SERB to appoint a different fact-finder who could schedule a full hearing sooner, “Geoff said.

“After consulting with our attorney, we decided that seeking appointment of a new fact-finder would just delay the schedule even more.”

Chapter President Paul Davis said, “When we notified the administration back in February that we were ready to start bargaining, we had hoped to avoid a long, drawn out process.”

“Unfortunately, so far the administration has not indicated that they share our desire to reach a negotiated settlement before the Early Fall Term begins,” Paul continued.

“In fact, they seem to be doing everything they can to delay reaching a settlement.”

“We consulted with our chapter attorney about available options,” Paul said. “Although this is not the ideal timetable for resolving our contract, we will live with it, and move forward.”

“We will continue to negotiate in good faith whenever the administration wants to discuss substantive changes to proposals,” Paul said.

“We will also prepare for fact-finding, and we will continue to prepare for the various scenarios that could occur after we receive the fact-finder’s report,” Paul added.

“We hope that at some point in the near future, the administration’s team will decide to buckle down so we can resolve this contract together, at the bargaining table,” Paul said.