

5-1-2009

Right Flier: Newsletter of the AAUP-WSU Volume 9, Number 3, May 2009

American Association of University Professors-Wright State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/rightflier>

Repository Citation

(2009). Right Flier: Newsletter of the AAUP-WSU Volume 9, Number 3, May 2009. , 9 (3).
<https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/rightflier/10>

This Newsletter is brought to you for free and open access by the American Association of University Professors at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Right Flier Newsletter by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

The Right Flier

Newsletter of the AAUP-WSU

Volume 9, Number 3, May, 2009

Editor, Henry Ruminski

Administrative Assistant, Connie Jacobs

One Step Forward, Two Steps Back: The Budget Crisis at our University

Rudy Fichtenbaum, Chief Negotiator with an assist from Jim Vance, Communication Officer

On April 10, President David Hopkins, Provost Steve Angle, and Associate Provost Bill Rickert met with four members of the AAUP-WSU Executive Committee to brief our union on the budgetary challenges facing WSU, a meeting held at the administration's request. During the first part of the meeting, President Hopkins told us there was a great deal of uncertainty regarding the state of the budget -- but that his best estimate was that the University would be facing an \$11 million budget deficit for FY 2010 (the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010). At this meeting, the President also informed us that the State Share of Instruction (SSI) was going to increase by an average (at Ohio public universities) of 6%, but it was likely that the SSI for WSU would only increase by 3.8% -- although he thought this number could be increased to approximately 4.2% based on our enrollment increases. President Hopkins stated that his administration was doing everything possible to avoid layoffs of staff but that some layoffs might have to be made.

After about an hour, the President and the Provost left the meeting. Then, Associate Provost Rickert asked the Bargaining Unit Faculty to give up some of the raises we had negotiated in our Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). This request was set against three concerns: 1) the expected \$11 million shortfall, 2) raises for staff would at most be 2% and there was a potential for layoffs among staff and 3) our raises would look bad to the Legislature at a time when other state workers were being furloughed or laid off, or agreeing to pay cuts.

We said "no thank you." In the rest of this article, we'll discuss the context in which our answer was given.

Uncontrolled expenditures and the rationale for our decision:

Now, a number of metaphors could be used to describe Wright State. We could use a sports metaphor and say we are all part of the same team. We could view ourselves as a family. If we view ourselves as a team, shouldn't we be willing to sacrifice for the good of the team? If we view ourselves as family, shouldn't we be willing to sacrifice for the good of our family?

The problem with these metaphors is that they do not accurately reflect our position as faculty at WSU. If one wants to use the team metaphor, we are the field players and the administration runs the front office. They decide who to hire and fire. They determine the spending priorities of the team: they can build a new stadium, they can hire more people in the front office and more coaches, or they can share their earnings with the players. In the family metaphor, the administration plays the role of the parents and we faculty are like the children. If they are enlightened parents, they may ask us where we would like to go on vacation; but, they alone decide on whether to buy a new car or house, or to save for college. They alone decide whether we will live within our means or get out the credit cards and spend recklessly. To quote our nation's former President, they are the "deciders." If you don't believe this, look at Article 6 of the CBA, "Management Rights."

So, what have those in the front office done with the team's money? How have our "parents" decided to allocate the family budget?

Between 2002 and 2008, payments to all WSU employees increased at an annual rate of 5.9% while the payroll for bargaining unit faculty increased at an annual rate of 5.5%. During this period, the number of bargaining unit faculty increased from 408 to 452 -- an annual increase rate of 1.7% -- and the

average salary of individual bargaining unit members increased at an annual rate of 3.8%. Payroll for non-BUF (i.e., all other WSU employees) increased at an annual rate of 6%, and if non-BUF salaries grew at an annual rate of 3%, this would imply that the number of non-BUF grew at an annual rate of 3%. According to the Ohio Board of Regents, in 2003 Wright State had 1,258 full-time staff and 240 part-time staff (excluding all full-time faculty, both BUF and non-BUF). This would imply that between 2002 and 2008 Wright State hired an additional 238 full-time staff and 45 part-time staff. Simply put, either Wright State has been on a non-BUF hiring binge or it has given non-BUF raises far in excess of those given to bargaining unit faculty. Is it right to ask BUF to give up our raises to fund the excessive growth of administrative positions at WSU?

A major problem at Wright State is that the administration, while well meaning, has the wrong priorities. Instead of devoting resources to the core academic mission of the university, the administration has decided to fund other priorities. Let us illustrate. According to the Audited Financial Statements, intercollegiate athletics ran a \$1.1

million deficit in 2008. This deficit is on top of the \$7 million subsidy – money that was transferred from education and general funds to support intercollegiate athletics. Only about one dollar in eight spent on intercollegiate athletics comes from revenue produced by intercollegiate athletics; the rest comes from money that would otherwise have been available for, say, teaching and research.

Unfortunately, intercollegiate athletics is just one example of Wright State’s misplaced priorities. For example, in 2008, the University transferred nearly \$1 million from educational and general spending to support the Nutter Center; the student union was slated to receive \$2.5 million; food services, \$223,011. Overall, in 2008, WSU’s auxiliary operations lost \$11.7 million. Where does this money come from? To repeat ourselves, it comes from money that might have been devoted to our core mission: teaching students and supporting research.

How does Wright State compare to other institutions in Ohio with respect to auxiliary operations? The table below, based on audited financial statements available online from the Ohio Auditor of State, provides the answer.

2008 Auxiliary Operations (thousands of \$)				
Institution	Revenue	Expenses	Net income (loss)	Net Income (loss) as a % of revenue
Akron	\$44,926	\$52,586	\$(7,660)	-17%
BGSU	\$70,764	\$76,569	\$(5,805)	-8%
Cincinnati	\$82,415	\$78,163	\$4,252	5%
Cleveland	2008 financial statement not available			
Kent	\$80,831	\$78,827	\$2,004	2%
Miami	\$106,209	\$109,650	\$(3,441)	-3%
Ohio	\$69,154	\$68,945	\$209	0%
OSU	\$192,071	\$220,682	\$(28,611)	-15%
Toledo	\$62,870	\$60,903	\$1,967	3%
Wright State	\$15,296	\$26,982	\$(11,686)	-76%
Youngstown	\$17,942	\$23,908	\$(5,966)	-33%

Source: Ohio Auditor of State

So the bottom line is simple: Wright State lost more money on auxiliaries than any other state university in Ohio except Ohio State University, even though our base of expenditures was smaller than anywhere else except Youngstown. What does that say about our priorities? About our fiscal responsibility? Is it right to ask BUF to give up our raises to fund out of control spending on Auxiliaries?

When we negotiated our first contract in 1999, we went to fact-finding because the administration refused to negotiate seriously over salary and benefits. At the time, our salaries had fallen from the middle among the eleven state universities with whom we compare ourselves to nearly the bottom. The administration offered us an increase that would have led to a further deterioration. Though the administration might have

been willing to pay more, the fact-finder largely stuck us with the administration's draconian pay proposal, so we stayed close to the bottom for nearly three years. The administration could have come to the union and said, "We got a lot better deal than we thought we would; we're worried that our salaries will not be competitive and that we will lose good faculty. Let's adjust upward the salary agreement." But that did not happen.

Why were we spending less on salaries than most of our Ohio peer institutions? Why did we also have fewer faculty members per student? As we have noted above, there is the penchant of Wright State administrations to spend lavishly on non-academics. But there are additional answers. First, the Board of Trustees decided for a number of years not to increase tuition to the maximum allowable under the state tuition cap. As a consequence, our tuition sank from being in the middle of the eleven state universities to the bottom. This decision, made over the objections of the Faculty Budget Review Committee, *permanently* lowered our tuition base; after all, tuition caps have continued essentially every year, so we have no chance to "make up lost ground." Therefore, we have fewer tuition dollars per student than do our peers. In fact, if one compares Wright State's current annual undergraduate tuition for Ohio residents with that of our peers, we are \$1,400 below the median. At 12,000 or more fulltime equivalent undergraduates, this means that Wright State's current annual revenue is \$16 million less than it would have been, if our tuition were in the middle. Even if one assumes that our enrollment would not have grown as rapidly, it is virtually certain that we would have at least \$11 million more in revenue if our tuition were in the middle, and that would have erased our "budget problem." Of course, we cannot blame the current administration for the past decision to permanently lower the university's revenue stream; that would not be fair. Is it fair for them to ask us to give up salary to pay for the consequences of this decision, one over which faculty had no control?

Looking again at our low salaries back in 1999: it took us three contracts and nine years to get our salaries back to the middle among the eleven state universities with whom we compare ourselves. Moreover, our salaries are still far below the median salaries for an appropriate group of national comparator institutions – a group including Wright State that is specified in the CBA at Cleveland State University. We are ranked 11 out of 16 at the rank of Professor, \$11,400 below the median, 12 out of 16 at

the rank of Associate Professor, \$3,500 below the median, and 10 out of 16 at the rank of Assistant Professor, \$900 below the median. Since we must compete in a national market for faculty, it will be impossible for us to retain and recruit high quality faculty if we allow the salaries of our BUF slip further behind those of our competitors. Is it fair to future students and the taxpayers of Ohio to ask BUF to give up raises if in the long run that leads to a lower quality faculty?

When we negotiated the current CBA, our salary proposals called for raises divided equally among the three years of the contract. However, we recognized that in the first year of covered by the current CBA, the administration would be dealing with the second year of a tuition freeze. So, to demonstrate our good faith, *we agreed to take a smaller raise (3%) in the first year of the contract – one that was below the national average for that year – in exchange for higher raises (5%) in the subsequent two years.* Now the administration wants us to sacrifice some of our raises which we have already deferred by a year.

Faculty salaries and the University budget:

How much of the university's budget is devoted to our salaries? In 2008, salaries for bargaining unit faculty were \$34.8 million, whereas the University's cash expenses (payments to employees, payments for benefits, payments to suppliers, and payments for scholarships and fellowships) totaled nearly \$341.7 million. Since Ohiolink accounts for approximately 10% of operating expenses, for which the University is reimbursed by the state, our net cash expenses were \$307.6 million. Even compared to this lower base, our salaries represented only 11.3% of the University's cash expenses. To look at things from a different perspective, expenditures for intercollegiate athletics equal 23% of the salaries of our entire bargaining unit.

So where are we? Even if we gave up half of the raises we negotiated, that would cover less than \$1 million (\$2 million, if we gave up our entire raise) of the \$11 million problem President Hopkins described in our April 10 meeting. Through collective bargaining for our salaries, we do influence about 10% of the university's budget. But we have no control over the remaining 90%.

Conclusion:

In summary, we have noted that there is a long history of misplaced priorities at Wright State University. Decisions with long-term consequences

have been made without consulting the faculty, or ignoring the advice of the faculty. The current administration, while well meaning, has continued to make bad decisions. Many of these decisions have sacrificed the quality of our institution, via expenditures not directly related to our core mission as an institution of higher learning, as well as choices that have limited the university's revenue stream. The current economic crisis has now exposed just how bad some of the decisions were. To quote Warren Buffet, "You only find out who is swimming naked when the tide goes out."

As a union representing the BUF on this campus, we represent the values of the Bargaining

Unit Faculty when we fight to protect the core academic mission of our institution. To this end, our union has tried, often with little success, to alter the spending priorities of our University. With somewhat more success, we have fought hard to increase the number of tenured and tenure track faculty. Likewise, we have striven for competitive salaries and benefits, so that we could attract and retain high quality faculty.

The way forward from the present budget problems is *not* to cut raises for faculty. Instead, it is to align our university's spending with the primary mission, the core values, that a university should espouse.

All Good Things Must Come to an End...

By Anna Bellisari, President AAUP-WSU

In just a few more weeks I'll be a past president of AAUP-WSU. I must admit that I'm looking forward to the day I'll be relieved of the many duties of the office, but I'm also feeling more than just a twinge of regret that my term is over. During the three years I served as president much was accomplished for our Bargaining Unit. We negotiated our fourth collective bargaining agreement, which offers three years of excellent salary increases, parental teaching relief and domestic partner benefits, guaranteed professional development funds, and many other provisions.

We reconvened Committee W to review the status of women faculty 15 years after the original Task Force report. Among other important findings, the Committee discovered disparities in the distribution of stipends and in the length of time for promotion from associate professor to full professor. It also made a recommendation, which has already been implemented, to revise the domestic partner affidavit.

We published a history of our collective bargaining chapter, written by former presidents Mel Goldfinger and Allan Spetter. At an annual national AAUP conference in Washington, we received the Beatrice G. Konheim award for "outstanding achievement in advancing the Association's objectives in the status of academic women and the establishment of equal opportunity for members of college and university faculties." Our Grievance and Contract Administration committee succeeded in resolving many issues related to promotion and tenure processes in the university. And our regular chapter membership

rose to over 80% of all Bargaining Unit Faculty (373 of 465 BUFMs).

Credit for these accomplishments belongs to all of the remarkable members of the AAUP-WSU Executive Committee, as well as to our Chief Negotiator Rudy Fichtenbaum, Grievance and Contract Administration Officer Mateen Rizki (preceded by Barry Milligan), and our outstanding administrative assistant Connie Jacobs. The dedication, commitment and expertise of these leaders are simply extraordinary. They have what I like to call the true collective imagination as they invariably give top priority to the greater good of the entire Bargaining Unit Faculty in their decisions and efforts to improve the conditions of our employment. I'm very glad that they will continue to serve our union in the future.

I can honestly say that my work in AAUP-WSU, beginning many years ago as a member of the first negotiating team, later as vice president, and finally as president, has been the most satisfying and rewarding service during my entire academic life. Of course it was costly in terms of time and a certain level of stress, but the achievements were many and significant. I am very grateful for the opportunity to serve our Bargaining Unit, and thank you all for granting me the privilege.

Remember, you too can support your faculty colleagues through AAUP-WSU. It only takes a phone call or email message to any member of the Executive Committee or to Ms. Jacobs to become actively involved. Here's wishing all of you, and especially our new President Henry Ruminski, all the best in AAUP!

A message from Executive Committee member-at-large Carol Loranger:

This year marks the end of my second stint as a member-at-large of the Executive Committee of AAUP-WSU. I served two terms on the first EC after we achieved collective bargaining in 1999; then returned three years ago to fill an interim vacancy and was elected to a full term at the end of that year. Looking back I feel fortunate to have been able to learn from and work with brilliant, witty, devoted colleagues from all over campus. Though my contributions to the bargaining unit have not been earth-shaking—mostly simply offering a wry eye and careful ear (and a perspective on CoLA issues) to discussions of collective bargaining business—I am proud to point to two material accomplishments for the union: the *Right Flier*, which I conceived, named, and edited for its first year during my first term on the EC before passing it over to more capable hands, and the AAUP-WSU Book Fund, begun just this year, to which I plan to contribute. Being a member-at-large has been time-consuming and occasionally nerve-racking but, by way of compensation, also always stimulating and pleasurable, and tied to a real sense of helping materially improve the lot of bargaining unit faculty week in and week out.

AAUP-WSU Executive Committee Contact Info Effective June 1, 2009

Henry Ruminski, President, Ext. 2950
Vice Presidential Election to be concluded May 20, 2009
Larry Turyn, Secretary, Ext. 2775
Lawrence Prochaska, Treasurer, Ext. 2551
Jim Vance, Communication Officer, Ext. 2206
Travis Doom, Member-at-Large, Ext. 5105
Linda Farner, Member-at-Large, 2914
Rudy Fichtenbaum, Chief Negotiator, Ext. 3085
Matt Rizki, Grievance & Contract Admn., Ext. 5117

AAUP Book Fund Report

In 2008, AAUP-WSU was a recipient of AAUP's Beatrice G. Konheim Award for "outstanding achievement in advancing the Association's objectives in academic freedom, student rights and freedoms, the status of academic women, the elimination of discrimination against minorities, or the establishment of equal opportunity for members of college and university faculties." The other honoree in 2008 was the St. Peter's College chapter of the AAUP. Our chapter's share of the \$1000 award was \$500. Wishing to use the award to contribute to both Wright State's academic mission and to the chapter's commitment to good collective bargaining practice, the chapter has used the funds as a seed to create a Book Support Fund for the Paul Laurence Dunbar Library. The fund, called the AAUP Book Fund, will be used to purchase books for the library's collection on the subjects of collective bargaining and academic freedom. You can find the fund in the library collections by clicking on "Giving" on the Library's main page, then choosing Book Support Funds. To recommend a book for purchase, contact the Executive Committee of AAUP-WSU. To make a tax-deductible contribution to the fund, send a check payable to the Wright State University Foundation to the Library, addressed to the Book Support Fund of the Paul Laurence Dunbar Library. The Library will credit the AAUP Book Fund's account before the funds are deposited to the Foundation.

Wright State
University Libraries
Book Support Funds

AAUP
American Association
of University Professors

WSU Chapter

WSU Faculty
Spring 2009

A Message from your Chapter Secretary, Professor Audrey McGowin

Congratulations to AAUP-WSU for reaching the 80 percent membership level! As outgoing AAUP-WSU Secretary, I would like to thank you for the privilege of serving you for the past six years. My term has spanned three Collective Bargaining Agreements and I have participated in some of the most ground-breaking advances we have made as a union such as a real family leave policy and domestic partner benefits.

Working with the other members of the Executive Committee and with several AAUP-WSU Presidents over the years, I have learned volumes about teamwork. Ideas and opinions at the table are respected and carefully vetted in order to best serve the bargaining unit, the students, and the university as a whole. The AAUP-WSU Executive Committee is a wonderful group of people working hard to preserve your rights in the workplace and preserve academic freedom at this institution.

I have also learned a great deal about how the university works; how decisions are made, who will be affected by those decisions, and how to

document change. The opportunity to work with other bargaining unit faculty members across all disciplines has given me greater respect for the work of the mind and how important it is to our society. While this education has been invaluable, it has come at a sacrifice of time and effort. Associate Professors often over commit their time and talents, with consequences to promotion, yet there are a handful of Associate Professors that do just that here at Wright State University.

I want to encourage Full Professors to make a greater commitment to the Chapter. It truly is a rewarding and thankless job all at the same time. But then, aren't you familiar with that type of work already? Please do not take for granted that our workplace issues will take care of themselves, because they do not! The success of our union depends on participation by all of our members. Please consider running for Chapter Officer or serving on a special committee the next time the opportunity presents itself, especially if you are a Full Professor. Join if you are not a regular chapter member. Vote. Give yourself a voice.

AAUP-WSU Membership reaches 80 percent of BUFMs

AAUP-WSU membership has reached 80 percent, a new high for the chapter. Special thanks to those members who have urged their colleagues to join and to AAUP-WSU Executive Committee members and others who actively recruited. Thanks also to those administrators whose actions may have helped to convince faculty members that the union did have something to offer them. The chart below

shows a comparison of chapter membership between May 2004 and May 2009. It reflects increased membership in all units but a percentage drop in CoNH. A special welcome to our new members in the College of Engineering and Computer Science which showed the greatest increase over the last four years.

Unit	2009			2005		
	BUFMs	RCMs	% members	BUFMs	RCMs	% members
WSU	465	373	80	414	304	73
CECS	59	49	83	49	27	57
CEHS	42	34	81	42	32	76
CoLA	144	122	85	126	101	80
CoNH	20	17	85	17	16	94
CoSM	129	93	72	118	79	67
Lake	21	20	95	15	14	93
RSCoB	50	38	76	47	34	72

BUFMs = Bargaining unit faculty members
All percentages rounded to nearest percent.

RCMs = Regular chapter members (voting members)

Academic Services Committee report

By Jim Vance, AAUP-WSU Communication Officer

The Academic Services Committee (ASC) was established by section 18.5 of our Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) to review the services of Computing and Telecommunication Services (CaTS), the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), the Office of the Registrar, and the Physical Plant. **Our motivation for this CBA provision was straightforward: these four “service” units have hardly been reliable in providing high quality support for the work of the faculty.**

This year, the members of ASC are Jerry Alter, Marty Kich, Mike Raymer, and Jim Vance – appointed by AAUP; and Lillie Howard (Senior Vice President for Curriculum and Instruction), Henry Limouze (Chair, English), and Bill Rickert (Associate Provost) – appointed by the administration. Vance and Rickert serve as de facto co-chairs.

Thus far, ASC has focused primarily on CaTS, collecting faculty tales of woe and attempting to formulate remedies. Earlier this year, ASC put the following list of issues before CaTS:

An increasing concern for faculty is making the most effective use of research dollars to support research. What needs to be done to make the chargeable costs for CaTS services (such as activating already-existing network ports, adding new network ports, and telephone service) more comparable to rates charged by off-campus service providers? Does CaTS recommend that academic units purchase cheaper alternatives for their faculty (such as cell phones)? **What is the trade-off between cost and security that precludes faculty from cost-effectively using an inexpensive hub to increase the number of supported workstations in an office or laboratory?**

A diverse research institution, unlike a standard corporate enterprise, requires an unusual and diverse variety of computing environments, software tools, and the like. What is CaTS doing to *support* faculty needs (non-standard computers, network configurations, scalable systems including hubs, switches, etc.) in a cost effective manner?

The State of Ohio has specific laws dealing with the privacy of student information. Likewise, federal funding agencies, the Department of

Defense, and other industry or government partners have confidentiality requirements for data stored on faculty computers and research servers. How does CaTS help faculty toward understanding and meeting their obligations in these matters? How are the faculty kept informed of new/changing tools?

Many students and faculty are currently using Google, yahoo, hotmail, or other on-line e-mail, calendar, and file space servers rather than CaTS- supplied services. What resources are spent on CaTS e-mail services, calendar services, and file space servers (whether for primary storage or backup needs), and what portion of the WSU community chooses not to use each of these? **What portion of WSU faculty use CaTS-provided storage space, software, and instructions to perform routine backups of their computers? How can we most effectively provide e-mail, calendar, file storage, and other e-services to faculty and students?**

Currently, WSU’s guests (including faculty candidates, distinguished visiting scholars, etc.) cannot access the wireless internet. Secure wireless networks are commonly provided as a courtesy at bookstores, coffee shops, and major metropolitan areas. What costs are associated with providing guest access on our wireless network?

It is vital that computing equipment purchased by faculty with research, development, FCI, and start-up funds be spent cost-effectively and that such equipment be delivered in a timely manner. Pomeroy seems to offer less flexibility in computing equipment selection, slower warranty/RMA service, and significantly longer delivery periods than on-line vendors (such as Lenovo, Amazon, Dell, etc). Pomeroy’s costs seem to be equal to (and sometimes greater than) on-line vendor costs for similar equipment. What are the advantages in using Pomeroy for faculty computer purchases? Exactly what performance criteria (e.g., (a) time between order and delivery; (b) frequency with which products are returned; (c) time between in-warranty service request and successful completion of repair), if any, are written in Wright State’s contract with Pomeroy? What records (averages, best, worst, etc.) have been compiled regarding the Pomeroy’s performance in areas (a),

(b), (c) above [or in other performance areas]?
Should we recommend that faculty purchase their systems through other vendors if appropriate?

How can we best provide more timely repair service for faculty and instructional (classroom, laboratory) computers that experience hardware failures?

It is vital that software packages used in instruction perform reliably, quickly, and nearly identically on instructional workstations (where instructors use workstations to teach subject matter or show students how to perform tasks) and laboratory workstations (where students are the users). Network installations for some software programs (such as Mathematica) have caused problems over an extended period of time. Also, software programs sometimes are inaccessible via menus on classroom PC's or have critical components removed. How can we make these programs (necessary for the core mission of the university) work more reliably?

When a faculty member contacts the HelpDesk (via telephone or e-mail), under what circumstances should a "Ticket Number" be generated and reported to the faculty member?

What mechanism does CaTS use to solicit faculty wishes for new (or updated) software usable for instruction or research and to respond to those wishes? To respond to unsolicited faculty requests for such software?

Likewise, ASC has met face-to-face with top CaTS management, sometimes with guest faculty members whose expertise or experience were especially valuable. In this regard we wish to thank Professors John Gallagher, Prabhaker Mateti, and Thomas Wischgoll.

As to results, these are minimal thus far, aside from our having communicated to CaTS the faculty's deep and widespread dissatisfaction with the organization's performance. We do expect CaTS to facilitate guest accounts for visiting faculty. At the moment, we are waiting for CaTS reply to ASC's belief that CaTS should allow faculty to use routers or hubs or switches to connect more than one device (computers, printers, etc.) to a single network port, thereby considerably reducing the cost of attaining connectivity. Likewise, we are waiting on a response from CaTS to a long-standing request to install *Mathematica*TM on classroom and lab computers, rather than depending upon the network.

Finally, let us take this opportunity to repeat our invitation and request: *report your problems with CaTS, CTL, Physical Plant, and the Registrar to any member of the Executive Committee or any AAUP member of ASC*. In this regard and in many others, we need the Bargaining Unit Faculty to *speak up* when they have problems.