April 2003

Volume 5, Issue 9



ADVOCAT

Education for Democracy —

Democracy for Education

Financial News: A Salary Increase is not Unrealistic

I started teaching for this district in 1974. Over the years, I have witnessed some tight, restrictive budgets. In all these years, however, I have never seen anything like the challenges that confront NHMCCD as we face dramatic budget constraints imposed by the state. Historically, NHMCCD receives 34% of its budget from the state. In what is, as far as I know, an unprecedented move, the state reduced its allocation to state entities by 7% in the <u>current</u> biennium. In other words, the state is reneging on 7% of its allocation to NHMCCD in the middle of a budget year, a loss of approximately \$3.1 million. Worse still, the state is proposing an additional 12% cut in our allocation for the next biennium, for a total of \$10 million. The college district has scrambled to accommodate the 7% cut, but the 12% cannot be managed without dramatic changes. On the table for consideration are limiting or freezing some hiring, not replacing some personnel as they leave, increasing student tuition, eliminating dual-credit tuition waivers, and modestly increasing taxes. Employees have been told not to expect a salary increase for next year. Unfortunately, this last proposal would cause employees to lose ground financially should our salaries remain constant while insurance premiums, gasoline and other energy costs, the cost of sending our children to college, and general cost of living continue to rise. A 4% increase in the cost of living is not unrealistic to expect.

News from the week of March 24 is that Comptroller Strayhorn may announce that the Texas economy is worse than anticipated. The college district has learned that the state may face an additional \$3 to \$4 billion in shortfall. Such an event would demand further reductions in the district's budget. There is even speculation that there may be additional cuts in state allocations to the college this year. It appears that our insurance co-pays for prescriptions and treatment will increase May 1.

Some of the budgetary concerns will be relieved if the district gets start-up funds for Cy-Fair, and, certainly, a salary increase would be reasonable to expect. If the start-up money does not come through, then the Board of Trustees must consider a more significant tax increase. The Board has put itself in a difficult position. As property values have increased, the Board has reduced taxes in four of the last six years, a popular trend in the country, especially among conservatives. It now finds itself in an environment where there is resistance to a tax increase. Hindsight suggests that it would have been better to leave the tax rate constant and have funds available to help with the current financial crisis rather than have to raise taxes in this climate. Of course, one fear the Board may have is that taxpayers will only remember an increase and forget the four previous cuts. That may be; however, this problem should not fall on the shoulders of college employees. We continue to provide excellent education and service to the community. A one-cent per hundred-dollar valuation would generate approximately \$6.4 million, enough revenue to ease the District's predicament and provide a cost of living increase to prevent employees' losing ground financially. Such an increase would cost the average homeowner an additional \$11.50 annually. The administration and Board may worry over public perception about raising taxes and at the same time providing a salary increase. The public's perception of the college and

Inside this issue:

Financial News: A Salary Increase is not Unrealistic	1-2
Luck of the Draw	2-4
Insurance Premium Threat	5
NHC Custodial Update	5-7
Social Insecurity for the Brady Bunch	7
Course "Banking" Revisited	8

AFT Dues		
Full-time Faculty	\$26.15	
Full-time Professional Staff	\$22.60	
Full-time Support Staff	\$19.00	
Adjunct Faculty & Staff	\$10.00	

Financial News: A Salary Increase is not Unrealistic (cont'd)

its employees is generally quite high, and I'm not sure that the worry is all that legitimate. Even if it were, NHMCCD must not allow its employees to be harmed by failing to provide a reasonable increase in salary. Certainly, the union recognizes the severity of the effect the state's deficit is having on the college district's budget. We appreciate the efforts of the administration to minimize the effect of budget cuts on employees and students, especially the Chancellor's commitment to "no-job losses." However, we do not accept the premise that a local tax increase means that employees must not receive a raise. The budget crisis is real, but there is a way for the Board to protect our employees from losing ground in the face of inflation.

Of course, the immediate response we will hear to this proposal is that the college gave employees an unprecedented 15% salary increase last year. How could we possibly expect more? We must remember, first of all, that staff only received a 5% increase last year. Secondly, the only ones to receive a 15% increase were the faculty who were teaching nine months only and those employees with faculty status who work 12-month contracts. A goodly number of the faculty, a majority I would assume, elected to teach in the summer and selected a 10.5-month contract. In actuality, they received a 5% raise; the remaining 10% compensates them for teaching a summer session. Some senior faculty actually lost dollars under the new 10.5-month contract. When the new system was only a proposal, I checked the effect on senior faculty, had the old system stayed in place, and if they taught both summer sessions. Assuming a 3% raise this current year, they would have actually earned \$2,000 more under the old system. In other words, they lost \$2,000 going to the new 10.5-month contract with the so-called 15% raise. Actually, they lost more because the raise would have been 5% under the old system, not 3%. Of course, they do not have to teach both summer sessions, and there is value in that. However, if we are looking only at dollars, some senior faculty lost money this year. In reality, it roughly averages out that the majority of faculty and all staff received a 5% raise last year.

States all over the nation are struggling with their budget shortfalls. We recognize the drastic cuts that are necessary here in this budget crisis, and surely there are certain sacrifices that faculty and staff are willing to make. For instance, most faculty and staff should be willing to forego professional development, travel, and lavish galas for a year. While these are nice benefits, they shouldn't take precedence over protecting employees, some of whom make only around \$20,000 a year, from the negative effects of inflation.

College employees work hard, and they deliver quality education and service. They do not deserve to suffer loss of a salary increase over public relations concerns. The employees did not get us in this situation.

Alan Hall

Luck of the Draw

I contributed an article to the last issue of <u>The Advocate</u> in which I pointed out that some departments at NHC are using unconventional time slots for scheduling classes on MW mornings. Not surprisingly, this practice has created scheduling conflicts for our students. I, therefore, recommended that a common scheduling model be adopted or, if one exists, that it be followed. My plea was met with mixed response. While one faculty member emailed me agreeing that "students need some sort of standardization in the schedule," another sent me a message built around Emerson's quote, "consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds." On the whole, most of the feedback was motivated by a desire to eliminate the MWF format. And, to this end, a number of creative strategies were proposed.

I phoned Dr. Nockie Zizelmann, Vice President for Educational Programs, to share some of these suggestions and also to get the administration's official position on scheduling. She verified that Dr. Sam had indeed relaxed the previous president's scheduling restriction, which prohibited MW classes from being offered before 1pm. As a result, departments have the option of offering a mix of both MW and MWF morning classes as long as three conditions are met. First, the classes must begin or end at a traditional MWF time. For example, if a department chooses to offer a MW morning class, then it must start at 7:30am, 8:35am, 9:40am, 10:45am, or 11:50am. Alternatively, the class may begin at an unconventional time, but must end at a traditional time such as 8:25am, 9:30am, 10:35am, 11:40am, or 12:45pm. Given that the instructional periods are not uniform across disciplines, adhering to these fixed start and end times is the best way to minimize scheduling conflicts. From what I've seen in the Spring 2003 schedule, the Psychology Department is the only department abiding by this condition. The second condition, which Dr. Zizelmann stressed, is that NHC cannot switch to only MW morning classes even though she recognizes that most students and faculty favor such classes. Space constraints on campus demand that MWF classes also be scheduled to accommodate the number of sections we need to offer. The final condition is that departments must have their dean's approval for scheduling MW morning classes.

Page 2 THE ADVOCATE

Luck of the Draw (cont'd)

Just to be sure, I contacted Dr. Zizelmann a second time to verify that I correctly understood the administration's policy. She replied with the following email message on February 25th:

"You are correct that a limited [sic] of MW classes can be scheduled using the MWF start and end times. The only exceptions to this would be scheduling for a group of students that are only taking a block of classes.

I believe the instructional [sic] needs to review our schedule offerings to make sure that we are meeting the needs of the students and are allowing them to schedule classes in a reasonable fashion. I have been waiting for resource 25 which would make the analysis very easy. We should have this tool within the next year."

Although not everybody will be happy with this policy, it seems like a necessary compromise. The more pressing problem is how can such a simple policy be the source of the conflicting class times that riddle the pages of our spring schedule? Dr. Zizelmann believes that perhaps Dr. Sam's MW morning policy may not have been properly understood by all of the associate deans. The subsequent reorganization of the college, which led to significant personnel changes in that level of the administration, further compounded the confusion.

I interviewed two instructional deans, Ms. Judy Taylor (Mathematics, Engineering, and Natural Sciences) and Dr. Jennie Harrison (Communications and Languages), independently on March 24th. The choice of these two deans was deliberate as both had been associate deans prior to the reorganization. Neither recalls having been informed that scheduling MW morning classes is possible, rather they conjectured that the change in policy was only relayed to the deans who asked. In other words, no announcement communicating the policy change was made to all of the deans. Accordingly, Ms. Taylor and Dr. Harrison assumed that Dr. Sam's stance towards MW morning classes did not deviate from that of his predecessor. Both deans admitted, however, that the new policy scarcely impacts their respective divisions since they suffer from room shortages and are thus married to the MWF format which maximizes room usage. On the other hand, they acknowledge that the recent scheduling practices of some departments outside of their divisions have indirectly affected them in negative ways. Both of their divisions, for instance, count on using rooms that are allocated to other divisions but not fully used. Ms. Taylor worries that finding such rooms will become more difficult as the traditional MWF time slots used by her division do not always fit with the time slots used by the divisions that may have open rooms. Furthermore, the class which she is currently teaching has some students that request to leave early because they are enrolled in another class that is scheduled to start 15 minutes before the traditional start time. Ms. Taylor's experience is not isolated. A colleague in biology complained to me that last semester a number of students were arriving to classes in her department 15 minutes late because of an overlap with their previous classes. The Biology Department, in turn, revamped their schedule to rectify the problem. It struck me as odd that departments have to shuffle around their time slots on an ad hoc basis in order to avoid conflicts when schedules should be systematically coordinated on a college-wide level. Dr. Harrison, who is also aware of the problem, says that Colleague does not allow students to register for classes that conflict. She contends that human error is probably responsible. During registration, a warning message which alerts the operators of the student's scheduling conflict may be overridden by simply pressing "Enter." The operators often times will not even see the warning as they repetitively hit "Enter" to advance through screens.

The higher administration at NHMCCD believes that Resource 25, a computer program, is the panacea for all of our scheduling ills. The plan is for a district-wide implementation. And, as Dr. Zizelmann indicated in her email, it is expected that it will replace our current mode of assigning rooms within the next year. When I discussed the matter with Ms. Taylor and Dr. Harrison, both expressed serious skepticism about the prospects of having the program that quickly. Dr. Harrison commented that she's "lost track of the number of times it's going to be next year." Likewise, Ms. Taylor reacted by saying that Resource 25 has been promised to us "for the last 10 to 15 years." That's enough to make a Pavlovian dog's salivary glands dry up.

Although both deans think that a comprehensive study of room allocations is long overdue because current allocations are based on badly outdated enrollment figures, they have serious concerns about using Resource 25 to make room assignments. In fact, part of the reason for the delay in obtaining the program, according to Dr. Harrison, is that it does not integrate well with Colleague. Moreover, if Resource 25 is adopted, then no divisions will "own" rooms except for specialized labs (e.g., choir room). This means that faculty could be assigned classrooms anywhere on campus. It is conceivable that a faculty member could have one class in the Academic Build and the next in the far wing of the Winship Building with only ten minutes to get there.

Currently, most faculty members enjoy having classrooms that are in close proximity to one another and to their offices. The divisions will have to relinquish nearly all autonomy over room assignments if Resource 25 is adopted. The process will resemble

VOLUME 5, ISSUE 9 Page 3

Luck of the Draw (cont'd)

lottery of sorts. Efforts have been made to make the process non-random by allowing the programming of various parameters (e.g., room with chalkboard, tables, and 35 seats). However, it seems that when there are no rooms that match the designated parameters, then Resource 25 could encounter problems. If there are more requests for rooms with whiteboards than actually exist, then how does it decide which instructors get those rooms? Is it based on who inputs their schedule first or is it back to the lottery system? Dr. Harrison perceives that this could lead to potential difficulties:

"I've been told that Schedule 25 [the scheduling component of Resource 25] allows the entry of up to one hundred parameters. It just can't ensure that all those parameters can be met. If you're out of rooms with chalk boards, you're out of rooms with chalk boards. The program generates a list of classes that it can't assign because it can't meet the parameters. Then it's up to people to solve the problem."

What's the point of using a computer program when it leaves a mess for humans to mop up? And, again, if two instructors both request a room that has unique parameters for the same time slot, who gets it? I posed the last question to L. J. McGlamory, Administrative Computing Program Manager, when I contacted her on March 27th. "Luck of the draw," she replied. Simply put, "if you run [the algorithm] twice, you can have two different outcomes." She added that the parameters, which can be ranked hierarchically, will not be built around instructor preferences, but rather around course and section requirements. I was getting increasingly disturbed and worried by what I was hearing. What if two instructors who teach the same course have two different methods of delivering the course content? My fear of Resource 25 was temporarily mitigated by the fact that she said partitions will be created in the program to try to keep rooms in clusters so that instructors will not be rushing back and forth across campus to get to their classes. My fear returned, unfortunately, once she revealed that "the first priority is space optimization." This, she confirmed, means that it is still possible for instructors to be assigned a remote room or a room without the desired equipment if they don't get the luck of the draw. I'm not implying that all instructors always get what rooms they want under the current system, but at least there is the ability to make negotiations and trade-offs. It's not an algorithm.

Ms. McGlamory is optimistic that Resource 25 can overcome these challenges by earmarking specific classes with special parameters and running the algorithm multiple times until we get desired room assignment output. In contrast, Ms. Taylor believes that a human, who is familiar with the content of a course and each instructor's needs, can more readily select an appropriate room for a class than Resource 25 can. It also seems like a difference of values, the cold bottom line of space optimization or the quality of the educational experience. For these reasons, Ms. Taylor argues that Resource 25 should be given a limited role, namely as an analysis tool that determines room allocations for each division based on enrollment data and identifies available rooms after assignments have been made by traditional means. Ms. McGlamory concurs that "the searching capabilities of Resource 25 is its strongest feature." It is far more efficient in locating empty rooms than the antiquated room grid that sits on Ms. Joy Tichenor's desk. I was particularly concerned about the beta-testing since this is a "district-wide initiative," as Ms. McGlamory put it. Apparently, there is no plan for beta-testing as such. Ms. McGlamory believes that there is no need because the algorithm will be run repeatedly until "we get what we want." I suppose it might work, but I like the idea of using a giant roulette wheel better.

Nick Oweyssi NHC, Professor of Philosophy





VOLUME 5, ISSUE 9

Insurance Premium Threat

I sent the following information about insurance premiums to all NHMCCD employees through email a couple of weeks ago. However, because of the seriousness of the situation, I wanted to again bring to your attention this important message in case you did not have a chance to read the email or have not yet had a chance to act.

The current budget crisis in Texas has dark implications for community colleges, including NHMCCD and our employees. First, the state cut its allocation to the college 7% in the current biennium, a move unprecedented in my 28 years of experience in this business. Moreover, the state is proposing an additional 12% cut in its allocation to the college in the next biennium. You have seen communications from Dr. Pickelman regarding these cuts and how the college will respond. Interestingly, Governor Perry insists that he wants these cuts made without cutting services. Friends, we are an institution whose business is service.

Governor Perry, as part of an effort to help the state overcome a \$10 billion deficit, has now proposed to cut state funding for health insurance for community college employees by 65%. In his latest communication to employees, Dr. Pickelman notes that such a "proposal is unlikely to pass the Legislature," but acknowledges that the idea is not dead. However, should this proposal pass and those increased costs be shouldered by the college, they will create additional hardship on an already troubling situation by placing additional demands on an already strained budget. Another option would be for the college to pass those increases on to employees. The monthly costs will be an additional \$199

for employee only coverage, \$314 for employee and spouse, \$277 employee plus children, or \$391 for employee and family. Remember, these are monthly increases to <u>current</u> premiums. Such a move would save the state some money, but it would be a blow should the college have to pay for the increases. However, passing the costs on to employees would be devastating to us. In effect, we would experience a serious pay cut. Make no mistake, this scenario is not coming from the college's administration. This situation is coming directly from the current leadership in Austin.

For additional information, you may go to the website of the union's state organization, the Texas Federation of Teachers, at www.tft.org. There you will find on the right a link, "Email or fax your legislator today." Click on it and go to a page titled "Action Alert." Click on the link regarding community college health insurance. That will take you to a page to enter your zip code. From there you will go to a page with information on legislators in your area and a message that may be sent. Remember, faxes seem to have more impact that emails. Legislators may be faxed from this page.

The union urges you to review this information and contact state legislators urging them not to reduce the state's contribution to community college health insurance premiums. Remember, do not use college email addresses, fax machines, or stationery to contact legislators.

Alan Hall

NHC Custodial Update

In the February 2003 issue of <u>The Advocate</u>, Jack Dixon reported on the AFT's efforts to solve problems encountered by NHC custodians. Initially, our focus was on a shift change made by management which moved custodians from a 3:30 to midnight shift to 6:00 pm to 2:30 am. In the course of working on this issue, we found a host of other concerns, including lack of access to email and voice mail, the inability to attend college functions during their shift as other employees are allowed to, and lack of a schedule to accommodate attending conference and convocation days. As Jack noted, the AFT reached an agreement with Dr. Sam to move four custodians from the night shift to a 3:30 pm to midnight shift. Two slots will be bid by seniority, and two will be bid by custodians wishing to take classes. If no one is taking classes, the second two slots will be bid based on seniority. Should more than two custodians wish to take classes, Dr. Sam committed to find a way to make that possible. We are happy to report that this system is now in place. Jack also noted agreements on all the ancillary issues we encountered. He also indicated that the AFT was continuing to work on additional issues and promised an update in this newsletter.



VOLUME 5, ISSUE 9

NHC Custodial Update (cont'd)

One of these additional issues regards the current policy on jury duty which requires an employee to report to work or take a vacation day if his jury duty does not interfere with his work schedule. With a shift beginning at 6:00 pm, it is possible for someone to serve on jury duty from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, have to report to work from 6:00 pm to 2:30 am, and then go back to jury service at 8:00 am until the court case is concluded. The alternative would be to take a vacation day, a situation unfair at best. Dr. Sam concurred with the AFT's thinking and agreed to make it an "unofficial" rule to allow employees in this situation to have the shift off any day that the employee is called for jury duty. While we are grateful for this unofficial practice, we wonder why the official policy isn't changed by the Board of Trustees.

We have also reached an agreement regarding meetings. In the past, if a custodian served on a committee, such as Support Staff Council, that met from 2:00 to 4:00 pm, the custodian would be allowed to punch in at 2:00 and stay on the clock until the end of the meeting, typically around 4:00 pm. However, that custodian was required to punch out for two hours and punch back in at 6:00 pm. Now, custodians in those circumstances are allowed to remain punched in after the meeting, start working their assignment, and punch out eight and one half hours after they punched in.

We have also reached agreement on the custodians' ability to attend special events. Changes will be made to custodial shifts to allow them to attend events like the district's awards dinner.

Finally, we also reached agreement with Dr. Sam that, as NHC adds new buildings, the college must budget for additional custodians. We cannot simply add additional square footage to existing work assignments.

The union continues to monitor these agreements and urge common sense and humane treatment for the NHC custodians.

The AFT frequently receives comments on articles in <u>The Advocate</u>. On occasion, we get a flood of them, as was the case on Jack's article. Following are a select few, highlighting readers' responses.

"[The AFT] did a masterful job of investigating the problem, analyzing the issues, and negotiating a solution (subject to proper implementation, of course). [...] [T]his stuff is elementary management [...] Maybe even elementary common sense."

Gary Clark

"Jack -- just wanted to let you know what a fine piece of work you did on the custodian scheduling issue. To me both the substance and the communication represents some of the best reasons why the AFT is so important. Thanks for doing such a careful and thorough job."

Olin Joynton

"Bravo to [the AFT] for bringing this issue to light. I personally have spoken with several custodians, some of whom had young children, who voiced a concern similar to those you stated in your article.

The question of safety is always a concern for staff. Pushing hours past midnight and after the bars are closed is not using common sense or expressing concern for those who work for you. I have one employee whose job it is to go to the high schools. I tell [her] that I expect her to have an escort to her car after the event or she will not be available. I will not let her stay past 9pm either due to safety concerns. I think these are reasonable accommodations for any employee.

Education is my pet peeve! We are hypocrites at best! I have [several] full time staff who report to me. I encourage taking advantage of the time and proximity to education and I expect all of my staff to have access to school. However, I reward those who plan first. I announce in our meetings that accommodations for a variable shift must be in my office by a deadline date. Those who meet the deadline are rewarded. Those who submit late jeopardize approval [...].

I don't think administrators need to be rocket scientists to do their job. I think they have to use "common sense" as you said in your article. However, unfortunately, that is a very rare commodity these days.

[. . .] I applaud your determination and patience to keep bringing these issues to light."

(Name withheld by request)

Page 6 THE ADVOCATE

NHC Custodial Update (cont'd)

"Just so you know, since before the start of the semester, there have been one police officer and one security officer assigned to the midnight shift, Monday through Friday. The decision to hire a security officer was to provide backup for the lone officer.

[...] At least now the other officer can call for help. The police officer is on hand for the custodial exit every night, with strobe lights flashing. This is recorded on his daily report. The custodians are advised to park in one lot, to facilitate this, but not all make that choice."

John Upton, Chief of Police, NHC

The union also received comments that the article was "balanced, fair, but very telling," and two respondents questioned whether language, race, ethnicity, and economics were the source of the custodians' conflict with management.

Alan Hall

Social Insecurity for the Brady Bunch

When I arrived at the Montgomery College campus and entered the Commons, a line of gray- and white-haired attendees cued in front of sign-in logs placed by Congressman Kevin Brady, Republican from the 8th congressional district. I moved close to the stage where the Congressman stood, and staked my claim at a small table just as he was asking the assembly to consider a moment of prayer and silence for our military servicemen and women. His stated purpose for holding town meetings was to solicit our help in doing his job. I reflected on this as being ironic, still believing my high-school history teacher's ideal that it is not our job to help politicians but their job to help us.

The Congressman began to answer questions from the audience, frequently repeating that the Social Security system was a "mess," and that we needed to close what he characterized as "the loophole." He tried to gain our sympathy by stating that he wanted to be "direct" with us, to give us the good and bad news. Apparently the abortive vote on these same issues last month was insufficient to cool his enthusiasm for active support of a bill that, according to Congressional Budget Office estimates, would save less than \$20 million per year. In my reporter's notebook, I prepared a question that I then asked Congressman Brady.

This administration has been characterized by some with an agenda of class warfare, that is, warfare against the elderly, the poor, the disenfranchised, and minorities. My question is: What is your reaction to this charge, and how can you justify your stated position of wanting to deny retirees what they and their spouses have earned, while you, Congressman, do what you accuse them of doing, that is, "double dipping"?

The picture I was trying to paint with my questions addressed more than economic and social class warfare. It seemed the majority of attendees at both town meetings recognized that the laws on the books for decades had tried to encourage an alternative to social security benefits, so as to close the benefits and pay gap between teachers in this state and elsewhere. At the Montgomery and North Harris town meetings, audience members stated that salaries for similar positions in other states were often twice what they were here in Texas and our district.

The Congressman will say "yes" in this coming week's House vote to take away hundreds of dollars, especially from elderly women teachers whose husbands toiled long and hard to provide a better life for their loved ones. The long-term effect of this vote will be not to save \$20 million per year but to force the next generation of teachers away from Texas classrooms.

This IS "class" warfare, waged in our classrooms against our teachers, our elderly, and our children. Congressman, should we not also consider a moment of prayer and silence for them, if you insist on voting against the wishes of your district?

Bob Corbin NHMCCD Adjunct Faculty

VOLUME 5, ISSUE 9 Page 7

Course "Banking" Revisited

Over the past several years, the administration at the highest levels of this district has been fighting a war of attrition against faculty salaries and benefits. Most notable among their efforts has been the elimination of the full summer stipend, the elimination of pro-rata pay for mini-semesters, and the imposition of the 70-20-10 workload agreement.

Today, we face a state and district budget crisis which threatens to further reduce or eliminate cost of living adjustments, benefits etc. Despite this, there are ways for the faculty to take advantage of these recent policy decisions in ways the district did not anticipate.

For example, as part of the new workload plan, faculty may elect to "bank" an overload class rather than get pay for it. Then, according to the workload policy, if you "bank" one class in excess of a full semester load, you can take a full semester off with pay. In other words, if you bank six classes, you can take a five-course semester off.

The current restriction is that you can only take classes off which are part of your contract teaching load. So, for example, in the past, you could not bank overloads to reduce your summer teaching load, because summer courses were not part of the faculty's contract year.

But, now they ARE. If you elect to teach a 10.5 month contract, two summer courses are considered a full summer class load. Which should mean, under current policy, if faculty members "bank" three overloads, they should be able to not teach their two summer courses and still get paid for them.

The point is, no full-time faculty member should ever settle for overload pay ever again. If you can bank a fall overload, a spring overload, and a mini-semester overload, you should be able to receive 10.5 months of pay for 9 months of work. Absent a mini-semester, faculty should realistically be able to bank enough courses over a two-year period to take every other summer off with no reduction in pay.

Tim Howard NHC, Political Science Professor

CALL FOR ARTICLES

We invite you to send us your opinions, your news, your questions and so forth. <u>The Advocate</u> is a forum for information and free interchange of ideas. Send your articles to Dawn Baxley, Editor, MC, or e-mail: dawnb@nhmccd.edu, or submit to any of the other following officers:

Alan Hall, President	North Harris College	ACAD 217-G
Velma Trammel	North Harris College	WNSP 174
Tim Howard	North Harris College	ACAD 270-G
Bob Locander	North Harris College	ACAD 270
Allen Vogt	North Harris College	ACAD 264-C
Cris Neuman	North Harris College	WNSP 120
Rich Almstedt	Kingwood College	FTC 100-G
Richard Becker	Tomball College	E-271-D
Julie Alber	Montgomery College	SSC 205-A
Heather Mitchell	Fairbanks Center	FAIR-220





2700 W. W. Thorne Dr. Suite A217 Houston, Texas 77073

Page 8 THE ADVOCATE