Table Talk

Faculty Contract Negotiations

March 1, 2013

1:00pm-5:00pm

Members present: Jillian Daly, Michael Guerra, Cece Hudelson-Putnam, Rose LaMont, Emily Malsam, Tom Nomof, Michael Sundquist, Diane Wirth

Gene Womble from 3:00pm onwards

Recollections: Rose LaMont

Issues on Workload continued.

1. The meeting began with a large discussion of the difficulties ahead of us in adjusting lab percent load. We talked about the fact that all labs at Columbia College are set at 75% of a lecture hour but that only labs taught in the sciences at MJC are at 75%--the rest (in the areas of Agriculture, Allied Health, Anthropology, Business, Computer Graphics, and Technical Education, and others) at MJC are equated to a lecture hour. We noted that only Kern in our cohort has labs at a one-to-one rate with lecture hours. Most of our cohort districts load laboratories at a variety of load percents depending on the type of lab.

2. We also discussed how labs are often scheduled so that they are overload for instructors, so the instructor is being paid out at the hourly lecture rate. Unlike many of our cohort contracts, our PTOL salary schedule does not differentiate between a lab hour and a lecture hour.

3. We discussed several different programs, such as Music and Theatre, whose lab classes involve many hours of performance preparation

4. We agreed once again that our shared goals are to create equity and cost savings to district in order to directly increase faculty total compensation. And we agreed to do more research and look at more data on the lecture-laboratory issue.

5. Next we moved on to the topic of district savings that could incur if some of our five and four unit courses dropped their unit values down to the amounts in the CI-D outlines. Over the weeks both teams have discovered that large savings to the PTOL could happen by reducing courses by one unit. Apportionment would initially be lost, but PTOL savings could be re-invested into creating more sections to not only gain back any lost apportionment but to generate even more. As ultimately this issue cannot be negotiated, both teams agreed to have Executive Management come to the March 15th negotiations meeting in order to review the data we have generated.

6. We also briefly reviewed the new salary comparison between YCCD and our cohorts, based on the 2013 Santa Rosa Salary Study. Based on most recent data (we compare highest non-
doctorate column), faculty in our Column IV would need between a $5000 and $10,000 raise to reach median in salary. We agreed to also show Executive Management this data.

7. We next reviewed workload agreements we have made thus far and that are ready to go to our ad hoc work group to create the actual contract language. Language is ready to be written for Minimum Class Size, Large Lecture Accommodation, Work Week Formula, Workload definitions. Issues concerning Maximum Class Size and Lecture- Lab Loads will most likely take us into Spring of next year.

8. Next we moved on to our Work Week formula and talked about whether we should use the traditional 40 hour week formulas based on a non-compressed calendar and simply write a note that as we are compressed, 40 hours equates to 42.5 hours, or whether we should actually change all the work week formulas to reflect the compressed calendar. We agreed to review other contracts to see if there are any models for us out there.

9. We briefly discussed non-instructional work load and agreed to tackle these issues first thing in the fall. A non-instructional work group will be formed, including non-instructional faculty and administrators.

10. We divvied up homework for the next meeting and ended at 5:00pm.
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