Table Talk

Faculty Contract Negotiations

March 8, 2013

11:00am-2:00pm

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

Recollections: Emily Malsam

1. We began the meeting with a check-in. YFA reported out that a productive Tri-Executive Board meeting between YFA and the two college Academic Senates had taken place earlier in the week in order to discuss the history and importance of the Faculty Consultant position. Allen Boyer and David Baggett attended.

2. We moved on to homework assignments and reviewed detailed processes and forms created by Chabot-Las Positas when they negotiated variable laboratory percent loads, varying from .625 through to .875. Their process involved presenting a detailed application with evidence to a Load Committee that would determine the load factor for that particular lab class. We then looked at materials created by Santa Rosa, now in the process of negotiating laboratory percents, and we reviewed their tentative language to create variable lab loads from .67 to 1.0 percent laboratory loads. We also reviewed a detailed survey that the Santa Rosa All Faculty Association (AFA) gave to their faculty who teach labs to fill out over a two-week period. We agreed to create a similar survey for our faculty to guide us in our process. Before negotiations, Chabot-Las Positas’s labs were all set at .75 of a Lecture Equivalent Hour (LEH). Labs at Santa Rosa are all set at .67 of an LEH.

3. We then reviewed homework that analyzed our PTOL salary schedule against our new negotiated cohort part-time salary schedules and found that unlike our full-time salaries, YCCD is not at the bottom of our cohort but not at median either. An analysis of our non-instructional hourly salary schedule (30 steps and based on a formula) found that while step one needed an 11% salary raise to be at median, by step nine, our schedule was above median, and by step 30 was 14% above median.

4. Next, both teams reviewed data for our presentation to Executive Management scheduled for March 15th. We double-checked math for PTOL savings generated by reducing courses down to Cl-D units (while figuring in lost apportionment) and compared several AA degrees at MJC and CC and compared the number of units completed by our students and by students taking courses based on Cl-D recommended units. We agreed to also present total compensation data and review our 50% law data with Executive Management.
5. Our next topic was a small reorganization of our Article 3: Academic Calendar and Article 4: Workload. Currently, our Work Week language is under Article 3. We agreed to move this language to Article 4 so all workload related contract language will be under one article.

6. The meeting ended by divvying up homework assignments for the next meeting. The Workload Work Group will also present newly written contract language on Minimum Class Size and Large Lecture Class Accommodation.
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