Table Talk
Faculty Contract Negotiations
September 14, 2012
10:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Members Present: Jillian Daly, Cecelia Hudelson-Putnam, Rose LaMont, Emily Malsam, Tom Nomof, Gina Rose, Michael Sundquist, Diane Wirth, Gene Womble

Recollections: Rose LaMont

In this meeting, both teams discussed “the story” of the budget and the state mandated workload reductions of the past several years, reminded ourselves where we were in our discussions of contingency concessions last April when we put a pause on the conversation, and discussed data needed to make final options.

1. The meeting began with a general discussion of rumor control and elephants in the room per the IBB traditional structure. YFA was concerned with statements generated around the district that all bargaining groups, including LTAC, were negotiating a straight 5% salary cut as this was a) counter to the philosophy discussed last April, and 2) seemed impossible to negotiate without all teams at one unity table. In April, YFA had been told that as faculty were 44% of the district’s expenditures on salary, faculty were responsible for 44% of the $3 million deficit we are trying to cover if Proposition 30 does not pass. That would be about 3.6% salary cut rather than 5%. In the end, we agreed that two different philosophies were being presented and we would discuss both in our negotiations.

2. We clarified that last year the contingency deficit was $4 million and was lowered to $3 million with use of reserves; however, due to the May Revise and further property tax shortfalls, the deficit has risen to $5.3 million. Reserves of $2.3 million are being used to lower this amount to the same $3 million. Use of reserves, though, is one time monies and lowers the reserves from 10% to about 7.5%.

3. Both teams approved the minutes and Table Talk for the Sept. 7th meeting.

4. Next, the table agreed we still needed the following data to analyze: current YCCD financial overview, current “scattergram”—a chart that shows the full-time salary schedule and how many faculty at each step, YCCD total revenue and reserves trend analysis, last five years of sabbatical costs at both colleges.

5. YFA then presented their interests for negotiations on contingency concessions as follows:
   a. Protecting all faculty jobs and programs within district
   b. Preserving district fiscal solvency
   c. Assuring competitive salary against negotiated cohorts
   d. Assuring salary does not drop its current comparison ranking from one year to the next
e. Creating a salary formula that helps faculty reach at least median or above, and in assuring interests c and d above, once the state mandated workload reductions are over (or growth occurs)

District agreed to have the Board of Trustees create interests specific to negotiation over contingency concessions and to bring those to the table.

6. As a constituency report, YFA reviewed notes from the last Bay Area Faculty Association meeting of April 25, 2012 as both teams were interested in what other unions are currently negotiating. Overall, these districts were in much better financial condition than YCCD and several have become or are planning to become Basic Aid districts. A Basic Aid district no longer has to receive state apportionment as funding through local property taxes allows that district to fund each student at a higher rate. Once going to Basic Aid, however, districts no longer need to follow the 50% rule or the 75/25 percent standard. As concessions, though, many of the Bay Area unions have negotiated away sabbaticals, and most have higher reserves that districts have agreed to “spend down” to avoid further concessions. We also compared YCCD to other district reports on GASB liabilities, Facility and Utilities sustainability, Vacation Pay accruals, and effects of the state budget deferrals.

7. We had a brief discussion about districts on “show cause” and their financial situations, and we discussed how community college funds have been deferred by the state.

8. We then got down to telling “the story” about YCCD and what would happen if Proposition 30 passed and if it did not. If Prop. 30 passes, YCCD would be down about 500 FTES that would need to be made up; unfortunately, thus far not enough PTOL money has been budgeted to create that much FTES. If Prop. 30 doesn’t pass, YCCD would be over 500 FTES and would have to cut sections appropriately.

9. Both teams agreed that proper enrollment management was necessary so that sections are offered, especially during summer, that get the most bang for your buck. We also talked about whether there was a need to cut summer and also a question about how each college’s savings from the previous year was being budgeted—whether, for instance, that money could be used to augment the PTOL.

10. Next we discussed more data we wanted to look at: the annual cost of the additional three steps to the summer PTOL salary schedule, reassigned time at both colleges, cost of Pro Rata pay (if any), total faculty salary cost, current cost of step and column, current cost of 1% salary, more data on what other districts are negotiating across the state against the possible failure of Prop. 30.

11. The meeting then ended at 2:00pm.
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