Table Talk

Faculty Contract Negotiations

September 21, 2012

10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

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

Recollections: Michael Sundquist

Negotiations for contingency concessions for 2013-2014 if Proposition 30 fails continued.

1. The Minutes and *Table Talk* for the Sept. 14th meeting were approved.
2. The discussion began by reviewing data gathered as homework assignments. We reminded ourselves that the YCCD deficit if Proposition 30 fails will be $5.3 million for 2012-2013; however, we currently have funding in this year’s budget, through a contingency fund and reserves, to cover this deficit. YFA, CSEA, and LTAC are currently negotiating concessions to make up $3 million of that continuing deficit for 2013-2014. We agreed that the faculty’s portion of that deficit is $1.32 million. New data presented showed that 1% of faculty salaries comes to $355,427, which translates to a 3.71% salary cut for all full-time and part-time faculty.
3. We discussed how other districts have made SERP (Supplemental Employee Retirement Program) agreements and agreed to have Human Resources research this option and investigate possible cost savings. A SERP is a type of “Golden Handshake” that targets specific numbers of employees in each category (staff, faculty, administrators) who would need to retire and then creates an annuity for those employees who opt to retire, spread over a number of years (so, not a one-time cash reward). A SERP requires a consultant to come in and create the plan to ensure cost-effectiveness.
4. Next, both teams created a long list of data items needed in order to move forward with analyzing final options. Some items on this list included the following:
   a. An updated “Scattergram”—this document shows the number of faculty on each step in each column and costs out total faculty salary cost.
   b. The cost of sabbaticals at each college for the past five years.
   c. The cost of summer differential pay (the additional three steps) on the PTOL and ideas on what the equivalent might be for non-instructional faculty.
   d. A five-year trend analysis on YCCD ending balances.
   e. A data sheet listing all reassigned time in the district.
5. We then moved on to listing both teams’ interests for negotiating contingency concessions. YFA came to the table with these five prioritized interests: 1) Protecting all faculty jobs and programs within the district; 2) Preserving district solvency; 3) Assuring salary stays competitive against negotiated cohorts; 4) Assuring salary doesn’t drop our ranking in comparison to our cohorts;
and 5) Creating a salary formula to reach at least median or above once growth monies come back to the district.

6. The District shared all these interests, but in a more generalized fashion. Here are the District’s interests: 1) Protecting all employees’ jobs; 2) Preserving district solvency; and 3) Attracting and retaining quality faculty.

7. After some discussion, we decided to go ahead and begin listing contingency options even though we all recognized we couldn’t at this time attach solid costs to each option. Both teams’ goal is to find ways to reduce the $1.32 million of faculty’s portion of the possible deficit so that any salary cut can be reduced. Twenty-three options went up on the board without any evaluation. Some of these options included a two-year suspension of sabbaticals, step caps to the PTOL and non-instructional hourly rates, a flat-rate pre-taxed payroll deduction, a straight salary cut, raising the overload percent to 167%, a one-time only Banked Leave cash out, etc.

8. We ended the meeting by once again reviewing data needed for the next meeting and assigning homework to each team member.

9. The meeting ended at 1:10pm.

Submitted by Jillian Daly