

Table Talk  
Faculty Contract Negotiations  
November 26, 2007

**Members Present:** Jillian Daly, Roe Darnell, Dennis Gervin, Brian Sanders, Teresa Scott, Nancy Sill, Karen Walters Dunlap, Diane Wirth, Gene Womble  
**Scribe:** Gloria Plasencia  
**Facilitator:** Victoria Simmons

1. The meeting began at 3:00pm in the YCCD Conference Room. The agenda for the meeting and the *Table Talk* for the November 9<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved.
2. As this was the first negotiation meeting on compensation, the group began by discussing the following elements of “the compensation story”:
  - a. We worked at reminding ourselves and informing new members of the results of our last negotiated compensation package. Last year we agreed to get to at least median of our negotiated cohorts using three key benchmarks (step 1, step 13 and step 30 of Column IV). We gave a lump sum of money across step and column for retroactive pay and then readjusted the salary schedule as of July 1, 2007 to bring everyone to the total compensation median. We met and exceeded our median benchmarks at steps 25-30. We added a hefty raise to the PT/OL salary schedule as of July 1, 2007.
  - b. We talked about how our full-time salary schedule is constructed, with the same total amount of dollars dispersed between steps 1 and 13 and a common but smaller amount between steps 13 and 30, and with a 4% increase in salary between each Column. (Column IV=benchmark column; Column I=88% of C.IV; Column II=92% of C.IV; and Column III=96% of C.IV). Column V represents a doctoral stipend of \$2100 per year over C.IV.
  - c. We spent some time discussing the State financial picture and the different elements that affect community college budgets. Some of this discussion focused on the projected State deficit of 8-10 billion dollars due to the San Diego fires and the property downward spiral due to the sub-prime mortgage crisis. On the upside is the possibility of more stable community college funding through the passage of Proposition 92. We also talked about the positive effects of the new funding model SB 361 and how it enabled us to survive much of our decline deficit.
  - d. We discussed the Golden Handshake, the resulting 10% loss of our faculty, and our FTES decline and its financial ramifications.
  - e. We then focused on Adjunct issues and acknowledged that the PT/OL salary schedule has lost ground in our plan to reach 70% parity with the full-time salary schedule, and that in last year’s agreement our Adjunct faculty did not receive any retroactive salary boost.
  - f. We wondered whether we should create a separate cohort group for our Adjunct salary schedule analysis, focusing on competing districts that market to our same Adjunct faculty.

- g. Finally, we talked about the difficulty in balancing the need to boost faculty compensation with competing financial interests such as hiring more full-time faculty, more money for instructional supplies, and increased funds for professional development.
3. We then moved on to mapping out the stakeholders and shared interests in regards to financial compensation and determined the stakeholders to be Faculty, Administration, the Board of Trustees/Community, and Students.
4. We found many areas of common interests between most stakeholders, including the following: maintaining an adequate reserve and fiscal solvency, attracting and retaining qualified full-time and adjunct faculty, and maintaining affordable quality healthcare.
5. We ended the meeting by agreeing that Nancy Sill and Teresa Scott should prepare a budget presentation for the December 3<sup>rd</sup> negotiation meeting and that the November 30<sup>th</sup> negotiation meeting will focus on Faculty Evaluation and other contractual issues.

The meeting adjourned at 7pm.

Approved