



PCC FACULTY ASSOCIATION

NEGOTIATIONS UPDATE

MARCH 2014 The Latest on Contract Negotiations

In This Issue

Latest on Negotiations	1
PT Faculty Job Security	1
Faculty Salary Comparisons	2
Faculty Survey Results	3

The Faculty Association Bargaining Team, lead by Julie Kiotas and Danny Hamman met with the District in a second meeting to negotiate over issues based on members' feedback from the Bargaining Survey, on Friday, March 21. The District's Lead Negotiator, Bruce Barsook and Dr. David Douglass, Associate Vice President, Strategic Planning and Innovation were present for the District. The meeting lasted just over an hour.

The District came to the table with a counter-offer on the Supplemental Early Retirement Program (SERP) proposal presented by the FA at our last meeting. This offer was contingent upon the agreement of a proposed retention of the current academic and work year calendar which was sun-shined at the November 6, 2013 Board Meeting by the District.

Mr. Barsook stated..."if the parties would agree to implement a proposed draft of a three-term calendar for 2014-15, the District would agree to new SERP proposal."

Mr. Barsook went on to say that the issue of accepting this proposal would not have any affect on future calendar negotiations. The FA team could not agree to this "package offer" (the District would only agree to all or none). According to our legal council, the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB)'s decision on the appeal which the District filed, regarding the calendar, is most likely to favor the Faculty and we should wait for the final decision, then faculty can decide what's best for students, faculty and the college community as a whole. Shared governance is at stake once again.

"Contract Negotiations" continued on Page 4

Contact

PCC Faculty Association
1570 E. Colorado Blvd. CC-204
Pasadena, CA 91106
(626) 585-7261
facultyassociation@gmail.com
www.pccfacultyassociation.org

PCCFA Fights for Part Time Faculty Job Security

The California Educational Code states in Sec. 87482.9 that "***The issue of earning and retaining annual reappointment rights shall be a mandatory subject of negotiations with respect to the collective bargaining process relating to any new or successor contract between community college districts and temporary or part-time faculty occurring on or after January 1, 2002.***"

Clearly, the California state legislature intended for colleges to move toward providing job security for its part time faculty. Bruce Barsook, Lead District Negotiator, has written (icwlegal.com/82087) that, "the obligation to negotiate in good faith . . . requires a genuine desire to reach agreement [and] a willingness to exchange reasonable proposals."

For more than thirteen years, the Faculty Association at Pasadena City College has taken this issue seriously, while the District has virtually ignored the legislature's mandate. The Faculty Association has introduced numerous proposals for a fair system for the right-of-first-refusal for PCC adjuncts, all of which have been dismissed with a variation of "not at this time" or "sounds too complicated". This doesn't sound like bargaining. Doesn't the District see the obvious advantages to offering its part time faculty job security?

"Part Time Faculty" continued on Page 4

Next PCCFA Meeting:

April 17, 2014
11:30AM-1PM
Circadian

PCC: High in Student Transfers, Low in Faculty Salaries

Pasadena City College transfer rates to University of California and Cal States for 2012-2013

1	De Anza College	1,952
2	Santa Monica College	1,911
3	Orange Coast College	1,700
4	Diablo Valley College	1,577
5	Pasadena City College	1,475
6	El Camino College	1,376
7	Mount San Antonio College	1,346
8	Palomar College	1,337
9	Fullerton College	1,299
10	City College of San Francisco	1,027

PCC Faculty Association Director Julie Kiotas researched comparisons of PCC faculty compensation with those of other California Community Colleges. Santa Rosa College faculty compile this vital data.

The results are startling. Despite the fact that PCC is one of the top-five transfer colleges to UCs and Cal States, our faculty salaries do not reflect our status as a top community college.

Rankings to your right reveal "Highest Non-Doctorate" (HND) compensation rates. PCC's salaries are strongest at the very beginning of career, ranking 16th at Step One. However, most telling are the data for mid-career faculty (steps 13 to 29). For those steps, PCC faculty are paid 64th to 71st out of 73 college districts.

For more faculty comparisons, including median home prices, please visit the PCCFA website at:

<http://www.facultyassociation.org>

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE

	Salaries	Statewide Ranking (out of 73)	
1	\$65,769	16	
2	\$65,769	25	
3	\$65,769	32	
4	\$65,769	44	
5	\$65,769	54	
6	\$65,769	65	
7	\$68,332	63	
8	\$70,894	61	
9	\$73,457	61	
10	\$76,019	61	
11	\$78,581	60	
12	\$81,114	58	
13	\$81,114	64	
14	\$81,114	68	
15	\$83,706	63	
S	16	\$83,706	70
T	17	\$83,706	71
E	18	\$86,269	68
P	19	\$86,269	70
20	\$86,269	70	
21	\$88,831	68	
22	\$88,831	69	
23	\$88,831	69	
24	\$91,394	65	
25	\$91,394	67	
26	\$91,394	67	
27	\$93,956	62	
28	\$93,956	62	
29	\$93,956	62	
30	\$96,519	55	
31	\$96,519	55	
32	\$96,519	55	
33	\$99,081	47	
34	\$99,081	48	
35	\$99,081	48	
36	\$99,081	48	
Max HND Salary	\$99,081	48	
Max Initial HND Salary	\$73,457	51	
Latest Schedule	2007-08		

PCC Faculty Association Contract Survey Results

PARTICIPANTS (1,356 surveys sent out)	
Full Time Faculty	158
Part Time Faculty	136
Declined to State	10
TOTAL Faculty	304

For a complete listing of the results, including comments, please visit the PCCFA Website at:

<http://www.pccfacultyassociation.org>

COMPENSATION	HIGH Priority	MIDDLE Priority	LOW Priority	DECLINED to State
Salary	84%	11%	3%	2%
Receiving FULL Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)	83%	11%	5%	2%
Reform and Fairness in stipends and reassigned time for Full Time Faculty	38%	28%	25%	10%
Fair compensation for extra work duties	65%	19%	11%	5%
Equity Load Adjustment (reconfigure lab and lecture compensation equitably)	43%	30%	21%	7%
Ancillary work compensation for PT Faculty	53%	22%	21%	4%
Additional compensated conference hours for PT faculty	56%	22%	18%	4%
Increased Reassigned Time for Academic Senate	27%	28%	38%	7%
Increased Reassigned Time for Faculty Association	28%	25%	38%	8%
Increased Pay for Weekend College	27%	23%	43%	7%

WORKING CONDITIONS	HIGH Priority	MIDDLE Priority	LOW Priority	DECLINED to State
Rehire rights for Part Time Faculty	60%	16%	22%	3%
Class size at Academic Senate approved numbers	62%	22%	13%	4%
Safety (emergency plans, access to emergency phones, etc.)	42%	27%	26%	5%
General conditions of classrooms (routine maintenance, etc.)	48%	29%	17%	6%
Improved technology access	46%	28%	22%	4%
Negotiated Calendar (school-year start and end dates, length of semesters and intersessions)	61%	19%	17%	4%
Improved grievance procedures	45%	31%	19%	5%
Evaluation for Full Time Untenured Faculty	31%	33%	29%	8%
Evaluation for Full Time Tenured Faculty	31%	30%	31%	8%
Evaluation for Part Time Faculty	38%	34%	23%	6%
Training for technology	44%	31%	20%	4%
Negotiated College Structure	46%	25%	22%	8%
Negotiated Class Times	45%	30%	16%	9%

HEALTH INSURANCE/LEAVE BENEFITS	HIGH Priority	MIDDLE Priority	LOW Priority	DECLINED to State
Health Insurance for Part Time Faculty	55%	19%	21%	5%
Retiree Health Insurance Plan (life time coverage)	62%	20%	12%	6%
Paid Family Leave	47%	29%	18%	7%
Sabbatical Leave Compensation	37%	27%	29%	8%
Supplemental Employee Retirement Program (SERP)	43%	25%	23%	9%

OTHER CONCERNS	HIGH Priority	MIDDLE Priority	LOW Priority	DECLINED to State
Part Time Parity Issues	42%	24%	21%	12%
Equivalency Determination	29%	30%	24%	16%

“Contract Negotiations” continued from Page 1

Faculty have the right to have working conditions such as wages, hours, terms and conditions of employment reconciled mutually and fairly and not have them imposed on us.

The FA Bargaining Team presented a draft proposal regarding Department Chairs. The FA asked the District to stop talking to Departments and individuals separately and without regard to FA contract terms, again to provide for shared governance and a sense of mutual agreement over these crucial changes. The District responded by asking about some details on the lines of authority, etc. in an attempt to clarify the process as it relates to FA duties to negotiate wages and working conditions. The FA suggested parties form a working group tasked with developing a workable model for the entire College.

The FA informed the District that the data the FA asked for at the March 7 negotiations meeting had not been received. This request by FA team members was needed to complete the initial draft proposals, a common request. Mr. Barsook, seemed surprised to hear that the FA team was dependant upon this data to make an informed proposal, he indicated that he didn't recall a deadline on the request and alleged it was an unfair practice for the FA not to meet without having stipulated this upfront.

Kiotas said, “we are meeting, we are here, but we cannot present a detailed proposal without data, correct data.”

The District has had difficulty getting data and information requests fulfilled in a timely fashion, in the past, this seems not to have changed. Information requests and data requests are, by law, to be satisfied in a timely manner. Mr. Barsook did present the FA with a small amount of what appeared to be some information from the Chancellors Office relating to class size. The district presented only one semester of class size data from the Chancellor's Data Mart.

The District responded to the FA data request later that same day, AFTER our meeting ended.

Our meeting ended with a request from FA for the District to provide the reasoning behind the figures they provided for the salary increases. Where did the District come up with these numbers? The District agrees with the FA that salaries are not competitive with other districts across the State.

Finally, the FA asked:
“Does the District seek to have faculty salaries competitive to those across the State?”

Mr. Barsook responded:
“That's difficult to say, the goal of the District is to increase faculty salaries, but do so in a prudent fashion that allows us to not only serve students but to be prudent in terms of class size, benefits and compensation.”

When will the FA Bargaining Team members meet again with the District?

Next week, and we will use all relevant data to craft a meaningful proposal. Please be advised that the district proposal has not changed in over two years.

PCCFA is working for a fair contract and shared governance for all PCC faculty! If you are not a member, please join now, to vote!

“Part Time Faculty” continued from Page 1

Doesn't the college want to keep its best teachers? Why leave them in perpetual uncertainty and encourage turnover among the part time faculty ranks when they find they can move to a college that offers job security? Doesn't the college want its part time teachers committed to the institution? Sadly, there is no indication that the college feels this way.

But aside from the issues of quality and fairness, there are significant cost savings that the college derives from a fair rehire policy. A study by the Community College Association (an affiliate of CCA/CTS/NEA) has debunked the idea that re-hire policies create “Mandated Costs” to the colleges. In fact, those areas that are tagged as mandated costs—keeping track of faculty evaluations and employment, creating seniority and hiring lists, and other associated costs (oversight, clerical, record keeping)—are not mandated at all, but are already part of the “cost of doing business” . And colleges are already doing these things.

Further, the CCA study found that the cost of rehiring existing faculty incurs almost no new costs, while replacing part time faculty lost to attrition and career movement (that is, jumping ship for a better campus environment) produces significant additional costs in requisitions from departments for new hires, in human resources expenses to prepare, advertise, and process new applicants, in training and evaluating new hires, and in time and effort spent integrating new hires into the campus community. These are not “mandated costs”; these are unnecessary extra cost the college incurs when it cannot maintain a stable part time workforce because of high turnover driven by the uncertainty produced by a lack of a fair and equitable retention policy.

What is the cause of resistance to re-hire right on the part of the District? They say very little, but the obvious reason is the District wants to be able to fire (by not re-hiring) any part time faculty member at any time without being required to offer any explanation for its actions. It is as simple as that. The District wants to use the part faculty to teach 40 percent of its classes, earn considerable return in FTES, and yet refuses to extend to those faculty members some level of job security. It is time for the District to comply with the mandate of the Legislature and begin serious negotiations about job security for adjunct faculty.