

NVCFA General Board Meeting

February 11, 2010

1. Announcements

- a. Welcome new members: John, Amanda, Janice
- b. Our Faculty Association donations: 4, \$500 scholarships toward NVC scholarships, \$100 to Academic Senate for Rich Bremer retirement, \$500 for the last McPherson awards, \$1000 to the Chris McCarthy memorial scholarship.
- c. PARS people here today if potential retirees still want to see them.
- d. Elections this spring in the next month or two. All positions open.
- e. Diane: pink slips: if they come, we would all get them; should get more information soon.
- f. Kudos to negotiators for their hard work.

2. Negotiations Update

- a. Denise “told the story” starting with part-time parity issue and end of monies to fund it. District did support up until now but has expressed that they can longer fund it which means p/time would lose 5% on the scale. District is not compelled to fund it but has tried to retain as much as possible. Talks tabled for a while, but now our position is that we stand with part-time faculty in terms of any cuts and we will take them or not together. “We are one body.” We are all waiting until we see the results for the retirement incentive. We need part-timers to keep us going if many retire. If they cut part-time parity, which they have a right to do, we will not be on record as supporting it. Next year is the real problem. We take our representation very seriously and have adopted a very careful stance before proceeding.
- b. Tom: budget is stable, but only for this year although they could make retroactive cuts. Even if the retirement incentive goes through, there is still a need to make cuts for next year. Numbers continue to change and come in. 1.3 million in cuts still need to be made according to the district. We keep holding off the district who wanted immediate cuts to salaries since before the semester began. Their new deadline is March 5th. However, everything is still on the table. We want real numbers to discuss, so we feel that must be after all the retirements are known. District is looking at possibly cutting: part-time office hours, part-time parity, per diem versus hourly pay, cuts to compensation (salaries), reassigned time, stipends, job blocks (for next year), extra days, science labs, load in general, program discontinuance (we want them to look at more than just the numbers to who they serve, etc). Everything is on the table. All of these possible cuts must be negotiated and voted upon.
- c. Andrea: 1.4 million needs to be cut for next year—at least cuts that we know about. If retirements don’t cover it, then we will have to go back and talk about additional ways to cover that difference. Also discussing a

contingency the district wants which would trigger salary cuts. If we can agree on a contingency agreement, they say it will minimize lay-off notices or make them non-existent. We don't want the pink slips to go out, but must decide if the contingency plan is acceptable to us. The first step is if the reserve goes below 5%, our salary cuts would reflect each whole percentage under the targeted 5%. We want to maintain 3% not 5%. We believe we shouldn't use salary cuts to finance a reserve above the watch list of 3%. Why 5%? This IS a rainy day. We all have an interest in funding salaries if state budget is protracted. We also stipulated that we want the retirement fund be tapped before we go to salary cuts. In other words, we want salary cuts to be the last resort. We also want an agreement for clear restoration language. This is our current discussion. This will all happen very quickly to meet the March 5th deadline. Board of trustees must vote on pink-slips. What is the feeling of the faculty?

- d. Discussion. Is it possible to have the cuts be off the schedule as our one-time increases were? Our goal is that it is not a permanent cut to the salary schedule. In this case 1% of reserve does correlate to 1% cut to salaries, but it is certainly subject to change. We also want to know exactly where the money from our salaries is going to. We are bargaining for faculty not the other groups although we do not wish them any ill will. For example, the district pointed out that part-time classified took a 5% cut, but our argument is that a 5% cut to adjunct faculty is far different and shouldn't be framed as the same. What about cuts to administrators—cuts to their load? Have not had that discussion yet. Faculty salaries save the most money. Expressed concern again that we don't want them using our money to fund what they want. We also want to be aware of where the money is put that could still make the reserve appear under the agreed upon percentage. The contingency's purpose is to have a plan if the state makes huge cuts or protracts the budget. Will they make the retirement list public? Are they also including replacement of faculty costs?

2. Other Business

Adjourned 1:30pm