

NVCFA General Board Meeting

March 11, 2010

1. Announcements

- a. Welcome! This may be the most well attended Faculty Association meeting.
- b. No pink slips for faculty.
- c. Student CTA memberships: Diane told us the progress of one of our selected students. Body agreed to offer the memberships to two, new students who plan on being educators. Send your student name(s) with a brief description of their accolades to Diane via email.
- d. Classified did vote to take a furlough day a month. Worried about layoffs. Equals 4.6% cut. Administrative and VPs also agreed to. Advised faculty not to do extra work for free.
- e. Nominations for FA board. All positions open. Send notice of interest to Cathy Gillis: cgillis@napavalley.edu

2. Negotiations Update

- a. Denise explained that we don't yet have recommendations but rather presenting to the body to get guidance. We object to the pending letter to part-timers regarding the part-time parity cut—about 5%. Faculty want to negotiate as one body (full-tie and part-timers), but according to the contract language, the district can remove the funding at any time. Additionally, without agreement from the FA, the MOU binds the district to the 2001 salary schedule. In other words, if we don't negotiate a settlement, the schedule must revert to the 2001 schedule, as per the language in the MOU. Unfortunately, we can't stop it because of the original MOU. This also affects full-timers as it is our overload/summer pay as well. If we agree to the 5%, we can insert a reopener. New contract will bargain for both groups. We want to eventually build the money back into the part-time salary scale rather than having it tied to categorical funds which the district can take back. Discussion. Can we counter offer? We really hoped the retirement incentive would avoid this. If we agree, then we would negotiate when it begins since the current MOU doesn't end until the commencement of the semester. Also, no more office hours for summer. We don't like to agree to a pay cut, but feel forced to agree to the 5% to preserve the reopener.
- b. Tom reiterated the pros/cons. Tom also brought up what else the district is looking to cut. Do we want to have a say? The district identified: preceptorship, job blocks, extra days, science load, per diem vs. hourly pay, division chairs. Discussion. Maria Biddenback explained that the preceptorship has to do with being on call 24 hours—how can you compensate? Also affects respiratory therapy and other divisions. Discussion. Member pointed out that we need to know exactly what the district is thinking. Diane reiterated that we won't supply them with the

ideas, but we want to be sure we understand what they propose. Member pointed out that we need to avoid the “divide and conquer” mentality. Every proposal must be voted on. Ask the district what their goal for the reserve is. Seems that they want about \$400,000 from us. Should we just take a pay cut or should we each do more or give up some monies?

- c. Tom explained the rest of the categories that the district identified. The district believes that the science load is an equity issue. We have not talked specifics with the district for most of these identified areas. The extra days for division chairs are not in the contract and are therefore not negotiable. The district can adjust these days at its discretion. What is in the contract, and therefore negotiable, is the stipend paid to division chairs. Member from counseling explained the contract days (not “extra”) and they do not have a choice whether to work or not. The days were negotiated for the purpose of serving students. Unfortunately, the contract does characterize these as “extra” in the contract.
- d. Andrea repeated that we need guidance at the table. Options: 1) We hold the line with the cuts we've already taken and ask the district to use the reserve to cover the shortfall; 2) we look at the identified areas and make cuts that, along with the cut to part-time parity, would cover the shortfall; or 3) We negotiate an across-the-board salary cut and leave the identified areas as they are in the current contract. Which option should we be coming from? Discussion. Defense of science load. Diane will put out a Zoomerang to get more input from the FA body. Faculty seem to initially support equity (across the board pay cut) rather than cutting the areas that actually represent extra work. Counseling said they are so understaffed that they couldn't even run registration if cuts made. Faculty member pointed out that we should be targeting the reserve. Member suggested that we should furlough flex days.

3. Other Business

- a. Steve explained the numbers. Says some things left out of presentation from district such as a 6.4% reserve. He explained how we have already taken many cuts which he stated is the definition of a furlough. More work for the same pay. In the last year, we've take \$950,000 in cuts. See attachment for overhead financial sheet he presented.

Adjourned 1:20pm