

## **The District's Rationale for the Current Proposal Shared with YFA**

Dear Members of the YCCD Community:

The Yosemite Faculty Association and the District have reached Impasse in our collective bargaining negotiations and are now working to reach agreement with the assistance of the Public Employee Relations Board (PERB). In their PERB filings, the YFA has highlighted several areas upon which they believe the two teams have been unable to achieve agreement.

In accordance with established legal precedents (*Rio Hondo Community College District (1980) PERB Decision No. 128; Sanger Unified Teachers Association (1990) PERB Decision No. 811.*), the District team is exercising its **right of employer free speech** to explain to the YCCD community the District's reasoning for its most recent proposal presented to the YFA, dated February 23, 2018 (attached). Negotiating contractual changes and coming to agreement on compensation and benefits is extremely difficult. The District team has done so in good faith, honestly, and prudently. It is incumbent upon the Board of Trustees and the District's administrators to sustain the overall health of the District and its colleges. Those who fail to do so set their Districts up for fiscal insolvency and ongoing turmoil that detract from the shared mission to educate students.

This document is being sent to the YCCD Community to explain how the February 23, 2018 proposal ("Contract Proposal") was formulated, delineate its details, explain the rationale behind the proposals presented, explain some of the challenges facing the District, and show practical examples of the new proposed changes. This is a long document, but the proposals are very complex and cannot be effectively explained in just a few words. Please be advised that the following factual information has been previously shared in detail with the YFA bargaining team. This information is being provided to the YCCD community for informational purposes only and to promote transparency in government.

**The Board of Trustees and the District Team believe that the Contract Proposal on the table supports the educational mission of the District and demonstrates significant support for our faculty.** The Contract Proposal contains provisions that address many of the concerns of both the YFA and the District which include: a permanent salary increase that significantly moves faculty toward the existing contractual cohort goal; the maintenance of fully District paid benefits for staff; and proposed standardized class sizes and instructional faculty loads across the District to promote equity. The included package within the Contract Proposal represents the greatest financial investment that can be made at this time given current fiscal realities and the foregoing discussion of financial prudence.

Upon reviewing the summarized details of the Contract Proposal below and the impacts on you, *individually*, please remember that this is a *collective* bargaining agreement process. The standardization aspects of the Contract Proposal may result in individual benefits and/or seeming costs, but they are designed for positive impacts on the collective faculty and the collective health of the District and the colleges.

## 1. Class Size

### *Background*

In 2015-16 the Class Size Committee was established as a workgroup as part of a tentative agreement between the Yosemite Community College District and the Yosemite Faculty Association. This same tentative agreement included a 5% across the board pay increase, and a commitment to continue to work on Appendix B issues. The Committee was comprised of Faculty from both Columbia College and Modesto Junior College, including representation from both Academic Senate and YFA, as well as administrators from both colleges. The Committee was chaired by the President of Modesto Junior College on behalf of the district. Committee members were polled to determine meeting dates and times, and consensus was gained for 4 meeting dates.

The Committee's task, identified in negotiations, was to develop a process for determining exceptions to a conceptual class size maximum. As part of that review the Committee reviewed the ASCCC whitepaper, *Setting Course Enrollment Maximums: Process, Roles, and Principles*, which includes sample models. It describes (from the State Senate perspective) the roles and responsibilities of Faculty, the Senate, the Union, and Administration in the determination of class capacity. The Committee also explored class capacity data from both Columbia College and Modesto Junior College.

The Committee reached consensus on the following general principles which served as a framework for determining a process:

1. Process for determining class sizes should be transparent with information easily accessible online.
2. Process will honor mandated restrictions.
3. Pedagogy and sustainability are prime, and perhaps competing, considerations.
4. Class size and room size are distinct concepts.
5. Faculty and administration have shared interest in class size and determination of exceptions.
6. It would be disruptive to make sweeping change across all courses at one time.
7. Other college models may assist in developing a rubric for YCCD courses.
8. Timeline and process for class size evaluation could align with curriculum review.
9. A rubric, worksheet, and standard data set would facilitate consistency of exception determination.
10. There is a shared desire to make a recommendation for a district class size maximum.

Based on these consensual principles, the Committee met and drafted a set of recommendation to the Bargaining teams from both YFA and the District. The summary report and Class Size Exception Request Form developed by the committee are attached.

### **The Class Size Committee suggested:**

1. Class size maximum is 40 (noting that the large-lecture chart calculations are based on a 40-cap class).
2. With the exception of those courses currently at 35 or above, that a five year timeline be established for implementation, in alignment with curriculum review.

3. Workload inequities, relevant to Appendix B, have potential to influence class capacity and warrant further review.

This initial recommendation was the basis from which bargaining continued with regard to the topic of class size. In bargaining sessions, the YFA and district teams realized that there were logical groupings of courses that might share class maximums. To establish consistency, the teams agreed to a process to assign similar groups of classes to one of four standard class sizes: 25, 30, 35, or 40 students. The District's latest Contract Proposal also listed 45 as a possible option in this list. The new 45-student option might potentially be used for appropriate courses to balance some classes potentially decreasing capacity to 25 or 30. Management of a comprehensive college district requires the constant balancing of faculty weekly student contact hours and class size in order to remain fiscally stable.

## 2. Standardized Workload

At almost all community college districts in California, the workload for an instructional faculty member is calculated based on the hours of lecture and laboratory for each course according to a standardized formula where lab hours are related to lecture hours. In faculty contracts, this approach is referred to in various ways, including "Equated Hours," "Lecture Hour Equivalents or LHE," "Teaching Units," "Classroom Teaching Load Calculation," and similar phrases.

YCCD is a rare exception to this rule. In the YCCD, we do *not* have a standardized formula for workload across the district. This lack of standardization has resulted in some structural inequities within the District – full-time faculty members teaching the *same* course for the *same* hours of lecture and laboratory may earn *different* percentages of their loads depending on the circumstance.

**Examples:** The following examples illustrate these inequities. Each example assumes the faculty member is teaching a four-unit class, with three units of lecture and one unit of lab, for a total of 54 hours of lecture + 54 hours of lab = 108 total hours of instruction.

1. Automotive Technology
  - a. MJC: Lec 15% + Lab 15% = 30% Total Load
  - b. Columbia: Lec 20% + Lab 15% = 35% Total Load
2. Computer Science
  - a. MJC: Lec 18.18% + Lab 18.18% = 36.36% Total Load
  - b. Columbia: Lec 20% + Lab 15% = 35% Total Load
3. Biology
  - a. MJC: Lec 20% + Lab 15% = 35% Total Load
  - b. Columbia: Lec 20% + Lab 15% = 35% Total Load

The reader may notice that loads for these two biology courses are the same at both colleges, but they don't match the other two classes at MJC in the previous examples. These examples illustrate that YCCD faculty load for an equivalent class may differ among departments at MJC (automotive vs. computer science vs. biology) and between colleges (automotive and computer science). The variability is small but real, and when multiplied by all of the inconsistent lecture-lab loads this inequity may occur across *hundreds* of sections per year. Each division office has to calculate loads for different disciplines

differently, making it particularly difficult to double-check results at the division level and negating effectiveness of central review. The District wants people to receive equal pay for equal work. Two faculty members teaching the same class should receive the same work load calculation.

In the Contract Proposal, the District proposes standardizing workload across all departments at both colleges to eliminate the variability, establish consistency from class to class, department to department, and college to college, and simplify calculations for effective double-checking at the college level to help ensure proper compensation for all faculty.

The four purple lines (automotive, computer science, and biology at Columbia and biology at MJC) are identical, however. *All disciplines* at Columbia College and *all disciplines* in the Science, Mathematics, and Engineering Division at MJC use a standardized 0.75 prorating factor on laboratory hours across all subjects. This means a 54-hour lecture equals 20% load and a 54-hour lab equals 75% of that, or 15% load.

The District proposal is to standardize all courses across all disciplines at both colleges in this same manner. This approach is consistent with the standardized approach used at almost every other community college district in the state. Throughout negotiations, establishing a standardized approach to workload has been a critical element of the District's goal, and will accomplish several important goals.

- Eliminate the department-by-department variability of loads as described in Appendix B.
- Ensure consistency of loads across departments at each college.
- Ensure consistency of loads in the same subject but across both colleges.
- Enable easier checking of loads at the college level to ensure all faculty are paid properly.

As workloads are standardized across the district, the total teaching load for some classes will decrease, some will increase, and some will remain the same. District calculations of the overall impact of standardizing workload indicate a slight net *increase* in overall faculty load. That is, the standardization will result in *more compensation overall* to the faculty for the same set of classes.

Standardized workload, as outlined above, also promotes sustainable instructional costs. Each 54-hour lecture would be 20% load and each 54-hour lab would be 15% load. The difference in load between lecture and laboratory is necessary to account for most labs having fewer students than most lectures. A lecture with 35 students has an FTES/FTEF ratio of 18. A lab with 25 students has an FTES/FTEF ratio of 17.14. These two values are quite close together, meaning a 25-student lab is almost as "efficient" as a 35-student lecture, and resulting in overall college "efficiency" in the mid 17's, as is expected across California.

The District's proposal is to standardize labs at 75% of lectures, as described above (almost all labs in the District are already at .75%). The YFA has asked for labs to be increased to 85% instead. Continuing the example above, a lab with 25 students using YFA's proposed factor results in an FTES/FTEF ratio of only 15.13, far below the mid 17's. Moving all our labs to the prorating factor proposed by YFA would result in a significant decline in our overall FTES/FTEF ratio – which is already too low. Overall our District's Fall 2017 FTES/FTEF ratio was only 16.12. We need to improve this ratio into the mid 17's. Any courses above 16.12 will move this value up, but any below will pull it down. 25-student labs at 15% total load

as proposed by the District will improve this district-wide ratio, while those proposed by the YFA will lower the district-wide ratio which would result in less revenue for the District.

**It is incumbent upon the administrators and the Board of Trustees to propose contractual language that attends to the economic realities of state funding.** The standardized workload proposed by the District promotes consistency and fiscal viability. Currently, the District's instructional operations are not efficient enough to support an increase in the laboratory load prorating factor.

### **3. Compensation**

The District negotiating team has listened carefully to the concerns expressed by the YFA negotiating team regarding matters of compensation. The YFA has raised valid points about inequities and structural problems in the current compensation model and has provided evidence indicating that total compensation for YCCD faculty members falls significantly below the median of the previously negotiated cohort.

**The District's Contract Proposal contains significant salary increases to the YFA. Compounded over two years, all faculty members will receive a net increase of at least 6.08%, with some as high as 7.17% due to the proposed migration to a 25-step salary schedule.** The YFA has not accepted the pending proposed salary increase. In addition, they are demanding the receipt of a plan from the District to get to the median salary of the negotiated cohort (Chabot/Las Positas, Contra Costa, Grossmont/Cuyamaca, Kern, Long Beach, Palomar, San Joaquin Delta, San Jose/Evergreen, State Center, and West Valley/Mission.). The relevant contract language (Article 14, Section 14.1) states that there is a **goal** that YCCD Faculty rank at least median of the cohort of comparable districts on each benchmark. This language is aspirational and the current Contract Proposal offer on the table moves faculty salaries significantly and permanently toward this goal.

**Major Fiscal Factors:** There are two major factors constraining the District's ability to promise public tax dollars for the purpose of additional higher salary increases. First, the cost of retirement payments to PERS and STRS is increasing dramatically each year. What used to be 8% of a teacher's salary is increasing to over 19%, and a PERS member is increasing from under 12% to almost 27% of salaries (see CCLC pension rates webpage). These increases represent actual dollars that the District must pay out each year to support employee retirement plans. The District Fiscal Services team is working diligently to find ways to pay these costs for our employees. But any money spent on *retirement* for employees cannot *also* be spent on *salary increases* for employees. Even if faculty salaries remain constant from one year to the next, the total compensation of each faculty member increases by approximately 2% every year just to support his/her retirement. As employees, we *all* want our retirement to be there and be strong when we are ready for it. The YCCD Leadership is committed to honoring our retirees and ensuring our active employees have a strong retirement system in place.

A second major factor is that the state is implementing a significant change in the statewide funding allocation model (see CCLC funding formula webpage). In February, the California Department of Finance (DOF) released a "simulation" worksheet that showed how each Community College District would fare under their proposed formula. Some districts stood to gain as much as \$20 million, while others would lose up to \$11 million. In that simulation, YCCD received only a slight decline in revenue. However, with such a wide swing from "winners" to "losers" it is clear that the DOF formula cannot be the final version. (In fact, it stirred such controversy that the simulation page has been taken off-line.)

The statewide community college CEO group has proposed an alternative formula, as has the CBO group. But as of this writing, no additional simulations are available. And as a result, the amount of funds that YCCD will receive in 2018-19 and beyond *is completely unknown*. There is a "hold harmless" provision for at least the first year, ensuring that total revenue does not decline; however, colleges in the "hold harmless" category do not receive COLA, thus resulting in a fiscal loss due to higher annual operating costs. **But there is no way to project the District's revenue in future years. It is just unknown.**

The Board of Trustees discussed these realities and the implications of salary increases for the current and future years. The Board understands that faculty total compensation reportedly falls below the goal of reaching median of the contractual cohort and they would like to close as much of the gap below median as possible given current fiscal realities. But the Board and the District must act prudently to protect the health of the organization. To that end, the Board authorized increases of 2% for the 2017-18 year and 4% for the 2018-19 year, plus several structural adjustments designed to improve faculty lifetime earnings, improve adjunct parity, and clear a few thorny issues, as delineated below. This **6% increase over two years** represents a significant investment in faculty salaries, particularly considering the two factors above. It is offered to conclude the previous cycle of negotiations, provide stability for ongoing discussions through 2018-19, and close a significant portion of the gap goal below median. The District remains hopeful that the new state funding formula *may* result in *improved* funding to the YCCD, which may permit further closing of the gap goal in the 2019-20 year and beyond. But if the new funding formula results in a *decline* in funding for the YCCD, then an automatic increase in faculty salaries for subsequent years would be impossible to sustain. Consequently, the District offer is silent on salary for 2019-20.

**Retroactive Pay:** The YFA has requested retroactive salary payments for the 2016-17 year. However, there was no COLA provided to the District for 2016-17, and as a result no employee groups were given raises for that year. By contrast, a COLA of 1.56% was given to the District for 2017-18 which was offered at an *increased rate* to all employee groups as a **2%** salary increase in August of 2017. CSEA and the Leadership Team accepted the 2% increase at that time, resulting in the 2% increase for 11 months of the 2017-18 year. YFA chose not to accept the offer at that time. However, the offer most recently presented to YFA includes the 2% raise on all earnings from July 1, 2017 through the present, which will result in faculty receiving the 2% increase for the 2017-18 year.

**Effect on Comparison to the Cohort:** Collectively, the structural changes and two raises will significantly modify our current faculty salary schedule. How faculty salaries in the YCCD compare to those of faculty in other districts in the cohort will need to be carefully analyzed by both YFA and YCCD to ensure we have a mutual understanding. Adjustments to contract language will be needed. For instance, one of the comparison benchmarks in the contract is the salary on step 30 – yet the new salary structure will not *have* a step 30. How should we address this issue? Another example: Since the adoption of the current cohort, the composition of multi-college districts within 100 miles of YCCD has changed. Should the cohort be adjusted to include the districts that currently meet the criteria? What should happen with those districts that are now Basic Aid? These questions and many others need to be addressed at the negotiations table to establish mutual understanding between the YFA and YCCD. By establishing pay increases for 2017-18 and 2018-19, the teams can meet regularly through 2018-19 to review the tenets of the cohort and determine how the new state funding formula will affect the YCCD. Together, the teams can determine next steps regarding progress toward the goal of median of the cohort in

2019-20 and thereafter – whether the existing cohort, a revised one, or something else determined together.

**Compensation Details Explained:** The February 23, 2018, Contract Proposal from the YCCD to the YFA included the following components:

1. Increase salary schedules by 2% on schedule for the 2017-18 academic year, paid retroactively for work since July 1, 2017, and implemented on monthly pay checks as soon after approval of the agreement as practicable.
2. **Background:** The current full-time salary schedule (FT) includes steps 1 through 32, with the first two steps stricken in the previous cycle of negotiations. No new full-time faculty members have been assigned to steps 1 or 2 since the current contract was implemented.

**Contract Proposal:** Effective July 1, 2018, condense the salary schedule from 30 steps to 25 steps to ensure that faculty members arrive at the maximum salary more quickly. This will be achieved by converting Step 3 (first viable FT step) to Step A on the new schedule, Step 4 to Step B, and so on, with some two-steps-to-one conversions for higher steps as illustrated in the tables below.

3. Also effective July 1, 2018, increase the new 25-step salary schedule by 4% over the 2017-18 schedule (for **a total of 6% over two years**). Each faculty member will be moved to the first step on the 25-step 2018-19 salary schedule (same pay column) that results in the *at least a 4% increase* over his/her salary on the 30-step 2017-18 salary schedule. In this way, no faculty member will receive *less* than 4%, but the compression process results in some faculty members receiving *more* than a 4% increase from year to year – a benefit that each employee will partake in as they pass through additional step increases for additional years of service.
4. **Part-Time Equity Issues:**  
**Background:** The current Part-Time and Overload hourly pay schedule (PTOL) has 10 steps in fall and spring and 13 steps in summer. Unlike the full-time schedule (see #2), the first two steps of the PTOL schedule were not stricken in the last cycle of negotiations. Therefore, unlike new full-time placements, some new adjunct instructors may have been placed on steps 1 and 2 of the PTOL schedule.

**More background:** Prior to the District's adoption of a compressed calendar, our terms were 18 weeks long but the state only paid us for 17.5 weeks, the maximum "term length multiplier" permitted by code. PTOL faculty members were paid hourly for these 17.5 weeks. A typical 3-unit lecture class met for 54 hours but only earned 52.5 hours of apportionment pay from the state and the faculty member was paid for 52.5 hours of instruction. Under the current compressed calendar, the District is now able to claim all 54 hours of instruction. Item 4.d is offered to increase the payment to the faculty member to 54 hours of instruction.

**Contract Proposal:** The District has proposed to increase the PTOL schedule in four ways to improve "adjunct parity" (see Article 14.2).

- a. Strike steps 1 and 2, like on the FT schedule. Move any adjunct faculty member on steps 1 or 2 up to Step 3, corresponding to the new Step A.
- b. Establish Steps A through K (11 total steps) at 1/1050 of the corresponding step on the FT schedule, in improvement from the previous multiplier of 1/1055. This provides a slight movement toward parity, as defined in the Article 14.2.
- c. Pay *all* adjunct and overload faculty with sufficient years of service (steps) through Step K for *all* terms. This results in a three-step increase in pay for all PTOL classes taught in fall and spring, for those with sufficient seniority. The proposal standardizes PTOL pay across all three terms, using the highest rate for all, and eliminates the summer differential.
- d. Pay each PTOL instructor the number of hours on the course outline of record (18 paid hours per lecture unit and 54 hours per lab unit, an increase from 17.5 hours and 52.5 hours respectively).
- e. Three additional items for adjunct faculty:
  - i. The District and the YFA will meet in the 2018-19 year to strive for a workable model to fund paid office hours for adjunct faculty.
  - ii. Adjunct faculty may purchase life insurance through the District in the same way as full-time faculty, with rates that may be preferable to what they can obtain as individuals.
  - iii. Adjunct faculty assigned multiple teaching sites in a given day may claim mileage payments for miles driven between sites. Adjunct mileage may also be available, depending on funding, for classes taught outside the district such as in Mariposa or Jackson.
- f. **Example:** To illustrate the impact of the increases to the FT and PTOL pay schedules and items 4a-4d above, consider an adjunct faculty member currently paid in Column IV, Step 10, (\$76.64/hr) for fall and spring classes, the highest available PTOL rate without a doctorate. Assume the instructor has sufficient experience to be merit Step 13 or higher if it were available. The faculty member teaches a single 3-unit lecture course.
  - i. Current Payment in Fall or Spring:  $52.5 \text{ hrs} \times \$76.64/\text{hr} = \$4,023.60$
  - ii. Current Payment in Summer (at Step 13):  $52.5 \text{ hrs} \times \$83.92/\text{hr} = \$4,405.80$
  - iii. Payment in Fall 2018 and beyond, if ratified (at Step K):  $54 \text{ hrs} \times \$89.45/\text{hr} = \$4,830.30$
  - iv. Notice that  $\$4,830.30/\$4,023.60 = 120\%$ . This means a seasoned adjunct faculty member with extensive units of credit will be compensated 20% more next fall than last fall.

### ***Visualizing the Salary Modifications over Time***

The table below shows how salaries are proposed to be modified in alignment with the details above. The tables only show Column IV of each schedule for clarity. However, the same mechanics apply to all columns.

- **Orange header** = Current 2015-16 salary schedule, which also represents faculty salaries for the 2016-17 year.
- **Blue header** = Proposed 2017-18 salary schedule, reflecting a 2% increase over 2016-17
- **Green header** = Proposed 2018-19 salary schedule, reflecting a 4% increase over 2017-18 and compressing to only 25 steps.
- **"Transition to 2018-19" Section**
  - First column shows what a straight 4% increase would be on each step
  - Second column shows the first new step (from the green column) that *least exceeds* a 4% increase.
  - Arrows and blue triangles indicate how each step number will move to the new salary schedule. Step 3 becomes A, 4 becomes B, ...both 16 and 17 become N, etc.

		<b>Transition to 2018-19</b>						
		<b>Current 2015-16</b>	<b>Proposed 2017-18</b>	<b>For minimum 4% increase, 2018-19 must be at least...</b>	<b>First step at or above 4% Increase</b>	<b>Arrows indicate compression to 25- step schedule</b>	<b>New Step</b>	<b>Proposed 2018-19</b>
<b>Current Step</b>	<b>IV Salary</b>	<b>IV Salary</b>					<b>IV Salary</b>	
1	57,817	58,973						
2	60,376	61,584						
3	62,936	64,195	66,763	66,763	→	A	66,763	
4	65,495	66,805	69,477	69,479	→	B	69,479	
5	68,057	69,418	72,195	72,194	→	C	72,194	
6	70,617	72,029	74,910	74,910	→	D	74,910	
7	73,178	74,642	77,628	77,626	→	E	77,626	
8	75,735	77,250	80,340	80,342	→	F	80,342	
9	78,297	79,863	83,058	83,057	→	G	83,057	
10	80,856	82,473	85,772	85,773	→	H	85,773	
11	83,417	85,085	88,488	88,489	→	I	88,489	
12	85,976	87,696	91,204	91,204	→	J	91,204	
13	88,537	90,308	93,920	93,920	→	K	93,920	
14	89,335	91,122	94,767	95,069	→	L	95,069	
15	90,131	91,934	95,611	96,217	→	M	96,217	
16	90,930	92,749	96,459	97,366	→	N	97,366	
17	91,727	93,562	97,304	97,366	→	O	98,514	
18	92,525	94,376	98,151	98,514	→	P	99,663	
19	93,321	95,187	98,994	99,663	→	Q	100,811	
20	94,120	96,002	99,842	100,811	→	R	101,960	
21	94,916	96,814	100,687	100,811	→	S	103,108	
22	95,714	97,628	101,533	101,960	→	T	104,257	
23	96,511	98,441	102,379	103,108	→	U	105,405	
24	97,309	99,255	103,225	104,257	→	V	106,554	
25	98,106	100,068	104,071	104,257	→	W	107,702	
26	98,905	100,883	104,918	105,405	→	X	108,851	
27	99,702	101,696	105,764	106,554	→	Y	109,999	
28	100,500	102,510	106,610	107,702	→			
29	101,297	103,323	107,456	107,702	→			
30	102,095	104,137	108,302	108,851	→			
31	102,891	104,949	109,147	109,999	→			
32	103,694	105,768	109,999	109,999	→			
		<b>Yellow cells represent the benchmarks on which the rest of the schedule is built.</b>						

The YFA and YCCD also measure "**30-Year Career Earnings**" to represent the overall career "buying power" of a salary schedule. This is calculated by taking the sum of the thirty annual salaries in each column. The table below indicates that the 2% increase for 2017-18 improves 30-year career earnings by \$53,338 but the subsequent 4% increase *plus compression to 25 steps* increases career earnings by \$149,060, or almost *three* times as much, not just double as one might expect. By compressing to 25 steps, allowing the faculty member to get to the highest pay step five years earlier, career earnings increased by a large margin. Moreover, the two-year increase in career earnings based on the 2018-19 schedule compared to the 2016-17 (which equaled 2015-16) is over \$200,000. This potential *increase* is over three times the starting salary on the pay schedule, in a sense representing earnings for three additional years worked.

		Current 2015-16	Proposed 2017-18	Proposed 2018-19	
"Year of Career"	Current Step	IV Salary	IV Salary	IV Salary	New Step
1	3	62,936	64,195	66,763	A
2	4	65,495	66,805	69,479	B
3	5	68,057	69,418	72,194	C
4	6	70,617	72,029	74,910	D
5	7	73,178	74,642	77,626	E
6	8	75,735	77,250	80,342	F
7	9	78,297	79,863	83,057	G
8	10	80,856	82,473	85,773	H
9	11	83,417	85,085	88,489	I
10	12	85,976	87,696	91,204	J
11	13	88,537	90,308	93,920	K
12	14	89,335	91,122	95,069	L
13	15	90,131	91,934	96,217	M
14	16	90,930	92,749	97,366	N
15	17	91,727	93,562	98,514	O
16	18	92,525	94,376	99,663	P
17	19	93,321	95,187	100,811	Q
18	20	94,120	96,002	101,960	R
19	21	94,916	96,814	103,108	S
20	22	95,714	97,628	104,257	T
21	23	96,511	98,441	105,405	U
22	24	97,309	99,255	106,554	V
23	25	98,106	100,068	107,702	W
24	26	98,905	100,883	108,851	X
25	27	99,702	101,696	109,999	Y
26	28	100,500	102,510	109,999	Y
27	29	101,297	103,323	109,999	Y
28	30	102,095	104,137	109,999	Y
29	31	102,891	104,949	109,999	Y
30	32	103,694	105,768	109,999	Y
<b>30-Year Career Earnings</b>		<b>2,666,830</b>	<b>2,720,168</b>	<b>2,869,228</b>	
<b>Year to Year Increase</b>			<b>53,338</b>	<b>149,060</b>	
<b>Two Year Net Increase</b>				<b>202,398</b>	

An examination of the **cumulative effect of these raises and compression** by percentage and real dollar differences is also revealing. The table below demonstrates that each step increases 2% for 2017-18. However, in achieving a *minimum* of 4% during the compression process for 2018-19, some faculty members will receive raises as high as 5.06%. Compounded over two years, all faculty members will receive a net increase of at least 6.08%, with some as high as 7.17%.

However, it is also important to remember that faculty members not yet at the highest step earn an additional step for each year of service. The final two columns represent the *actual increase* in real salary for a faculty member currently at or below step 30. For example, a faculty member on step 3 in 2016-17 will be on step C by 2018-19, and the salary received will be 14.71% *above* her salary for 2016-17, with an additional \$9,258 in earnings. Faculty will see a real increase of as much as \$10,503 *per year* more than would be earned if no changes were made to the schedule.

Increases Over Time						
In 2016-17 on Step...	In 2018-19 on Step...	2017-18 over 2016-17	2018-19 over 2017-18	2018-19 over 2016-17	2018-19 over 2016-17 Including Step Advancement*	Annual Earnings Difference Including Step Advancement*: 2018-19 versus 2016-17
3	A	2%	4.00%	6.08%	NA	NA
4	B	2%	4.00%	6.08%	NA	NA
5	C	2%	4.00%	6.08%	14.71%	9,258
6	D	2%	4.00%	6.08%	14.38%	9,415
7	E	2%	4.00%	6.08%	14.06%	9,569
8	F	2%	4.00%	6.08%	13.77%	9,725
9	G	2%	4.00%	6.08%	13.50%	9,879
10	H	2%	4.00%	6.08%	13.25%	10,038
11	I	2%	4.00%	6.08%	13.02%	10,192
12	J	2%	4.00%	6.08%	12.80%	10,348
13	K	2%	4.00%	6.08%	12.59%	10,503
14	L	2%	4.33%	6.42%	10.58%	9,093
15	M	2%	4.66%	6.75%	8.67%	7,680
16	N	2%	4.98%	7.08%	8.99%	8,031
17	N	2%	4.07%	6.15%	8.03%	7,235
18	O	2%	4.38%	6.47%	8.34%	7,584
19	P	2%	4.70%	6.80%	8.65%	7,936
20	Q	2%	5.01%	7.11%	8.96%	8,286
21	Q	2%	4.13%	6.21%	8.03%	7,490
22	R	2%	4.44%	6.53%	8.33%	7,840
23	S	2%	4.74%	6.84%	8.63%	8,192
24	T	2%	5.04%	7.14%	8.93%	8,543
25	T	2%	4.19%	6.27%	8.03%	7,746
26	U	2%	4.48%	6.57%	8.32%	8,096
27	V	2%	4.78%	6.87%	8.61%	8,448
28	W	2%	5.06%	7.17%	8.89%	8,797
29	W	2%	4.24%	6.32%	8.02%	8,000
30	X	2%	4.53%	6.62%	8.31%	8,351
31	Y	2%	4.81%	6.91%	8.59%	8,702
32	Y	2%	4.00%	6.08%	7.74%	7,904

\* A faculty member at Step 30 or less on the current schedule progressed one step after 2016-17 and will progress a second step after 2017-18. The columns to the right indicates the resulting salary two steps down the same pay column after the two raises are applied, representing the actual salary increase since 2016-17.

Together, these three tables illustrate **that the offer provided to the YFA by the District is not simply "2 + 4 = 6 percent" but represents a generous and significant financial investment in the faculty. It is as generous as can be offered under the current fiscal constraints.** Its tenets, particularly the 25-step schedule, will have long-lasting impact on future negotiations as well. The District is anxious to sit down with YFA and determine the impact these increases have had in comparison to the existing cohort, and to also discuss and possibly develop mutually agreeable modifications to the cohort itself to meet our current mutual needs.

### **Benefits**

Health rates are released in mid-April, and graduation is at the end of April. The health benefits plan year starts each October 1. In the 2016-17 plan year the lowest cost health plan was \$1430. The District contribution for the YFA remained at \$1420 as the parties did not reach agreement on a successor collective bargaining agreement and YFA chose not to negotiate during the summer of 2016. As a consequence, faculty has had to pay \$10 out of pocket which represents the difference between the District's negotiated contribution and the lowest cost health plan. The 2016-17 fiscal year has long closed, and no new funds were budgeted during 2017-18. The District has offered retroactive payment effective October 1, 2017, to remain within the current fiscal year.

### **4. Closing Thoughts**

It has taken 29 months to reach this point, and there has been much commentary and hard work put in by both YFA and District representatives. When breaks in the negotiations are tallied (e.g. Summers 2016, 2017, winter breaks, etc.), nearly 12 months were lost.

At the core our mission is to educate students. For every decision we must ask, "How will this benefit students?" The Board of Trustees and the District's administrators are charged with keeping the District fiscally viable to ensure this mission continues. The District remains open to further discuss in good faith the content of the Contract Proposal currently on the table and other remaining issues.