

LCCEA November 2008 Bargaining Survey

Mid-Bargaining Survey

Faculty members: Your LCCEA Bargaining Team has been bargaining with the College since April and we need your input. Please take a few minutes to complete the following bargaining survey.

Please submit a completed survey by 6:00 p.m. Monday, November 17; you may submit responses after this date, but we will begin to analyze the results then in preparations for bargaining on Tuesday. (you may access the survey as many times as you wish; you may only submit your survey once)

Summaries of current College and Association package proposals may be found at <https://lccea.lanecc.edu/bargaining/>

Many questions ask you to indicate whether you would currently accept the College's proposals, reject them and commit to engage in work actions SHORT of a strike, or reject them and vote to strike over them.

Please note that this is a SURVEY ONLY, NOT a binding VOTE. However, it is essential that the bargaining team has a clear picture of what members will commit to do in order to get a settlement. When answering each of these questions, assume that other issues are resolved. Finally, also note that if the faculty later vote to strike, preparations for the strike will ensure that strike funds are available to all picketers.

Please e-mail lccea@lanecc.edu if you have any problems submitting the survey. Your LCCEA Bargaining Team: Dean Bergen, Chair; Stacey Kiser; Adrienne Mitchell, Jim Salt, John Lorang (OEA)

1. LCC department/division (titles are from College -- please e-mail LCCEA with any corrections; departments with only one faculty member are not listed to preserve anonymity -- please indicate 'Other')

Academic Learning Skills	3.5%	(4)
Adult Basic and Secondary Education	4.3%	(5)
Advanced Technology	5.2%	(6)
Art and Applied Design	3.5%	(4)
Aviation Academy	0.9%	(1)
Business	5.2%	(6)
Child & Family Education	2.6%	(3)
Computer Information Technology	2.6%	(3)

Cooperative Education	1.7%	(2)
Counseling	2.6%	(3)
Culinary and Hospitality Management	1.7%	(2)
English as a Second Language	4.3%	(5)
Health & Physical Education	6.1%	(7)
Health Clinic	0.9%	(1)
Health Professions	8.7%	(10)
Language, Literature, and Communication	12.2%	(14)
Library	0.9%	(1)
Mathematics	3.5%	(4)
Music, Dance and Theatre Arts	0.9%	(1)
Science	8.7%	(10)
Social Science	16.5%	(19)
Student Life & Leadership Development		(0)
Other	1.7%	(2)
TOTAL	98.3%	113 (115)

2. For 2008-2009: the College proposes a 1.0% COLA (plus the 1.75% adjustment from OEBS savings already applied for a total of 2.75%); the Association Package 1 proposes 2.53% (plus the 1.75% for a total of 4.28%) and Package 2 proposes 1.85% (plus the 1.75% for a total of 3.6%). Package 1 is based upon the CPI change of 4.28%. You would vote to

accept the College proposal	18.3%	(21)
reject the College proposal	81.7%	(94)
TOTAL	100.0%	115 (115)

3. ANSWER ONLY IF you rejected the College proposal in the previous question: You would _____ over this issue.

commit to engage in job actions (e.g. contact Board of Education members, work to contract, etc)	58.3%	(67)
vote to strike	20.0%	(23)
TOTAL	78.3%	90 (115)

4. For 2008-2009: the College proposes providing only 1/2 step increases to those due them; the Association Package 1 proposes full steps retroactive to July 1, 2008; Package 2 proposes providing full steps to those due them starting January 1, 2009 (the latter would postpone steps until Winter 2009, but leave faculty starting Fall 2009 with their full step). You would vote to

accept the College proposal	14.8%	(17)
reject the College proposal	82.6%	(95)
TOTAL	97.4%	112 (115)

5. ANSWER ONLY IF you rejected the College proposal in the previous question: You would _____ over this issue.

commit to engage in job actions (e.g. contact Board of Education members, work to contract, etc)	59.1%	(68)
vote to strike	21.7%	(25)
TOTAL	80.9%	93 (115)

6. For 2008-2009: the College proposes to slash the part-time flight tech salary schedule by over 25%, create a two-tiered faculty, and eliminate longstanding contract language. Both Association Packages propose treating flight tech faculty salary provisions no differently from contracted and part-time (i.e., COLAs and steps) and no other changes to salary schedules or language. The College proposal would establish separate salary and benefit provisions based upon year of hire, thus establishing a 'two-tiered' bargaining unit precedent that could threaten all faculty. You would vote to

accept the College proposal	13.9%	(16)
reject the College proposal	79.1%	(91)
TOTAL	93.0%	107 (115)

7. ANSWER ONLY IF you rejected the College proposal in the previous question: You would _____ over this issue.

commit to engage in job actions (e.g. contact Board of Education members, work to contract, etc)	56.5%	(65)
vote to strike	19.1%	(22)
TOTAL	75.7%	87 (115)

8. Our Main Agreement calls for bargaining over a three-year economic agreement (2008-2011). The College is only proposing a one year contract (2008-2009), to be followed by bargaining this year for a two year reopener for 2009-2011. Your Bargaining Team has proposed a three-year agreement (2008-2011) in Package 1 and a two-year agreement (2008-2010) in Package 2 to be followed by a new Main Agreement (2010 - TBD). You would vote to

accept the College proposal	9.6%	(11)
reject the College proposal and support a three year agreement	41.7%	(48)
reject the College proposal and support a two year agreement	46.1%	(53)
TOTAL	97.4%	112 (115)

9. The College has proposed to modify Article 6.2, making it easier for them to declare financial exigency. Currently the College may only declare financial exigency when there is a reduction of 5% or more in the level of state fund support from one year to the next, and a health insurance rate renewal increase in excess of 20%, and a majority vote of the College Board of Education. Under their proposal, the College could declare

financial exigency with only a reduction of 5% or more in the level of state support and a majority vote of the College Board of Education; health care renewal costs would no longer be a factor. Note that even if the College does declare financial exigency, Article 6.2 limits the College and Association to negotiating over reducing in-service days in lieu of the annual COLA for the following fiscal year. You would vote to

accept the College proposal	 18.3%	(21)
reject the College proposal	 75.7%	(87)
TOTAL	 93.9%	108 (115)

10. ANSWER ONLY IF you rejected the College proposal in the previous question:
You would _____ over this issue.

commit to engage in job actions (e.g. contact Board of Education members, work to contract, etc)	 55.7%	(64)
vote to strike	 16.5%	(19)
TOTAL	 72.2%	83 (115)

11. Regardless of your answers to the questions above, regarding the College proposal as a whole, you would vote to

accept the College proposal	 10.4%	(12)
reject the College proposal	 85.2%	(98)
TOTAL	 95.7%	110 (115)

12. ANSWER ONLY IF you rejected the College proposal in the previous question:
You would _____ over this issue.

commit to engage in job actions (e.g. contact Board of Education members, work to contract, etc)	 56.5%	(65)
vote to strike	 25.2%	(29)
TOTAL	 81.7%	94 (115)

13. Association Package 1 proposes full COLA (4.28% when including 1.75% from OEBS savings), full steps retroactive to July 1 2008, maintenance of a 172 day work year for 2008-2009 only (return to 175 days next year), a three-year agreement, 'Tier 3' members paid for unused sick leave at retirement, plus non-economic language on workloads, complaint procedures, charters and other proposals (see LCCEA website for full details). Please indicate the level of your support, where 1 = Very High and 5 = Very Low.

1	 45.2%	(52)
2	 25.2%	(29)
3	 14.8%	(17)
4	 4.3%	(5)
5	 7.8%	(9)
TOTAL	 97.4%	112 (115)

14. Association Package 2 proposes 3.6% COLA (when including 1.75% from OEBB savings), full steps starting January 1 2009, maintenance of a 172 day work year for 2008-2009 only (return to 175 days next year), a two-year agreement, plus non-economic language on workloads, complaint procedures, charters, 'Tier 3' members paid for unused sick leave at retirement, greater flexibility for part-time insurance eligibility, faculty chairs, eliminating transportation fee, providing new College budget data, and other proposals (see LCCEA website for details). Please indicate the level of your support, where 1 = Very High and 5 = Very Low.

1		23.5%	(27)
2		37.4%	(43)
3		21.7%	(25)
4		5.2%	(6)
5		10.4%	(12)
TOTAL		98.3%	113 (115)

15. Please RATE (not rank) the importance of each of the following non-economic Association proposals where 1 is the top priority and 5 is the lowest:

	Average rank					
	1	2	3	4	5	
New language protecting faculty during complaint procedures						(2.3)
Making charters binding						(2.6)
New language protecting faculty workloads						(2.0)
Establishing a faculty chair pilot program						(2.9)
Providing greater flexibility for part-time faculty to maintain insurance eligibility						(2.1)
Providing the Association detailed College budget data						(1.9)

16. Comments:

Response

1 A big thank you to the bargaining team. We should thank the community for taking care of the college's environment; it is time for the college to come to the table with a fair offer.

1 Along with workload and complaint procedure protection, I would like the bargaining team to address the language regarding grievances of college policy that was accepted for the current main agreement. This language does not serve the Association, in any way, and drastically weakens our overall grievance language, in my view. LMC is *not* the place to be addressing/processing grievances.

1 As an overworked and underpaid part-time faculty member, I do NOT feel very engaged in this process, and don't really care what happens. Plus, we need to accept the REALITY of the current terrible economic times.

1 Don't think any members should be paid for unused sick leave at retirement. This is an out of date luxury. Strongly desire a COLA at or above rate of inflation and greater flexibility for part-time insurance eligibility. AND ensure that PT faculty are not taken advantage of (PT being offered \$15 hr to teach a credit class that was considered part of FT faculty FTE and they were paid at contracted rate - this is going on.)

1 Given the current state of the economy and its impending worsening, I would support the Association's Package 2. And a big thank you to the Bargaining Team for your continuing hard work on behalf of the faculty.

1 Having student evaluations not seen by division deans is a big problem in our dept! Students have a lot of complaints about a particular faculty member's lack of performance, but there is no way for the dean to find out this is happening (unless students write letters, which they don't).

1 I am happy to help advocate for the union, but I do have full-time elder care after my work day. Any volunteering would need to be done from my office during my lunch breaks or from home on weekends.

1 I am happy with the progress, so far, of the Bargaining team. Thank you. I am MOST concerned over workload, compensation (COLA included), and recognized step advancement. I also feel strongly that 'vote to strike' is a tactic to employ only when the Administration is deemed to be purposefully and willingly engaged in stone-walling the bargaining process.

1 I appreciate all of your efforts. I think we are being offered a truly rotten deal from the college. The move to OEBC is personally VERY expensive for me (most of my Rx's come with a \$100 copay!!), so I believe it is time to hold the line with the contract. I am ready, willing and able to strike and I think the board/Spilde believes we are all easy marks. GO TEAM

1 I honestly don't feel as if I've been given sufficient information over the bargaining process in order to understand some of the issues on the table, and I don't have sufficient time right now to plow through all the language on the website. What happened to our updates? My general sense is that we are in hard economic times and we won't get a ton of support from the community if we strike, especially given the fact that we just won the bond. I'd settle for a wage freeze if we got additional faculty to help with work load and if the administration made steps to ameliorate our horrible moral situation, such as behaving well or telling the truth. Sorry to sound so hopeless, but I can't say I enjoy being at LCC most days, despite the rewards of teaching.

1 I know a holistic approach is best, but if it were at all possible to bargain baseline economic factors (insurance, COLA) separately from charters, and other "quality of work-life" matters, I encourage it. I would be content with cost of living maintenance, which in this inflationary environment is a lot. I also think that it would be absolutely fine to keep to 172-day year--the inservice in the fall is useless after a couple days. If we could add an inservice day to each term, that would be a different story.

1 I noticed that in the administration's proposal there was language regarding part-time seniority, but did not see any language within the union's proposal. I wonder if the union recognizes the issues to part-timers in regards to seniority within the part-time structure of the contract and how it affects morale. Who came up with that idea to have part-timers on seniority? I have been here for almost five years, and I am still low man on the part-time, seniority totem pole. I am fairly confident in my ability, and that if part-timers were assigned classes based on their ability, not time spent here, I would be assigned more classes. Also, as low man on the totem pole, we then get some of the classrooms that have not been switched over to smart classrooms. I leave a smart classroom, because that is where my 8 o'clock class is held, to run to another building, I run because I have 10 minutes, to a "smart" classroom (the computer is in a cabinet, that you wheel out into the classroom to hook up, the

projector, basically looks like an old slide projector, and there is no elmo). I leave the smart classroom, after my 8 o'clock class, for a full time contracted faculty member who does not use any of the technology in the room. My second classroom is better than the one I have in the afternoon - overhead projector, television on a cart, and a chalkboard (try finding chalk!) I have spent time away from teaching trying to figure out how to make computers work, where does the DVD go, and where is there more chalk. I don't mean to rant, but better morale is not all about pay increases and steps. I would love to have access to a smart classroom every time I teach, and the decision on whether or not to use the restroom will not determine whether I am late to class or not.

1 I recommend we stay with proposal 1. In addition, we should insist on detailed budget data as a matter of course. Failing ull budget disclosure, we should run a public information campaign on the matter.

1 I sincerely appreciate the work of the bargaining committee. I truly hope these issues are resolved before we feel the need to strike, however, I will support the Association if that happens.

1 I support Package I, although I would also like to see us avoid a strike. That said, I do understand the usefulness of threatening a strike.

1 I was bit disturbed by the work load being increased to 35 students per section. It would seem that this is unenforceable, due to absolute lack of quality classrooms to accommodate that number of students. It is understandable that these economic downturns require sacrifice from all levels of our society. Over the past several years we have given up work/paid days, accepted lower pay increases than the cost of living, and taken on increased work representing the college without much appreciation by the administration. I would like to see more appreciation for the work being done by our staff and classified employees by our administration, instead of placing obstacles in our paths to provide quality educational experiences for our students in the classroom, not just in the "student services".

1 Intellectual property and keeping the college from giving my online class to another instructor to teach without my consent (or preventing me from using it, should I teach elsewhere) is an important concern for me.

1 It was hard to answer the questions in this survey because you could not change your answer, there was no "unsure" or parts of both option. I think the flexibility for part-time faculty to maintain insurance eligibility is very important, but I don't think it is included in the Association Proposal 1. I would strongly support that for our part-timers. We lose part-timers to the U of O every year because their benefit package (even though our salary is better). I also think that if I was convinced that the college was truly in dire financial straights, I would answer the questions differently. I would be more amenable to the 1/2 step increase if it was retroactive to July 2008, for one thing. I would also strongly support any proposal that keeps us from returning to the bargaining table every year (!) to renegotiate. I think it lowers morale and creates an atmosphere of distrust or at least confusion on the part of the faculty toward the administration. It takes away from our mission and our energy to do the jobs we were hired to do.

1 Just support for the bargaining team through a difficult time. Keep the faith.

1 Not enough information on #15; i.e. could be good or horrible depending on the details. This survey should be used for organizing, to help in seeing how much of an effort it will take and the direction of the effort. Without organizing, lack of support in a survey means very little. It should not be used as a pretext for capitulating at the

bargaining table. Until the union leadership shows it is capable of organizing effective job actions, much less routine organizing, it is doubtful people will have confidence in this leadership during a strike. The survey, as such, is not a good measure of whether the membership could support a strike. There were no direct questions on the manipulation of the work year, so here is my opinion: No work was eliminated; it is just a pay cut; and the union leadership should be in the forefront of exposing this sham, not supporting it. While some people new to the top level may see the loss of pay through the work year cut as a net gain, the pay of those previously at the top should not be sacrificed for that purpose nor should that opportunism be allowed; it is not good for the whole of faculty.

1 Not knowing the actual language makes it difficult to rate non-economic Association proposals. Summaries of the proposals are not helpful.

1 Our salary has continued to fall in proportion to the increase in the cost of living over the 1st several years. Having been at level 3 for many years, I have seen minimal increase in my salary. I am most interested in seeing our pay increased. As always, thank you so much for the hard work that you do for us.

1 Remind the bargaining team that some of us have lost 50% or more in 403bs and though the economic times are bad, it is worse for us. Also I have 550% in Pers variable which I have never been able to change so I am doubly affected by the economy. Is not Tier 3 members being paid for sick leave a Pers function?

1 Thank YOu

1 Thank you for your continued efforts at bargaining. I would only ask that you PLEASE establish some very clear guidelines regarding the "decision to strike" process and that you CLEARLY communicate the process ahead of time to all faculty. In particular, I strongly feel that the decision to strike or not should be based on a clear majority vote of all faculty, rather than a "close" decision based on whoever participated in an online survey. That is, we should establish a minimum baseline level of support as x% supporting a strike action AMONG ALL FACULTY in order to declare that action. I also really desire more information about this "strike fund" that would be available. I have heard different amounts mentioned (\$100 per day?), available for all part-time and full-time both? Does the amount max out after a certain amount of days? Are we still covered by insurance? etc.. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

1 Thank you, you have all worked very hard and donated a lot of time to this. I think it's sad the college wants to continue wasting so much of so many people's time by negotiating every year and I'm tired of feeling to unappreciated by the administration. Morale at the college seems very low and the administration needs to realize that we work very hard and expect to be compensated fairly for that hard work.

1 Thanks for the ongoing time and effort of the bargaining team.

1 These are tough decisions. In an ideal world, I would vote to support Package 1 and back it with a strike threat. I, however, cannot afford to be on strike without pay for a long time. It would be helpful to provide those of us who have never done so, with information about the ramifications of a strike: financially, ethically, and logistically. Thanks for your hard work

1 This is my first term teaching part time at LCC. I am dedicated to doing a good job for my students. The amount of time I have had to spend on class preparation and dealing with students has added up to at least the equivalent of full time hours. I

don't consider the salary I am being paid commensurate with my qualifications, much less this unexpected workload. The faculty and staff at LCC seem to be stretched very thin. Materials and orientation for new faculty have been minimal. In fact, I would say that as someone new to the organization, the college was simply unprofessional in helping a new hire adjust to the environment. When a public institution finds itself financially strapped, it asks its employees to "shoulder their fair share of the burden". When and if conditions get better (a rare occurrence in today's world) they seem to forget those that help them make it through the hard times. They fail to make up for the lean years. As you might imagine, with the low pay and high expectations, I see my tenure at LCC being short lived. I'm sure many who work at the college feel the same way. The logical conclusion of this is that, in general, those who will remain at the college will be those unqualified to do anything else. Not a good way to provide a quality education to our students. If LCC is truly concerned about the education of their students, they must take steps to attract and retain quality faculty. The way to do this is through adequate compensation. Were I to see things turn around and compensation along with work expectations become more fair, I would probably be willing to stay with the college longer. I feel the union owes it to its employees and to LCC to push for fair and adequate compensation. Doing anything less shortchanges faculty, students, and LCC itself. As you might imagine, this combination

- 1 Though I voted not to strike, I do feel at some point it may have to be placed on the table. I think we many steps to go through before that would happen. I just wanted to state that I would support the action down the road.
- 1 Unlike some faculty, I think the bargaining team is working very hard in my best interest.
- 1 We must work with the administration to reach a "reasonable" contract settlement. There is only so much money available. If we could really see what's there we might be able to work with the administration more effectively.
- 1 We've been working longer hours with fewer resources for way too long. The way I see it, the college expects us to bail them out of this financial mess they've gotten themselves into. Faculty has already made sacrifices and administration still wants more from us. I'm fed up.
- 1 Why is there no organizing? A survey is the last thing the union should be doing, particularly with the Bond passing!
- 1 With the passage of the bond the college should step up and make sure that as one of the top cc's in the country we are treated as such. This means financial issues and others as well. Have specific contract language in regards to faculty and the classes they are assigned to teach. Have specific language that allows for contracted faculty under 1.0 to be assigned additonal duties based on seniority or other. Allow for contracted faculty to have the 1st option of teaching summer overload. The college really needs to take a look at the function of HR. HR need's to be reminded that they are supposed to look out for the best interest of the college and that does not always mean the best interest of the administration. If the Admin is incorrect on an issue then HR needs to base their actions on what is correct for the college not the Admin.

17. LCC Faculty Status

Contracted

 80.9% (93)

Part-time	17.4%	(20)
TOTAL	98.3%	113 (115)

18. CONTRACTED FACULTY MEMBERS ONLY: What is your salary step?

1		(0)
2		(0)
3	0.9%	(1)
4	0.9%	(1)
5	1.7%	(2)
6	0.9%	(1)
7	1.7%	(2)
8	9.6%	(11)
9	6.1%	(7)
10	5.2%	(6)
11	3.5%	(4)
12	7.8%	(9)
13	19.1%	(22)
Don't know	23.5%	(27)
TOTAL	80.9%	93 (115)

19. PART-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS ONLY: What is your salary step?

1		(0)
2		(0)
3		(0)
4		(0)
5		(0)
6		(0)
7		(0)
8		(0)
9		(0)
10		(0)
11	0.9%	(1)
12	2.6%	(3)
13		(0)
14	5.2%	(6)
Don't know	7.0%	(8)
TOTAL	15.7%	18 (115)

20. FLIGHT TECH PART-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS ONLY: What is your salary level/step?

1-1		(0)
1-2		(0)

1-3		(0)
1-4		(0)
1-5		(0)
1-6		(0)
1-7		(0)
2-1		(0)
2-2		(0)
2-3		(0)
2-4		(0)
2-5		(0)
2-6		(0)
2-7	0.9%	(1)
Don't know		(0)
TOTAL	0.9%	1 (115)

[Go back to Management Interface](#)

Powered By phpESP, v(2.1.4)