

[Help](#)

LCC Budget Survey - April 2007

LCCEA Member Survey – April 2007

On Friday, April 6th, responding to its significant revision upward of its projected deficit for FY08, the LCC administration asked the Association (as well as the Classified Federation) to informally discuss possible contract revisions for the FY08 year in order to reduce college expenses as an alternative to retrenchments and other administration proposed budget cuts. In explaining the new deficit projections, they cited higher medical insurance costs than previously projected, a projected \$1.8 million dollar FY07 deficit, and their desire to make a one-time payment of \$1.2M toward rebuilding the ending fund balance which they report as well below the level required by Board policy. Their suggested topics for discussion:

- Work year reductions (i.e., reduce the number of days in employee group work years and reduce COLAs by an equivalent percentage reduction)
- Increase instructional productivity
- Freeze COLAs
- Freeze steps
- Increase insurance out-of-paycheck increases to offset renewal rate increases

The College's plan is to present a list of cuts to the LCC Board on Monday, April 23rd. Their current plans appear to have a significant impact upon instruction and student services, including a combination of program cuts, elimination of some small disciplines, reduction of budgets for part-time faculty, reduction of release time, and instructions to department chairs to implement capacity utilization strategies (e.g. replacing classes typically experiencing lower enrollment with those with higher enrollment). Any contract concessions we make will be used to reduce the deficit and buy back some of the cuts that would otherwise occur in instruction. While we do not want your responses to the survey to be fear based, it would be irresponsible not to clarify the administration's plans and how the question before us relates to them.

Finally, please note that the College can *not* require the Association to agree to open up our contract, nor can it impose any revisions. The Association is free to either

reject the invitation, or accept the invitation and then walk away from any talks for any reason.

Survey Introduction

This survey is being conducted to provide the LCCEA executive board direction from members on how to respond to the College request. We ask you to read the survey and respond by 5:00 p.m. this Friday, April 20th (you may send responses after that time, but we plan to review the responses received by that time and make an initial determination on how to proceed). This survey is just that: a survey. It does not constitute pre-approval of any tentative agreement reached by the Association. If discussions are entered into and tentative agreements reached, they will be submitted to LCCEA members for a ratification vote.

We want to keep the survey short so that all Association members have time to read and respond, but we also want to provide some context for the survey questions, as well as to provide some possible arguments for and against the various options so that members can consider the questions and issues more fully. We certainly can't try to capture all of the arguments members may have for or against various options, let alone fully explore all of the issues. Nor should our listing of these arguments be seen as necessary endorsements of them; we are attempting to frame this as neutrally as possible. We do hope we've identified some key issues and provided important context and food for thought.

Survey Questions

Please read the whole survey before responding so you have a full picture of what the options presented are before answering the survey questions.

1.

- A. ♦ The Association should accept the Administration's request to discuss possible contract revisions for the FY08 year. ♦

Arguments in favor:

- The most obvious argument in favor of accepting the request is that while no one *wants* to open up their contract, it sometimes is better to do so to prevent

budget decisions that are more harmful to the faculty and the college. Many would argue that retrenchments are the most harmful impact on a faculty or other workgroup

- Retrenchments would not only be very harmful to faculty members and students, they would also reduce college revenues and result in greater, long term fiscal harm to the college, perhaps resulting in greater future painful and debilitating cuts, creating a so-called ↻spiraling down↻ effect
- An agreement could be pursued that requires the administration to meet related faculty interests, e.g. eliminating other budget plans or other harms to the faculty and the college
- An agreement can be tied directly to the level of state funding provided, and/or other objective financial conditions, so that only if certain criteria are met (e.g. worst case scenario for state funding) would the agreement come into play
- See below for other arguments specific to particular ↻proposals↻

Arguments against:

- A contract is a contract is a contract, and should be respected as such
- If the college can not afford the costs of its programs, services, etc, it should reduce them, not pass on the costs to the employees
- The administration should have foreseen the deficit and taken appropriate steps to ward it off
- The college should pursue other options, including growing revenue or making reductions allowable within existing contracts
- See below for other arguments specific to particular ↻proposals↻

Strongly Agree	23.4%	(33)
Agree	40.4%	(57)
Disagree	15.6%	(22)
Strongly Disagree	20.6%	(29)
TOTAL	100.0%	141 (141)

2.

B. If the survey results indicate faculty support for the Administration's request to discuss contractual revisions, a number of options may be considered, including five posed by the administration. In order to determine the faculty's preferences regarding such options, please answer each of the following questions, regardless of your answer to question A, above.

1. Possible reductions in the number of days in our work year and commensurate reductions in the COLA. E.g. three faculty work days constitute 1.71% of contracted faculty's work year, so a reduction of three in-service days would be equivalent to a 1.71% reduction in the cost of living adjustment (COLAs for next year are currently set at 2.47% for contracted faculty and 2.89% for part-time faculty).

Arguments in favor:

- Reductions in work days in exchange for commensurate reduction in COLA would provide a quid pro quo for faculty, where we receive something of equal value in exchange: i.e., less work for less pay.
- An agreement could require a reduction in administration organized in-service days, which many faculty have questioned the value of, while protecting faculty days (e.g. class prep days)
- Can be tied to time too agreements that require that all groups take comparable work year reductions
- Could be made permanent in future negotiations to provide recurring cost savings to the College, reducing future deficits
- If not also agreeing to COLA reductions or step freezes, all faculty would still receive some absolute salary increase

Arguments against:

- Reduces total annual income
- Reduces in-service days used to plan and organize important faculty and college work
- Once in-service days are reduced, it may be difficult to regain them [the contract runs through June 2011, and specifies the number of work days, so we have some protection from this, but the college could propose making this change permanent in negotiations next year]

Your position on this possible revision:

Strongly Agree	27.0%	(38)
Agree	41.1%	(58)
Disagree	17.7%	(25)

Strongly Disagree

13.5%

(19)

TOTAL

99.3%

140

(141)

3.

2. Instructional Productivity: Two currently identified options: a) increase assignable class size (e.g. increasing average class size by one student produces an estimated budget impact of \$816,000, by two students = \$1.6M, etc); b) increase number of sections taught per year where recent changes in curriculum have resulted in moving from fifteen courses per year per faculty member to eleven, by increasing this back to twelve. Note, any such changes would focus on contractual provisions, not enrollment management efforts to increase capacity utilization within current workload definitions.

Arguments in favor:

- Faculty relying upon COLAs to compensate for inflation, as well as salary steps, may prefer a temporary increase in class size rather than experience compensation reductions
- In some departments, productivity increases can be organized to provide additional enrollment, and thus additional student opportunities, which in the long run is better for the college and the community than enrollment reductions
- Classified staff and managers argue that their workloads have been increased by last years layoffs and holding vacancies open
- Could protect related interests by requiring language protecting faculty members roles in determining class assignments
- We could require that all assignable class size workload agreements be clearly identified and adhered to. Individual faculty members at times agree to voluntarily exceed contractual workload arrangements; this agreement could incorporate this strategy into the budget, and do so in equitable ways that also reduces/eliminates individual variances from our contract

Arguments against:

- Many faculty workloads are already too high
- Increasing class size would reduce student success and/or result in harmful pedagogical changes
- While we could include strong language in such an agreement that would

state that the workload increase is only for one emergency interim year, the College could argue in the future that the class sizes and workloads that worked in any temporary arrangement are therefore appropriate permanently. While they could not contractually require (without imposing a contract at the end of bargaining) such a change during the 2005-2011 contract, they could attempt to use this experience as evidence for the validity of higher class sizes and workloads

- The focus appears to be on increasing *faculty* workloads; no similar discussions appear to be occurring with other workgroups; other workgroups' complaints about increased workloads ignores the impact on faculty workloads caused by vacant faculty positions and reduced classified support

Your position on this possible revision:

Strongly Agree	 15.6%	(22)
Agree	 36.2%	(51)
Disagree	 27.0%	(38)
Strongly Disagree	 18.4%	(26)
TOTAL	 97.2%	137 (141)

4.

3. Freeze COLAs for one year

Arguments in favor:

- Is perhaps the simplest way to reduce employee compensation costs
- COLA freezes are progressive in terms of total dollar impact, and flat in terms of percentage cut, with higher salary employees receiving greater dollar reduction than those with lower salaries
- Could be easily tied to a "me too" agreement, where the reduction occurs only if all work groups agree
- Could be negotiated to be limited to one year, and not result in a permanent pay cut (e.g. by having the COLA kick in on the last day of the work year, rather than the first, so that it is carried forward into the next year)

Arguments against:

- COLAs are "cost of living adjustments" to offset inflation; they are not raises; freezing COLAs are a cut in compensation rates

- If agreed to in combination with a reduced work year, would result in an absolute pay cut for faculty not receiving step increases
- COLAs were a central part of the contract we negotiated, and as such should not be re-bargained

Your position on this possible revision:

Strongly Agree	16.3%	(23)
Agree	30.5%	(43)
Disagree	23.4%	(33)
Strongly Disagree	27.7%	(39)
TOTAL	97.9%	138 (141)

5.

4. Freeze Steps

Arguments in favor:

- Reduces college expenses
- Could be easily tied to a me too agreement, where the reduction occurs only if all work groups agree

Arguments against:

There are more arguments against this than time/space to provide, including:

- Very regressive, impacting only those not at the top step
- Impacts only a portion of work groups
- Undermines the ethical foundation of salary differences, making step placement dependent not on level of experience but rather the year in which the experience was gained
- We fought long and hard to successfully regain the steps lost in a previous bargain (2000-2001); we shouldn't return to that territory

Your position on this possible revision:

Strongly Agree	8.5%	(12)
Agree	12.8%	(18)
Disagree	35.5%	(50)
Strongly Disagree	41.8%	(59)
TOTAL	98.6%	139 (141)

6.

5. Insurance Out-of-Paycheck Increases: Have employees cover some/all of the insurance renewal rate hike that the College is contractually obligated to pay (i.e., the first 15 percentage points)

Arguments in favor:

- Some argue this possible contractual revision is *more* **fair** than others since those receiving greater benefits (i.e., employee plus one, full family) pick up more of the increased costs
- Could be tied to a **me too** agreement where the reduction occurs only if all work groups agree; however, current differences in workgroup insurance **out-of-paycheck** rates could be exacerbated

Arguments against:

- Some argue this possible contractual revision is *less* **fair** than others as some (those with higher benefits (i.e., employee plus one, full family) pick up more of the increased costs
- Faculty members are already responsible for picking up any increased costs above a renewal rate of 15%, until the **stop loss** and/or **cost neutrality** protection kicks in (see Article 33.3.2.3 and 33.3.2.4); if the renewal rate is very high (e.g. 25%), this would result in a very significant increase in payroll reductions and in the faculty share of insurance costs
- Maintaining the employer's responsibility for medical insurance is a high priority for all employee groups in the current U.S. **system** for providing health care

Your position on this possible revision:

Strongly Agree	11.3%	(16)
Agree	19.1%	(27)
Disagree	34.0%	(48)
Strongly Disagree	31.9%	(45)

7.

6. Please recommend any other contractual revisions that you recommend considering as part of any informal Association – College discussions to find alternatives to budget reductions:

Response

1 -Reduction of release time appointments

1 Allow any faculty member who would like to take an unpaid term off or year off to do so without punishment. Perhaps 2 faculty members could job share --sharing also benefits. I would say let faculty cut their load voluntarily but benefits are a sticking point here.

1 close cottage grove center stop SLI release

1 Close Cottage Grove, Florence, and sell the downtown center

1 Cutting inservice days would be the ONLY reason in my book for going back to the table!!!

1 Decrease the inservice days. Apply the dollar savings. Do not cancel class time that usually is cancelled due to inservice. That puts students first. It gives the students more class contact time. Do not compensate employees for the "added" class time because the employee would be expected to be on campus anyway. I realize the employee loses compensation with this plan but it does help the student, the employee would be on campus anyway, and the college saves X amount. Probably should have a one, two or three year trial, not an endless donation of "spirit". The many hours of planning for the inservice by the many people, if spent with the students in class could be a positive step. Those that don't have classes could conduct one(or two) or collaborate and obtain grants.

1 Developing a reasonable severance package for faculty who do lose their positions.

1 Don't put the gates in. Save that cost. Evaluate areas that are not college transferable or work related and minimize. Examine the cost of having trainers for mentally and physically challenged students, eliminate or definatly minimize. Eliminate travel budgets. Eliminate any teaching overloads. Eliminate classes that do not have a minimum of twenty students or do not pay for instructor salary plus profit to the college. Get rid of the Center for Meeting and Learning. Streamline particularly administration requiring them to teach at least one class per year.

1 Eliminate speciality courses -- stick with introductory survey courses.

1 Fast Track new class offerings, and increase maximum load with a provision for profit-sharing as opposed to (overload / release time.

1 Fire the person who "lost" our money in the first place. Why wasn't the person who made the original budgeting mistake not the first person to go bye-bye???
Accountability is the theme here. I realize firing one person won't solve the crisis. BUT if "you" fail to plan adequately, fail to do your job, fail to properly track the \$\$\$, then "you" - not others - should experience the consequences. This should apply in particular to administrative staff up to and including the president of the college.

1 For each day we reduce our pay we get 1.5 to 2 days off. If we are reduced 4 days, then we have 6-8 less days of in-service.

1 I believe that all discussions should have a limitation on how long the faculty will accept the changes for. I do not believe that it should have an open end and I also think the ET must provide a 5 year plan that shows how they will manage the college out of this on-going financial crisis.

1 I do not believe we should change the contract. Until we have a clear budget and are part of that process this is absurd.

1 I might be willing to accept minimal reduction in benefits (i.e. going to a \$20 co-pay) but not willing to increase monthly premium contribution. Not a contract revision, but we need to cut middle management positions (div. chairs) at the College to save.

1 I recommend that part-time faculty not be paid for attending departmental meetings. Some of us part-timers actually find it demeaning and alienating that we must be paid to show interest in our departments and teaching disciplines. I would be able to continue attending meetings without feeling exploited. However, if I had to endure salary cuts and pay more for insurance, this would be very hard. I have taught at Lane for five years. I do not, however, want to encourage anything that creates a system where most of the faculty are part time. The stances of huge national organizations (like MLA and NCTA, for example) are that this is a deplorable and preventable situation.

1 I think it would be good if there could be a change in our contract that would ensure fairness between FT faculty who currently do not work full time (ie they leave early everyday and do no committee work) and those who do more than their share of the work. We need to create a two tier option of pay for those who don't want to participate in committee work and want to go home right after their classes are done (early in the day) and those who stay all day and work into the evenings to get college work done (because we care not because "management" is forcing us to). There also needs to be consequences for those who are not following the contract/college agreement. We would also need to institute more strict oversight of this to ensure that the people who want to go home early everyday don't continue to accept the higher pay and continue to do more of the same. This could save the college money and get the negative people who are ready to be done (burn't out) with their work at Lane off campus where the rest of us don't have to be burdened by their toxic attitudes. It is likely that there is at least one person who fits this description and possibly more in every large dept. from what I have heard. Although this wouldn't be huge college savings it is an option that would save some money and lessen the toxic attitudes which could make the college both a more efficient and more productive and positive place all the way around for the rest of us.

1 I would like to see the possibility of VOLUNTARY, limited-period pay cuts as a way of saving LCC money in this crunch time but not adversely affecting our long period earning potential. Some employees will be hurt more badly by negotiated, across-the-board pay cuts, but others might be able to willingly forego a part of their paychecks for a year or two without undue hardship on them or their families. It might be interesting to poll LCCEA members on this to see whether it is a viable alternative.

1 I'm not sure what is meant by "contractual revisions", but before there is ANY discussion of increasing workloads or decreasing funds, it would be nice to see ALL faculty living up to their current contractual obligations (i.e., teaching a full load of students each term). And, given that the purpose of the college is to TEACH, release time & other boondoggles should be eliminated before ANY discussion of faculty wage freezes occurs.

1 In the art department one of the ways we approached our budget was to take an unpaid sabbatical once in a three year period. That does not mean three years rotating - just once in the next three years. So most of us would have done that and agreed to it. So salaries remain the same except for that term. I wonder if that was campus wide, how much money that might save.

1 Increase in average class size, rather than number of sections.

1 Increased premiums should apply to faculty or other group members not participating in wellness activities. Smokers should be charged an extra premium.

1 It would be a lot easier to respond to this one after the details of the next round of cuts have been published...

1 Making workloads more equitable across faculty would help. There should be a standard number of classes required of people to teach. 4 seems fair. And those 4 classes should be approximately the same size. say, 35. If, for pedagogical reasons, classes need to be smaller, faculty can teach more of them. teaching 150 students instead of 100 will reduce costs.

1 Many classes experience considerable student drops so that by the mid point of the term the "true" enrolment is well below intended student levels. I Suggest that initial enrolments be adjusted on a class by class basis to reflect these variations and have classes completing with the intended course load. (This is a variation on the proposal to increase class size by 1-2 students)

1 NO contractual revisions. We work with what we have now. We use the contract as it is written to reduce costs. If this means cutting programs and positions, so be it.

1 none at this time.

1 Please consider getting rid of SLI. The release time those instructors have does not outweigh the FTE they generate in that program--they would would generate FTE if back in the classroom teaching a full load. Look at all release time--cooridinator positions within departments and disciplines, departmental scheduling, and some-not all-committee work release time.

1 Please don't come after the new full-time faculty!!!

1 Prefer that solutions maintain the instructional programs and student opportunities. Prefer that agreements are time-limited. Prefer that Unions get to review financial outcomes of these actions so that we can see the net effect and move quickly to reverse "our donations" when financial picture improves. Prefer some "me too" with administration; less clear about classified...so many already lost jobs. Prefer the a little hit on all, a few more students by many, rather than whole jobs, disciplines disappearing.

1 reinstate MOA for distance learning so that more support/investment in online classes by the college could increase productivity/FTE

1 Since online courses are in high demand, the college should consider expanding its offerings in this area, paying particular attention to attracting students from outside the Lane County Area (but still Oregon residents and eligible for in-state tuition). These courses have also have lower administrative costs and support needs (e.g. no printing and graphics costs, fewer student services required). No classes and few, if any, programs occur in the afternoons or evenings during the summer. Classroom utilization in general seems to be low. This is a vast untapped resource. Faculty who desire to teach during the summer and are willing to design curricula and recruit/advertise students, should be able to hold summer institutes, honors programs, conferences and receive financial incentives to create, administer or teach

in such programs. Higher tuition charged for honors courses or higher enrollments (i.e. large lecture classes held in the Forum) could bring in revenue to the college from tuition alone, whether or not there was state FTE reimbursement. These courses could be given emergency fast-track consideration and deadline waivers by the curriculum committee. There could also be programs geared to capturing graduating seniors who want a jump-start on college. In exchange for temporary increases in class size or other concessions, accept a permanent rescinding of the rule that faculty must be on campus and hold one office hour each day of the work week without a departmental waiver. Faculty who have no classes on Friday should have the flexibility to work from home (especially if teaching distance classes) or put in their 30 hours Monday through Thursday. This is something which many faculty would like which costs the college no money to grant.

1 The Insurance should be set up so that there are 4 plans, whereby people pick their amount of coverage and pay accordingly, i.e., the ones who use it the most would pay the most for coverage. Peace Health has this system in place and it works real well.

1 The only concession I'd support at this point would be a limited one: increase instructional productivity by raising the class size (maximum increase of two students) but absolutely no increase in the number of courses taught.

1 The union should not follow a course where faculty at Lane finally "catch up" to salaries of like institutions in the state, only to freeze COLA and steps and fall behind once again.

1 Use the 15% we are to give to the college to increase productivity in some way....offer CE courses, recruit students for the college, get creativity going have faculty state/write out how they think they can use the 15% to increase productivity. make eye exams for single employee only Get rid of covering some of the nice to haves in the insurance package.....make massage therapy a required physician RX make student/faculty health even more attractive to be used by faculty....advertize all the services available Do something about the summer term being more productive....get flashier brochures to advertize the summer term offerings. Our materials look second rate. Putting money into advertizing to college students and paying for courses could up FTE.....Faculty should take a lead on summer term since the entire college appears to be on summer vacation these days.

1 Whatever we do, we need a solid fiscal plan in place as part of any agreement we might concede. The plan must have covenants, benchmarks and restriction in place to make sure the ET leadership that has contributed to this problem, does not continue to mismanage the fiscal assets of the college. What assurances will we have that this will not continue?

1 While I might agree that the Union could be in discussions about possible budget related contract issues, it does concern me to give up concessions when there is not clear picture of the states actual funding level to the college. The alleged differences of \$529million (wish list), vs the \$483 million governor request and the \$453million Ways and Means assessment is just too vague for me to commit all my focus, before we actually know the "real" bottom line.

8.

C. Additional comments:

Response

- 1 *I am still not perusaded by the Administration's numbers. How much of the projected deficit is the result of fiscal mismanagement by the College? (I am thinking of the \$1.2 million "glitch," to use Donna Koechig's term, that affected the deficit in the last fiscal year.) **If I as a union member would agree to any kind of opened discussion or temporary concession, I would want to be assured that (1) the concession would indeed temporary and would not constitute a precedent and (2) "give-backs" would lessen the impact on colleagues. I would not want concessions by the Union to be a way for the College to maintain its top-heavy management apparatus. While the College talks enough about instructional redesign, perhaps faculty should call more loudly for administrative redesign, looking to other colleges for models that are perhaps more fiscally and pedagogically sound.
- 1 A variation of what was stated in a faculty list serve exchange: I would like to see some sort of guarantee from the College that there would be an end-date to any changes that we agreed to in contractual re-negotiations.
- 1 Admin. and college needs to come clean on budget---esp. 3 million \$\$ "error." Needs to work much harder NOW to secure outside funding sources. Look at cutting or downsizing administration before any cuts are made in teaching faculty. We generate the FTE, the money, the students!
- 1 All agreements should include: 1) A triggering provision, such that the change is only implemented after a clear loss in state funding is identified; 2) A sunset clause, keeping all agreements temporary, and specifying precisely when the agreement expires. This ensures that the original contract is respected and returned to rather than opening up a new strategy for contract negotiations; 3) Include a "me too" clause to ensure fair burden across employee groups; 4) A transparent accounting system be implemented, based upon a a "best common practices approach" consistent with accounting practices of similar institutions. 5) An LCCEA representative is placed on the Executive Team.
- 1 Although willing to look at decrease in inservice days, step freezes for 1 year and increase in insurance costs doesn't mean I support doing all of them together
- 1 Another way to look at these options could be to rate them from least worst to worst. Whatever is decided, I hope it is with the concept of saving the college - all programs - because once a program is lost, it is very difficult to start again.
- 1 as a part timer already getting donating time to college
- 1 As usual with surveys of this type there were a few items where agree/disagree would have been a more appropriate choice. I hope that the Association will take this into consideration when formulating its action. Thanks for seeking input.
- 1 close the downtown center, close cottage grove,close florence, fire half of the VPs and managers, then shut down programs like reading together
- 1 Faculty should be cautious in making contractual concessions. Many of us are not willing to invest more of our time and money unless the college can demonstrate that they are capable of making wise,long-term budgetary decisions that will hold us in good stead. Administration needs to be held accountable for their actions and provide us with a one, three, and/or five year plan showing their budgetary priorities and contingency plans to address budget shortfalls. We want assurances that the sacrifices that many of us are willing to make to address this budgetary crises, will not be frittered away resulting in us having to face this same scenario in the future.
- 1 For #1, I would vote "agree" on this ONLY if the days cut were the administration

days, which I have largely found to be useless - we NEED those prep days. For # 2 I vote "agree" ONLY for slight increases in class size (I'd be willing to add two students/class), NOT for an increase in # of sections - in developmental ed, our workload is already far too high - because developmental students need lots of practice and repetition, almost every class has homework almost every day, which, with five sections, creates an enormous grading workload for developmental teachers, every day, every night, every weekend.

1 For me, the most important question is: What can we do that minimizes the impact on STUDENTS? If programs and services to students are cut, students are the ones who are most affected, because many will simply not pursue higher education. Lane provides the only access to higher education for many adults in our population. I would favor any of the proposed revisions, if they allow us to continue to offer the current level of programs and student services.

1 Freeing steps should be only for one year.

1 Great survey. Thanks for all that you are doing and keep up the good work.

1 Grow on-line offerings, but ONLY by investing appropriately in infrastructure support. If the college is concerned with retention and success, and it wants to "grow" itself, it must have the proper tech-support that this requires. Do away with time spent on Unit Planning--our work seems to be pointless and unused. Do away with reassignment time for special programs and projects such as SLI, Learning Communities, Service Learning and reassignment time for serving on "special" committees. Wonderful programs, but extremely costly, and often filled by faculty members from more "expensive programs", e.g. those who teach fewer credits annually.

1 hang tight hang together

1 I am in agreement with Bill Griffiths' comments regarding the lack of inclusion of faculty in the real decision-making process. I also wonder if there is someone in the administration who is experienced in accounting and business. Without full information about the budget proposal I reject any opening of the faculty contract. I am also disappointed that in the last state election process we didn't continue to pursue signatures on the measure that requires corporations to pay their fair share of taxes.

1 i am interested in hearing a discussion of eliminating the downtown center, cottage grove, florence, etc. as opposed to budget cuts that cripple the main campus.

1 I am not a classroom instructor and do not feel that it is appropriate for me to respond to question #3 because it would not directly affect me. I believe that I need to be willing to make any changes needed to allow students to continue their education at LCC.

1 I like the idea of LCCEA representation of the Executive Team

1 I marked "Agree" to Question 1A, but did so with some reluctance, since the Administration made a poor showing in the last contract negotiations by using obstructionist tactics which resulted in a lengthy delay in ratifying the contract. My only reason for marking Agree is that if we do not talk to the Administration, we will likely be depicted, to our disadvantage, as obstructionists ourselves and as being unwilling to come to the aid of the College in a time of serious difficulty.

1 I put my non contractual ideas up above. thanks for all the work you do. Please keep talking and continue to be as creative as possible to keep people employed.

- 1 I support insurance increases mainly because the premium increase is the one item that LCC has little control over. It is regrettable, but until we can get a single payer system to replace our present health care system, we all will suffer for it, and I don't think it is fair that LCC should have to bear the whole burden of the jump in premiums.
- 1 I think it's essential that faculty "come to the table"; not to do so sends a message to the campus and community that would be detrimental to our "work" in the longer term.
- 1 I think there are programs and outreach facilities that are not cost effective at this time. The college should "mothball" them until the funding base stabilizes. This might mean some retrenchment. The association should be open to this.
- 1 I would consider a small increase in out of pocket or co - pay toward insurance. For example, from \$10 - \$20 office visit.....but not my first choice!
- 1 I would only support a loss of contract days if those days are not the class preparation days. Spring inservice has been a complete waste of time the past few years so it could go. Why is such a new contract even up for discussion, if the college couldn't meet it's obligation why did they negotiate this contract with the union?
- 1 I would state the bleeding obvious. That ANY concessions must have either 1) a definite expiration date, or 2) be subject to withdrawal by the membership IF further "change of circumstances" makes them too onerous or burdensome to a significant number of members without commensurate gains.
- 1 I'm wondering about the increases in insurance costs. Are they equal to or greater than the savings when we hired Pacific Source? Did we get taken for a ride?
- 1 If we re-open the contract at the admin's request, will they ever re-open it at our request to give us additional compensation if the college is ever financially stable?
- 1 In a budget crunch like this, we should be eliminating (temporarily) all non-essential student services and ALL projects that are not DIRECTLY related to classroom instruction. Additionally, if the College wants us to have more students, they need to hire a real marketing team. It's frustrating as faculty to be told that we're doing a good job, we're working hard - but work harder and take pay cuts. I'm doing my part in the classroom. The College needs to do their part by 1) not making financial errors, 2) cutting costs that make sense, and 3) marketing our school effectively.
- 1 In the current environment, both at and beyond LCC, a position of shared sacrifice seems the most productive. That said, any conversation on these topics should require that the numbers presented are accurate, and that any contingency decisions based on a change in these numbers is provided clearly beforehand. Thanks for your careful and conscientious work.
- 1 Increase productivity by decreasing meetings. Stop some of the extra-curricular things (Reading Together) and cute initiatives for a couple of years. Save mailing costs by not mailing out Mary Spilde's "welcome back, I had a great time in Scotland" letter in September. Close the campus on Fridays.
- 1 It is foolish to remain a state sponsored educational institution in a state with a rinky-dink attitude toward education. I think we should adopt fee for service models such as counseling, publishing, consulting, as if we were an educational laboratory like NWREL. Or like Mondragon Corporation. It's getting boring saying this, but those of us faculty who are entrepreneurial should be allowed to do that...ya'll who think that revenue enhancement is beneath you...welcome to the world outside the ivory /

1 It is very difficult to respond in the best way to this survey without all of the information regarding Lane administration's proposals. If contract days are reduced or some changes are made which reduce faculty income, some faculty may need to take on second jobs to make up for lost income. The least painful route, perhaps, would be to go the way of increased productivity by filling courses to capacity. I would also recommend simplifying the current unit plan process, which seems to be a waste of valuable resources and doesn't follow the strategic plan as it should. (I would be happy to clarify this for you at a later time.) Another great waste of resources is the time spent in somewhat useless meetings. Finally, many of the recommendations of the Efficiency Team were not completely implemented. Thanks for all that you are doing. I am late in responding because I was out of town a portion of last week.

1 It seems much too early to have substantive talks with the College about concessions and cuts without knowing what money we'll be getting from the state. But the Association should have a plan in place to meet any financial crisis resulting from underfunding. My preference would be to cut high cost/low FTE programs like Flight Tech. A temporary increase in class size should also be considered. The shrinking of offerings, while killing off FTE and reducing state support may be necessary in every dept. if the deficit is sizable enough. But we should hold the line on reducing wages and benefits, including giving way inservice days, which would constitute a significant cut in wages. We made really good progress with this contract, but we're still behind what we should be, especially at the top, where we compare very unfavorably with other CCs in the state. Obviously, reductions of course sections will have negative impacts, not the least on the employment of part-timers with low seniority, but a big hit should land there, and the full-time positions should be protected against erosion of salary and benefits.

1 It took a lot of time and energy to get our current contract. I don't think we should be asked to assume this burden and throw out our contract. While cutting salaries/benefits is a short term solution, it really creates more problems for the college down the road when Lane can't compete for new faculty because our compensation falls too far below other institutions or what a person can earn outside of academia.

1 Just as a general comment- While I certainly agree that ideally our contract should be viewed as permanent (not open to revision), I think at this point in time it would be in our union's best interests to really consider some of the "me too" proposals mentioned above in the survey. The current work climate is definitely one of "management and classified have said they will take some hits, so why shouldn't faculty?" I think if we don't cooperate on at least some level, it will drive a deeper wedge between classified and faculty in particular. The classified union rep would obviously maximize this attitude to create a highly uncomfortable workplace environment. Sorry, but keeping 1.71% of my normal workyear salary (the proposed 3-day reduction) is not worth it to me if it means coming in to work every day in an environment filled with discord and resentment. **One last comment - I appreciate the union's hard work on these issues, and realize you are dedicated to coming up with the best solutions in a bad situation. Thanks.

1 No, no, no no, and also NO! There are SO MANY sources of revenue-sucking-non-FTE-producing-waste (boondoggles like the SLI and The Center for Meaningless Learning and classes being allowed to run with 10 people enrolled and,...) that the

notion of considering any of the above sacrifices is NOT APPROPRIATE.

1 none at this time.

1 Okay, I find I can't answer some of these questions b/c of the way they are bundled. So, here goes. I do *not* favor going back to the table with the college *unless* we get something out of it--say a role in ET, as Ruth and Bill suggest. I would favor a cut in the workyear if the two days we lost were *not* prep days or union days but were the forced participation in-service days sponsored by the college (we'd also save \$\$ by *not* hiring speakers/serving food, etc). I would also favor a temporary increase in class size by 1 student (and in some cases, 2 students)

1 On B2: I'm not sure what impact this would have on my department. In my department, workload is based on TLCs instead of number of courses. Also, our faculty reviews class sizes on an annual basis and makes individual increases when possible. Some of our second year classes must be allowed to run with low enrollments, which vary from year to year. If this were done in departments where applicable, and not made a rule for all that is enforced from above, I might agree. We will be losing faculty positions in our department over the next couple of years, and if we also lose part-time funds, we will not be able to cover the courses that we need to cover for our programs. Cutting numbers of sections of well-enrolled classes will start the "downward spiral." I want us to make sure that any cuts we agree to can and will be reversed if/when finances improve. I would also like us to make very sure that funds we give up are being used prudently and wisely in the big picture.

1 Once the College administration shows a CONCRETE financial plan that clearly lays out how these type of budget "mistakes" can never happen again, i think we should look at working with the College on this current situation. Fix the system so this does not happen again! Accountability! Put Responsibility Where it belongs! Faculty did not 'cause' this! Why do we have to suffer to fix it?

1 Once we have given up something as a temporary measure, the likelihood of permanent loss of that contractual gain increases. My opposition to the proposal to reopen the contract could not be stronger. We should abide by the contract to cut costs as necessary. Why is increased tuition off the table? Why does the administration continue to create funded positions and add costs, whether for assessment, new and extraordinary supply needs, expanded expenditures for cost overruns, and so on? They will not live within the budget they have created, and they expect faculty to bear the brunt of their lack of discipline. This becomes evident in every committee I sit on. We get new notebooks, someone gains reassignment time, new curriculum development projects emerge. In inservice, we continue to invite and fund speakers, provide supplies, and so on, that tap to dry the college budget. The administration will not do without, yet they want faculty to yield their needs. No, NO, NO!

1 Suggest that we pull out of the League of Innovation--we cannot afford it! Take a hard look at non-FTE generating areas, such as: Women's Center, facilities that we maintain and pay taxes on at the airport, buildings/structures on campus that we lease, CML, organized sports and the cost of maintaining fields and equipment.

1 Thanks for your good and thoughtful work on behalf of the union members and the college.

1 The bargaining committee has spent countless hours of their time for the well being of the faculty at L.C.C. For that I am very grateful! If you can't swim stay out of the water. Made a contract at the bank yesterday to borrow money for 6%, went back this morning and tried to have it changed to 4%. Think it will fly?

1 There are two reasons for my strong disagreement with all of the above revisions: 1) At this point, I feel as though the discussion has been about how to fix the problem for next year -- a band-aid for our wounds. I don't feel we should enter into negotiations about band-aids; I feel we should be talking about curing the affliction. In other words, if I were confident that we had a long-term plan for recovering from this crisis, and one or more of these revisions were part of that plan, I would be more inclined to support it/them. 2) I simply don't feel that I have adequate information or understanding to make this decision (though I do appreciate the information and communications that our union has provided). I am very reluctant to support opening up a contract that we fought long and hard to finalize without more fully understanding the long-term implications -- on our union, on our future bargaining efforts, on our contract, and, ultimately, on our college's ability to offer excellent and accessible learning opportunities for our students. I don't know that anyone can fully predict all of the potential consequences. But on this point, I would be willing to concede my position to others who have much more information and experience in these matters than I. In short, I don't know that opening up negotiations is ultimately a bad idea. On a personal level, I am always eager to "do my part" in times of crisis. But I am very concerned about the terms for doing this, as articulated in the two points above.

1 Use our willingness to discuss some issues to protect all of our interests

1 We are already being paid far below what other Community Colleges in this nation are making. More importantly We have more VP's than most Universities.

1 We did not create this problem. Nonetheless it's ours now. Politics aside, we must maintain as many classes and opportunities for students as possible.

1 We have much too tall an organizational structure. Cutting our levels of upper and middle management, especially those added recently, will save a great deal of money. I realize that administrator workload is high, but hiring enough admin assistants to help with some of these tasks is much cheaper than having more managers.

1 We need to work collectively across all employee classifications to resolve our budget issues with the least amount of retrenchment possible. Faculty cannot expect to be a "privileged" class, nor can we afford to be perceived as such. All of our boats rise and fall together.

1 Where I have indicated agreement, in most cases, I would have preferred the option to say that my feelings are divided or mixed. In other words, I have only reluctantly agreed to explore certain options, but am not terribly enthusiastic about any of the proposals. I do, however, trust our bargaining team to explore these matters with the College, and thus "agree" signals not agreement with the proposal, as stated, but rather that it's ok for the bargaining team to discuss the proposal with the College. I also trust that, as the bargaining team explores these possibilities, they will also require the College to make concessions in order to get concessions from us. Given the hardline and disrespectful bargaining practices engaged in by the College during the last round of talks, I am very reluctant to effectively reward such behavior by making concessions if we get nothing in return. Michael McDonald

1 Why isn't raising tuition in the list of options? A modest increase in tuition could ease much of the pain.

1 Would it be possible for many/most of the "administrators" who have teaching credentials or capability to teach two or three classes. As classroom faculty members

(part time or full time) leave LCC, employees with capability could assume or divide the departed employees classes. (Without additional compensation of course. Their administrative tasks would have to be decreased and some of the college "growth" or "planning activity" would be slowed). There has to be some good points in this idea. Our administrators are tremendously talented and capable. I would think the students would benefit from this association and so would their "teachers". The basic root and purpose of this college is to attract and teach the needy and to provide qualified entry level citizens into the work force. The nation is hurting for qualified entry level wage earners in all vocations. This college has the facilities and talent to help.

- 1 Yes - I think we should talk with Admin. We should also get more clear answers about who is making budget reduction proposals and tie any agreements to codifying faculty roles: - restoring charters - faculty roles in assignment of classes - faculty role in shared governance If we have to open the contract, I'm strongly in favor of minimizing any impact on compensation. I would much rather increase class size by one to three students per section than any other option. I'm NOT in favor of adding additional sections, however. A second choice is cutting work days but only if managers and classified cut a proportionate number of days as well. I'm NOT in favor of reducing COLA or freezing steps. Thank you for asking for union member input.

[Go back to Management Interface](#)

Powered By phpESP, v(2.1.4)