

TO: Sandra Serrano, Abe Ali, Bruce Barsook

FROM: Andrea Garrison, CCA Chief Negotiator

DATE: May 13, 2011

SUBJECT: Evaluation of 2010-11 Negotiations Process

CCA negotiators are committed to resolution of the pending negotiation items for our successor contract. At the beginning of negotiations this year, CCA agreed to try the 2010-2011 negotiations process outlined by the district for 6 months and then evaluate its effectiveness. This document is our promised evaluation of the process.

The suggested process was novel to recent negotiations in management in the following ways:

- Only one negotiator was named to the management “team.” The word “team” is in quotes here, because technically, when engaging in Interest Based Bargaining (IBB), there is only one team, consisting of both management and faculty representatives.
- There was only minimal IBB training, and essentially no team building efforts prior to negotiations.
- The single management “team” member was not a KCCD employee who understood the processes and culture of our district.
- Different district administrators were brought into negotiations at different times, to contribute their expertise on the topics of discussion.
- The negotiations agenda was arranged in a manner that accommodated the availability of these administrators, rather than the importance of the agenda item to one or both negotiation “teams.”
- An attempt to restrict the length of negotiations was made by pushing the start of negotiations to January, and setting only six dates for negotiations. Only one back-up date was set, despite the repeated suggestions of the CCA negotiators, who felt more back-up dates would be prudent.
- Faculty negotiators agreed reluctantly to negotiate on Wednesdays, which is typically a day of heavy student responsibilities.

The process has not worked for CCA for several reasons:

- The lack of a consistent management “team” and team-building exercises changed the dynamics of the IBB process and failed to build mutual trust among management and faculty negotiators.
- The single consistent management negotiator did not understand KCCD processes or culture. This required extra effort on the parts of CCA negotiators as well as management’s administrative experts in explaining KCCD processes and culture to him.
- The manner in which the overall agenda was established did not insure resolution of those topics that, in the end, were considered most important by one or the other “teams” of negotiators.
- The lack of back-up dates resulted in an inability to find common dates for further negotiations, since by the time we got to the last date faculty had filled their calendars with our primary responsibility—obligations to students.

All of these issues created problems in making progress on the issues sunshined by both management and faculty. There have been disgruntled comments of impasse, when in fact the real problem is that we don't have enough common dates, beyond the original six, on which to meet to grapple with the really tough issues.

Therefore, CCA negotiators are not willing to agree to a similar process during future negotiations. We expect to start negotiations no later than the beginning of October, as prescribed in the contract. This should alleviate the stress of negotiations running into Spring finals and the end of the academic year. We hope management will establish a consistent team of administrators who know KCCD processes and culture, and are willing to start the IBB process with significant training and team-building exercises. In addition, we hope to set an agenda based on priorities, rather than administrative availability. Negotiations should take place on Fridays, so that faculty negotiators do not feel obligated to spend time in negotiations at the expense of their students.

With a well-trained and cohesive IBB team in place, we remain hopeful that we can conclude negotiations in a timely fashion—perhaps even completing the process in six sessions, which was the goal for this year.

Our proposed dates for Fall 2011 are:

September 23 for IBB training

October 14

October 21

November 4

November 18

December 9

We would also suggest at least two planned back-up dates, with the knowledge that we could go into the Spring semester if necessary. Using Fridays for negotiations will facilitate faculty availability should additional dates become necessary, since Fridays impact services to students less than the other weekdays.

Cc: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg
Heather Ostash
Antonia Ecung
Ann Beheler
Bill Henry
Deanna Campbell