

Wednesday, December 4, 2024
9:00AM - 1:00PM

NTT-Skidmore Bargaining

Attendees

Evan Halstead
Johanna Mackay
Eileen Sperry
Sean Collins
Ruth McAdams
Mike Paulmeno
Erika Shielke
Will Kennerly
Patrice Malatestinic (Zoom)
Pete Murray (Zoom)
Beatrice Kendall (Zoom)
Casey Gray (Zoom)
Jeremy Sloane (Zoom)

Sarah Delaney Vero
Rob Manfredo
Dorothy Mosby
Julie Delay

9:00 Admin requests caucus time to work on their proposals. Reluctantly agreed. No notes during caucus.

11:05 Admin returns from caucus. Meeting begins.

- Rob thanks us for allowing them the time to continue their discussions.

Sean presents our response on Compensation (Article XX)

- Section 5: on promotional raises: We've revised to \$3750 for 1st tier to 2nd; \$4500 for 2nd tier to 3rd. We've dropped the 1-time promotional bonus for PT; we are maintaining on ranks (unpaid promotions) for PT.
- Section 8: (on FT accompanist workloads)—we're agreed. Sean asks for College to provide schedule for accompanists to union 3 times a semester to monitor work creep. Rob asks if they could instead inform the union only when there is an increase in workload. Sean clarifies the types of cases we are thinking of.

- Section 11.2 - We maintain on 1.5x credit rate for those not designated as Field Placement or Field Work Coordinators. Sarah asks about additional credit given that there is already a recognition of the additional workload (4 credits awarded for a 3 credit course).
- Section 12: (re course caps) We counter asking for freezing of course caps @ time of agreement, locking in for term of contract.

Rob presents admin's counter on Benefits (XXI)

- Section 2: They struck the weird phrase "who are benefits eligible..." Added notice of 90 days for changes to benefits. (They have agreed to our language)
- Section 3: College agrees to amend its plan document within 30 days following ratification to allow unit members to participate in 403(b)
- Section 4 - Agreed (??), contingent on agreement to limit terminal contracts to three years.
- Section 5 - College maintains, believes Internal Tuition is covered, not interested in extending this to PT.
- Section 6 - If both parents are both unit members, they may be granted leave concurrently or consecutively. Requests shall not be unreasonably denied. Birth parents are eligible for 8 weeks of Short-Term Disability. Reduced teaching load may be split over consecutive semesters. Special projects/compressed courses in consultation with Chair. Eileen asks about an apparent typo in fourth paragraph (seems like a mistake).
- Section 7 - added "reasonably", otherwise no change (*Note that this word was in our proposal, not sure why it looks like an addition here*)
- Section 11 - largely agreed, but added "if approved by the carrier"
- Rob is hopeful that we are close to a TA on benefits. Sean says we need to caucus on family leave.

Sean brings up info request to help us figure out how we are going to slot people into new ranks, particularly those who have been both PT and FT. Also brings up those who have been left off of the unit member list: Dung-Lan Chen, Adam Cottle, Peg Boyers, Gary Wilson, and Manny Valentin. Sarah says they were going off of what is listed in Oracle but they are willing to look further at whether those Oracle designations are appropriate or not.

11:35 Caucus called. No notes during caucus.

12:38 Meeting resumes. Sean thanks them for the time. We have some responses for you, but anticipating that we won't finish up next Friday, we want to schedule future bargaining sessions, possibly the week of December 16. Sean proposes some possible dates. Also, the week of January 6. Rob will take a look at calendars and get back to us.

Sarah: Wrt Compensation, we appreciate your movement, but we're anticipating a \$10million deficit. She encourages us to attend the budget session later today. They've asked every division to cut \$1million from this year's budget and it was painful. We'd have to dig much deeper to fund even a portion of what NTTs are asking. It's not a negotiation tactic. One of the

reasons ppl come to Skidmore is that we handle these things together. We're not Colgate. Colgate's endowment per student is 3x what Skidmore's is. We want to be competitive, at the median, it's served us well. NTTs are asking for more than what other employees receive, so this is hard. We'd be facing not giving the GSA to anyone else. We've worked hard to address underlying concerns about things like terminal contracts, etc. From a compensation standpoint, we don't think it makes sense for the college to pay over market for some individuals and have to pay under market for others. Please go to the event and listen. We are looking at a deficit for next year, and admissions are down.

Erika: Is there a recording? I'm teaching during that time.

Sarah: We'll look into it.

Julie: It's also available online.

Ruth: Is the college willing to say what it's paying the external consultants? Is it true that it's between \$600-800k?

Sarah: I don't know. They're gathering info. The logic is that it's a large deficit. It's a one-time cost, not an ongoing cost that increases every year. We're attempting to supplement the administrative workforce to gather information about cost savings. We've been working on it for the past two years, but it's a lot. We did cut \$1million from operational budget. We are all in this together and "want to preserve as many people as possible." We want to meet your core concerns.

Sean: Our core concerns about security and compensation are the college's core concerns. NTTs are the first professors and faculty that incoming students encounter. Investing in faculty is a long-term investment in the college, to counteract enrollment challenges. Have you calculated what the costs are of our proposal?

Sarah: We have calculated the costs of the original, but obviously not the new one you just gave us.

12:53 Sean: We have a response on Benefits.

Section 2: We can agree, with caveat that withdrawing COBRA supplement for terminal faculty is contingent on bringing their salary up to renewable first tier levels.

Section 3: We would want the terms of the plan to be memorialized in the agreement, to be static and frozen. The consultants are going to target this for cuts, obviously.

- Sarah: isn't that clear already?
- Ruth: Do you object to having the 10% and 11% spelled out or do you intend to cut that?

- Sarah: We do not intend at this time to cut but don't know what the future holds.
- Sean: this is a "re-opener"...
- Rob: Yeah, we see this as decisional rather than impact bargaining.
- Sean: Well, okay then maybe we can just memorialize the current terms.

Section 5 Eileen: We are going to maintain on the question of PT faculty being able to enroll in a course. This is an important component for PT professional development. We've moved on PT compensation and think that this would supplement that effectively. If we couldn't secure the internal tuition benefit for PT employees, we'd need to revisit overall compensation for them. We think this would be a low-use, high-impact thing.

- Sarah: Are you willing to consider a threshold on # of credits?
- Sean: We'd be curious what the financial impact of this actually is.
- Sarah: We'd need to make sure that there's space in the class.

Section 6 Erika has questions about family leave. We appreciate the response. We think we're essentially in the same place but have some things that we're confused on.

- We had the word "around the birth"; you had "after the birth" : was that intentional?
- 8 vs. 12 weeks: Is the college's proposal that [*Omg this is confusing*].
- Erika describes a situation that we had been trying to avoid, wherein a course would start with one instructor and end with another. CPDs do not like this idea, for obvious reasons. It does seem like this is something that the admin's proposal would still allow under some circumstances. The possibility of a "compressed" teaching schedule appears to be limited to the fall semester in admin's plan. Was that the intent?
- Eileen: are you amenable to a circumstance in which the faculty takes the fall semester as parental leave, extends the 12 weeks through the beginning of the spring, and does "special projects" etc, on a compressed schedule, in the spring?
- Julie/Sarah: these situations are unique. [*Sorry, tried to get as much as possible*]

1:10 Section 7: We're agreed.
Section 11: We're agreed.

Sean: We also want to follow up quickly on Article XX, Section 10 (Prep-Intensive Multi-Section Labs).

Erika: We want to maintain here. At the previous session, admin indicated that CPDs were opposed to our proposal in this area, and the dean permitted us to follow up with CPDs to see if we could work something out, so we had some conversations. We have not heard resistance to the points system from CPDs, so we are struggling to understand how to respond. We have discussed alternatives to the points system, but we don't know

what the issues are that we are addressing. We don't have a sense of what the issues with that system are so that we can come back with a response.

Sarah: I've reached out to a few chairs. In theory we're looking at it.

Erika: Okay, great. If you have specific feedback, that would help us formulate a response.

1:12 Meeting adjourned.