



House Appropriations Committee  
TESTIMONY

Submitted by Dr. Bernard J. Sadusky, Executive Director

February 10, 2021

**HB0894 – Education – Community Colleges – Collective Bargaining**

**POSITION: OPPOSE**

---

The Maryland Association of Community Colleges, representing all of Maryland's 16 community colleges oppose HB894/SB746 because the proposed legislation fails to guarantee sufficient state funding to compensate our colleges for increased collective bargaining costs. Historically, community colleges have been underfunded and Maryland's community colleges are no exception. The mere fact that the CADE formula has never been fully funded since inception 29 years ago points to the State's inability to meet its one-third funding responsibility. Our community colleges formula has been rebased eight times since 2008, equating to \$140 Million in funding which should be in our base.

Most recently, our projected increase of \$36.2 Million was rescinded for the current fiscal year. The Governor's Budget Reconciliation and Financing Act (BRFA) legislation for next year's budget also specifies we will lose another \$26 Million and based on our continued enrollment decrease spells fiscal disaster for our colleges. Adding collective bargaining will only add to our college's fiscal deficits.

Beyond the fiscal impact, MACC would like to address other issues of the bill as written. First, MACC absolutely agrees that the General Assembly's intent should be to promote harmonious and cooperative relationships with the public employees of community colleges. In fact, our colleges work hard to actively achieve that goal within their fiscal parameters. To meet the intent stated above and shared by both groups, the proposed legislation should be modified and/or amended. Several examples of necessary modification or amendment follows:

1. Since the State has proven to be an inconsistent partner in funding, the CADE formula and any increased fiscal burden associated with collective bargaining will fall on the local governments served by our community colleges. This legislation should require approval of local governments for their community colleges.
2. The legislature should attempt to ensure maintenance of the professional culture which now exists on our campuses without disruption. Specifically, the allowance of as many as 6 bargaining units per college is far too many and would place our colleges in constant negotiations. Remember, unlike state government negotiations for all state agencies, this

legislation is per campus; hence we can have as many as 6 bargaining units bargaining at our 16 community colleges, totaling 96 varied negotiations at one time. This would be costly and certainly not serve the efficient operation of our colleges. No more than 3 units are necessary.

3. The definition of part time faculty needs to be defined since by nature of the mission of community colleges, our colleges employ many professionals from many professions to teach single courses. They are necessary to teach the many technical and skilled courses we offer, but should not be included in this legislation, hence a definition of part-time or adjunct faculty is needed. In past testimony, SEIU has pointed to the Montgomery College contract as ideal. It contains a definition of part-time that is reasonable and workable.

These are just a few issues with the proposed legislation and should not be read as a complete list. Other issues remain, such as unit size, management rights, length and manner of voting, new employee processing timeline, unreasonable timelines, all of which need discussions and more appropriate redefinition. These multitude of issues indicate additional conversation between affected parties to resolve issues in a reasonable approach before implementation.

It is MACC's hope that if the General Assembly is intent on passage of this bill, that it is also their intent to pass a bill that promotes harmony and efficiency on our campuses.