

## Article 14 Job Classification System

[...]

14.4.4 Classification Review Appeals Procedure. An employee may appeal the decision regarding the classification review of their job. The procedures used to appeal classification and grade level decisions shall allow for Federation representation at the employee's request throughout the process and shall include the following steps:

- (a) The employee may appeal the classification review decision to the Classification Appeals Committee (CAC). The employee's intent to appeal must be submitted in writing to the Director of Labor Relations within 10 working days of the date on the written notification to the employee of the classification review decision. The appeal request must be in writing, specify the job classification proposed, and the basis or justification for the proposal. The CAC shall have no authority to consider appeals which do not meet this requirement. The employee shall provide **seven copies a digital copy** of the appeal and all supporting documents.
- (b) The CAC shall meet to consider the appeal within 30 working days of receipt of the appeal unless an extension is agreed to by the parties. The authority of the CAC shall be limited to one of the following decisions:
  - (i) That the job is appropriately classified; or
  - (ii) **That the job is not appropriately classified, and which existing classification is more appropriate. That the job is more appropriately allocated to a different but existing job classification**

**The CAC shall issue a written decision within ten working days after the meeting to consider the appeal. Copies of the decision shall be provided to the employee, the Federation, and PSEC. The decision of the CAC shall be final and binding on the parties.**

(iii) **If the CAC determines that no existing job classification is appropriate, the CAC may recommend that a new classification be created. that no existing classified job classification is appropriate and that the job **should** be re-evaluated by PSEC. If appropriate, the CAC may recommend a new job classification **description**.**

The recommendation shall be issued in writing to the Associate Vice President (AVP) of PSEC and copies provided to the Director of Labor Relations and the Federation within 10 working days after the meeting to consider the appeal. The recommendation shall include the reasons why the CAC believes that neither option **ai**) nor **bii**) above are appropriate and what specific responsibilities of the job warrant that a new classification should be created.

The Chair of the CAC may request a meeting with the AVP of PSEC to explain the CAC's recommendation. The meeting will occur within 10 working days of the request. The decision of the AVP of PSEC as to whether or not a new classification will be created shall be issued within 10 working days of this meeting. If a meeting is not requested, the decision shall be issued within 10 working days of receiving the CAC's recommendation. The decision of the AVP of PSEC shall be final and binding on the parties.

If, after an appeal, a Classified employee's position description is outside of the scope of their job classification, PSEC will ensure that the position description is adjusted to reflect the decided job classification, in collaboration with employees currently in those positions and the Federation.

Copies of the decision, along with the position description and job classification, shall be provided to the employee, the Federation, and PSEC at each step of the process.

[...]

Old Article Language in Regular text, with changes formatted as detailed below

\*STARTING ON 11/28/23 WITH PROPOSAL #s 23-023, 23-024, 23-004 (Counter), and 23-035 and up\*:

- a. Text proposed for addition shall be in **red, bold, underline** text, (**Example proposed addition**) and when accepted by the other party in a counter-proposal, changed to **blue, bold** text (**Example proposed and accepted addition**). When **not accepted** by the other party shall be changed to **struck through purple, bold, underline** text, (**Example proposed but not accepted addition**)
  
- b. Text proposed for deletion shall be in **struck through, red, bold** text, (**Example proposed deletion**) and when accepted by the other party in a counter-proposal, changed to **struck through, (non bold), blue** text (**Example proposed and accepted deletion**). When **not accepted** by the other party shall be changed to **purple, italic** text, (**Example proposed but not accepted deletion**)

#### 14.4.5 Classification Review System

1. A classification review system will be maintained which allows employees to submit requests for classification reviews at any time based on a belief that the employee's job duties have changed.
  - a. The Classification Review System will consider Internal Pay Equity, market data, and a Whole Job Analysis (WJA).
2. The role of the Classification Appeals Committee (CAC) will be limited to one of the following decisions that:
  - a. the job is appropriately classified;
  - b. that the job is more appropriately allocated to a different, but existing, job classification; or,
  - c. that no existing classified job classification is appropriate and that the job should be re-evaluated by PSEC.

The CAC will not have authority to determine grade level placement other than through a) through c) above.

~~The CAC will not have the authority to reclassify bargaining unit members into Managerial, Supervisory, or Confidential status as defined by PECBA.~~
3. The membership of the Classification Appeals Committee (CAC) shall consist of:
  - a. Two managers, at least one of whom shall have direct or indirect supervision of Classified Employees.
  - b. Five Classified employees, at least one of whose work is related and/or impacted by the job classification under review.
  - c. An ~~ex-officio~~ non-voting representative from ~~the~~ PSEC Classification/Compensation team.
4. Changes in the grade level placement of existing Classified job classifications will only occur as a result of selective salary adjustments through contract negotiations for a successor agreement, a contract re-opener for the purpose of negotiating selective salary adjustments, or following appropriate notice to the PCCFCE of a recommendation by PSEC to implement such a change. In the event PSEC recommends a change to the grade level of an existing classification, or recommends a grade level for a new classification, PSEC will notify PCCFCE in writing and the Federation may file a demand to bargain over the proposed level in accordance with ORS 243.698.
5. For the purpose of gathering market data, the College will rely on published surveys and/or gather data directly from comparator organizations within the appropriate labor market. Market comparisons will be made to benchmark classifications and other jobs for which market data is available. Classifications for which market data is not readily available will be aligned to grade levels based on Whole Job Analysis (WJA) within the market framework established by the benchmarks and other jobs for which such market data is available. (We agree to remove these two paragraphs of the MOU with the agreement they are adequately represented in the current contract language and/or this or other proposals)

**6.—As part of contract negotiations, PSEC will review the classification and grade level of classifications identified by the Federation to determine their position relative to the market and benchmark jobs. PSEC will recommend a grade level for each of the classifications and notify PCCFCE of the recommendation in writing. Grade level changes as a result of bargaining will be implemented according to the terms agreed upon by the parties in reaching a settlement.** *(This paragraph of the MOU is not represented elsewhere so should be moved into the contract.)*

Old Article Language in Regular text, with changes formatted as detailed below:

- a. Text proposed for addition shall be in **red, bold, underline** text, (**Example proposed addition**) and when accepted by the other party in a counter-proposal, changed to **blue, bold** text (**Example proposed and accepted addition**). When **not accepted** by the other party shall be changed to **struck through purple, bold, underline** text, (**Example proposed but not accepted addition**)
- b. Text proposed for deletion shall be in **struck through, red, bold** text, (**Example proposed deletion**) and when accepted by the other party in a counter-proposal, changed to **struck through, (non bold), blue** text (**Example proposed and accepted deletion**). When **not accepted** by the other party shall be changed to **purple, italic** text, (**Example proposed but not accepted deletion**)

## Article 15 - Pay Policies

15.1 Salary Schedule. Wage increases during the term of this Agreement and the salary schedule for each year are published in Appendix A - Wages and Classified Salary Schedule

15.1.1 Classified bargaining unit employees will receive the following wage increases:

Effective June 21, 2023:	6% Structure increase
Effective June 21, 2024:	8% Structure increase
Effective June 21, 2025:	<b><u>3% Structure increase</u></b>
Effective June 21, 2026:	<b><u>3.5% Structure increase</u></b>

[...]

Old Article Language in Regular text, with changes formatted as detailed below

\*STARTING ON 11/28/23 WITH PROPOSAL #s 23-023, 23-024, 23-004 (Counter), and 23-035 and up\*:

- a. Text proposed for addition shall be in **red, bold, underline** text, (**Example proposed addition**) and when accepted by the other party in a counter-proposal, changed to **blue, bold** text (**Example proposed and accepted addition**). When **not accepted** by the other party shall be changed to **struck through purple, bold, underline** text, (**Example proposed but not accepted addition**)
- b. Text proposed for deletion shall be in **struck through, red, bold** text, (**Example proposed deletion**) and when accepted by the other party in a counter-proposal, changed to **struck through, (non bold), blue** text (**Example proposed and accepted deletion**). When **not accepted** by the other party shall be changed to **purple, italic** text, (**Example proposed but not accepted deletion**)

December 2, 2025  
Management Amended Proposal to FCE  
Article 18 - Insurance Benefits

**Background:**

The college recognizes the financial burden that rising insurance costs pose to employees and their families as well as the challenge to save for future retirement. As a means to help offset these costs, the college proposes to increase the contribution for the monthly cap to align with the premium costs for Health Savings Account (HSA) eligible plans. The college contribution will exceed the cost of plans that qualify as a HSA for all categories of coverage leaving a balance that will be deposited to a Health Savings Account. These funds belong to the employee and can be used to help offset medical expenses or saved for future qualifying expenses.

If an employee chooses a HSA Eligible plan, there will be no premium costs for those employees which could result in an increased monthly paycheck.

**Proposal:**

Upon ratification, increase the college's monthly insurance contribution (Caps) for 2025-27 Biennium as listed:

<b>Full time staff</b>	<b>2025 monthly contribution</b>	<b>Proposed monthly contribution</b>
Self only	\$785	\$835
Self + Spouse or DP	\$1,416	\$1,566
Self + Child(ren)	\$1,315	\$1,415
Self + family	\$1,953	\$2,228

Part-time staff will have contributions prorated based on the position's budgeted FTE.

Effective with the 2026 Enrollment Period, employees selecting the Health Savings Account (HSA) eligible plan for either Moda or Kaiser will receive the balance of the district contribution as a contribution to a Health Savings Account as established by the employee.

Part-time employees in positions scheduled to work fewer than 12 months per year will continue to receive the prorated College contribution for the entire 12-month period.

Estimated cost \$592,188

## Portland Community College Trüpp Study Task Force

### Purpose

The Trüpp Study Task Force serves as PCC's shared governance body for collaborative analysis of the Compensation, Classification, & Staffing Study conducted by Trüpp HR. The task force ensures that PCC's approach to implementation is grounded in shared understanding of the study's findings, their costs, and their implications within PCC's unique operational context.

- ❖ **Primary Function:** The task force translates complex study findings into actionable intelligence by:
  - ❖ Reviewing and contextualizing methodology and recommendations,
  - ❖ Identifying priority recommendations for deeper analysis,
  - ❖ Supporting cost validation and implementation planning in partnership with Finance and PSEC, and
  - ❖ Documenting dependencies and impacts that inform both administrative planning and collective bargaining.

Its role is to create a common analytical foundation for decision-making, not to negotiate outcomes.

- ❖ **Connection to Strategic Priorities** – The task force's work directly supports:

- ❖ **Operational Excellence** through data-informed analysis, cost modeling, and sustainable resource planning.
- ❖ **Shared Values** by modeling transparency, inclusivity, and collaborative engagement across stakeholder groups.
- ❖ **Academic Excellence and Holistic Student Support** indirectly, by ensuring compensation and staffing systems are aligned to attract, retain, and support a high-performing workforce.

### Intent

The Trüpp Study Task Force bridges the gap between external consultant recommendations and PCC's implementation reality by engaging stakeholders in collaborative analysis and sense-making.

As a result of the task force's work:

- PCC will have a shared understanding of the study's methodology, findings, and their relevance to PCC's multi-site environment.
- Priority recommendations will be identified and analyzed using transparent, criteria-based methods.

- Cost implications and implementation considerations will be documented in partnership with Finance and PSEC.
- The distinction between items requiring bargaining and those subject to administrative action will be clearly described.
- Decision-makers will have a synthesized final report outlining dependencies, sequencing, and complexity of implementation to guide future actions.

## Annual Scope of Work ('25 – '26)

What is the Work? (Outcomes)	Work Product(s) / Deliverable(s)	Connected Governance Bodies	Forcing Events	Deadline
<p><b>#1 Establish Shared Understanding of the Study</b></p> <p><b>Activities:</b> Review methodology, findings, and recommendations through PCC's unique context</p>	<p><b>1a)</b> Consensus statement validating key findings</p>			March 31, 2026
<p><b>#2 Prioritize key recommendations for analysis</b></p> <p><b>Activities:</b> Develop evaluation criteria (impact, feasibility, alignment to PCC priorities) and apply them across Trüpp recommendations</p>	<p><b>2a)</b> Shortlist of high-priority recommendations for costing and deeper analysis</p>			May 29, 2026
<p><b>#3 Analyze costs and implementation requirements</b></p> <p><b>Activities:</b> Request Finance and PSEC modeling of high-priority items; discuss complexity, sequencing, and</p>	<p><b>3a)</b> Costing summary with implementation notes and key dependencies</p>			August 31, 2026

Interdependencies with stakeholder input				
<b>#4 Synthesize findings and prepare transition to decision-making bodies</b>  <b>Activities:</b> Document shared understandings, unresolved differences, and recommended next steps; clarify which items require bargaining vs. administrative action	<b>4a) Final report to Cabinet and union leadership outlining analysis, costs, and pathways for implementation</b>			November 30, 2026

## Membership

**Ways of Working:** Stemming from the One College United framework, PCC's governance group participants will maintain the following principles, values, and behavioral expectations guiding group operation and collaboration:

- **Core Operating Principles**
  - *Shared Accountability:* Every group member accepts responsibility for active participation and informed decision-making.
  - *Inclusive Participation:* Groups will create space for all perspectives, encourage respectful dialogue, and ensure decisions reflect careful consideration of diverse viewpoints.
  - *Transparency:* Deliberations, disagreements, and decision rationales will be documented, so groups can be transparent about how perspectives shaped decisions.
- **Communication Standards**
  - *Constituency Connection:* Group members commit to regular communication with their constituencies, reporting back on group activities and decisions.
  - *Multi-Tiered Information Sharing:* Groups will utilize appropriate communication strategies for sharing information with different audiences, ensuring information reaches stakeholders through channels suited to their role and need for detail.
- **Meeting Operations and Collaboration**
  - *Respectful Engagement:* Group members will listen actively, speak respectfully, assume positive intent, and address conflicts constructively.
  - *Structured Facilitation:* Groups will follow consistent meeting protocols that support productive dialogue, efficient decision-making, and clear documentation of outcomes.

- *Preparation and Follow Through:* Members will come prepared for discussions, contribute meaningfully to deliberations, and follow through on commitments made.

## **Members: Standing Members (15 total)**

### **Management Representatives (5)**

- Associate Vice President, People Strategy, Equity, & Culture (Co-Chair)
- Director of Labor Relations or designee
- Chief Financial Officer or designee
- Academic Affairs leader(appointed by President's Cabinet)
- Student Affairs leader (appointed by President's Cabinet)

### **FCE Representatives (5)**

- 5 appointed by FCE leadership

### **FFAP Representatives (5)**

- 5 appointed by FFAP leadership

## **Categories of Membership - Definitions**

**Standing Members:** Official members with full participation rights, responsible for attending all meetings, reviewing materials, and contributing to analysis and deliverables.

**Subject Matter Experts (Invited as Needed):** Individuals with specialized expertise invited to inform specific agenda items (e.g., compensation placement, budget modeling, systems implications). SMEs provide input but do not hold standing membership.

## **Decision-Making Authority**

### **Scope and Limits**

The Task Force operates in an advisory and analytical capacity only. It does not possess binding authority to implement Trüpp recommendations.

### **Reporting Structure**

- Reports simultaneously to the President's Cabinet and federation leadership (FFAP and FCE).
- Functions as a (temporary) task force within PCC's shared governance framework.

## Decision-Making Vehicles

This task force produces:

- **Informational Products:** cost analyses, implementation considerations, contextual assessments
- **Consultation Mechanisms:** stakeholder input and constituency feedback
- **Advisory Outputs:** analytical findings and considerations for decision-makers

## Process for Developing Outputs

- Strive for consensus on analytical findings
- Document areas of agreement and disagreement transparently
- When consensus cannot be reached, present multiple perspectives with supporting rationale
- All outputs are reviewed and approved by the Task Force prior to release

## Communication of Findings

- Findings are distributed simultaneously to Cabinet and union leadership
- Analytical products maintained in shared repository

## Accountability Measures

- Quarterly progress check-ins against the approved scope of work
- Meeting attendance and participation tracking
- Deliverable completion against timeline

---

## Group Logistics

### Meeting Structure

- **Frequency:** Monthly during academic terms (January-December 2026)
- **Duration:** 2 hours per meeting
- **Format:** Hybrid (in-person with remote option)
- **Location:** Rotating between campuses for in-person component

### Agenda Development

- Agendas developed jointly by the Task Force co-chairs
- Members may submit items in advance for consideration
- Final agendas circulated in advance of meetings

### Documentation and Communication

- Meeting summaries captured and shared with members
- Approved summaries forwarded to Cabinet and union leadership
- No public-facing website; communication through existing governance channels

## Resource Support

- Administrative support provided for scheduling, documentation, and coordination
- Access to relevant Trüpp study materials and data
- Meeting facilities and technology support
- Access to subject matter experts as needed

## Meeting Guidelines

- Meetings are not open to public observation
- Members are expected to attend personally (no proxies)
- Quorum requires at least 3 representatives from each stakeholder group

---

## Sunset Provision

The Task Force will automatically dissolve on December 31, 2026, unless extended by mutual agreement of the President's Cabinet, FFAP, and FCE leadership. Upon dissolution:

- All analytical products will be transmitted to appropriate implementation bodies
- Documentation will be archived in accordance with PCC retention policies

## STATE OF OREGON, EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD

## COST SUMMARY FORM

For ERB Use Only

Case No. ME-077-25

Date Filed 02/06/2026

## Projected Increase/Decrease in Each Year

(add or shade unused columns as needed)

Proposal Description including Article or Section Numbers	Current Cost	Year 1	Year 2	Total Projected Increase / Decrease	Explain calculations. List all factors and assumptions used in calculating costs for each year. Attach additional sheet if necessary.
14.4.4 Classification Review Appeals Procedure  Passed by PCCFCE on December 11th, 2025.				\$0	
14.4.5 Classification Review System  Passed by PCCFCE on October 28th, 2025.				\$0	
15.1 Salary Schedule 2025: 3% 2026: 3.5% Retroactive to July 1st, 2025.	\$48,192,169	\$2,013,471	\$4,491,719	\$6,505,190	Costing is based on records provided by management from April 2024.
18.1.2 Health, Dental, Prescription and Vision Care Insurance Premiums  Passed by Management on		\$0	\$592,188	\$592,188	The costing is as provided by the college. However, PCCFCE does not have sufficient information to calculate the current cost or verify the provided amount for the increase.

December 2nd, 2025.					
Trupp Working Group Charter  Passed by Management on October 13th, 2025.				\$0	
<b>TOTAL (for each column)</b>	<b>\$48,192,169</b>	<b>\$2,013,471</b>	<b>\$5,083,907</b>	<b>\$7,097,378</b>	<b>Total current is missing the unknown value of the current 18.1.2 costing.</b>