

Theater Department presents
"Best Man"
Page 4



Cougar boss
accepts post at
Auburn
Page 8

the PRINT

Clackamas Community College

Wednesday, May 16, 1984

Vol. XVII, No. 23

Voters reject tax base proposal

By Doug Vaughan
Of The Print

After trying two identical three-year serial tax levies and failing, the Clackamas Community College Board of Education put a tax base on the May 15 primary elections ballot. To no avail, county

voters rejected the new approach, also.

As of presstime, the tax base was being defeated at a five to three ratio. With partial totals from 99 of 169 precincts it had been outvoted 5080 to 3403.

Hakanson relayed distress over the failure and said that

the board will have to re-evaluate the levy. He was confident that the College would propose the revised levy to the voters on the June 26 election date.

The College is currently functioning on the last year of a three-year tax levy that was passed in 1981. The levy expires June 30, 1984.

Twice this year the board had proposed three-year tax levies asking for a 12 percent tax increase over the three years. The levy that the College is functioning under now taxes county citizens \$1.24 per \$1000 of assessed property value. The two proposals that failed would have set a limit of \$1.39 per \$1000.

The reason the College decided to try something new was because tax bases can only appear on general or primary election ballots on even-numbered years, therefore the opportunity was at hand.

College President John Hakanson said the advantage of a tax base is that it sets a limit on tax increases. This election's rejection was the

Election Results

Yes.....5080

No.....3403

(With partial totals from 99 of 169 precincts)

seventh time county voters have denied a College tax base proposal.

Hakanson had said that there was not a difference in the amounts of the three proposals, just that this last one took another disguise. The rejected tax base would have contributed \$8.2 million to the College's revenue. It allowed for a six-percent increase per year to accommodate for inflation, but any increase more than that would have had to go before the voters again.

Hakanson had confirmed that the tax base approval had no bearing on the closure of

summer school. But it does have an effect upon fall term.

The College has enough money to function in summer term due to the budget cuts that were enacted in November and December of 1983, but fall term hinges on the passage of a future levy.

"We will have to make some more cuts in our levy depending on what the board and budget committee's attitude is at tonight's meeting," Hakanson said. "We have enough revenue for our summer program, but we need to pass a levy in order to function fall term. If we pass one, then it's no problem."



College President Dr. John Hakanson

File Photo

Faculty contract now in Boards' hands

By Shelley Ball
Of The Print

Clackamas Community College's ongoing struggle to ratify a faculty contract may soon be over, as the College's faculty yesterday voted to accept a newly negotiated contract.

The proposed two-year contract will go into effect if the College's Board of Education ratifies it at tonight's board meeting.

The College's previous faculty contract expired in July of 1983, and since that time the faculty has been operating

without a contract. Although the College's faculty and administration have held numerous negotiation meetings, no agreement had been reached, so a fact-finder's hearing was originally scheduled for April 26.

That hearing has since been called off, as Counselor David Campbell said another meeting was held just before the hearing, in which both sides hammered out an agreement over the course of several days.

"Basically, compromises were made on both sides,"

Campbell said of the negotiation meeting. Campbell is a part of the four-member faculty group representing the entire faculty in negotiation meetings.

Campbell explained the newly negotiated contract consists of putting a two-year freeze on faculty wages, with an increment during the second year. This faculty salary freeze is categorized under the economic issue of the faculty contract, and it is one of the newest changes made during the recent negotiation.

Campbell also said the faculty feels they have

negotiated an increment only and not an actual salary raise. "They (board) would view it as a raise in salary. The faculty sees it as money for demonstration of competence on the job," he said.

"We (faculty) have given up a pay raise in effect of recognizing the dire straits of the College," Campbell said.

Another issue negotiated on the faculty contract included an early retirement clause, which will go into effect during the first year of the contract, or in 1983-84. The language issues of the faculty contract, which involved a

Reduction in Force procedure and faculty evaluations, were negotiated for each year of the contract.

In regards to the upcoming board meeting, Dean of Instruction Lyle Reese said he and other members who represent the administration side in the negotiation meetings are still not at liberty to talk about the contract negotiations until after both sides have ratified the contract, if that is the case.

The next time the College's faculty will be meeting to negotiate the next two-year contract will be in February of 1985.

