



SMC Hourly Advocate

Volume 22, Issue 1

October 2007

Parity

By Martin Goldstein

“Parity” or “parity pay” is about putting more money in your pocket. It’s about making part-time and full time salaries more equal; if we were at 100% parity they would be exactly equal, and your salary per class would be the same as a full timer with similar credentials and experience. That’s not just a good thing, it’s a *very* good thing.

Your duties and responsibilities would also be the same, proportionally. Parity is about equal pay for equal work, and right now part-timers are equal in neither. We get paid less per class, and theoretically at least, we work less per class. Most of us are not responsible for much of the outside-the-classroom work an full timer is contractually obligated to do – office hours, committee meetings – any and all non-teaching duties. (The few who *do* have office hours are paid additionally for them; about 3-5% additional pay on the current salary schedule.)

A full timer with a 15-hour-a-week teaching load is obligated to work *at least* 15 additional hours on these duties. This difference in work obligations is the main difference used to justify paying part-timers less; at SMC about 70% as much as the equivalent full timers, per class. (We’ll leave out for the moment the state law that prevents us from teaching more than a 60% load, thus further reducing our possible income at any District.)

If we are to move to 100% pay parity, we must also move to 100% equal work obligations. Thus a 60% load (say three 3 unit classes) would require *at least* 9 hours a week of work outside the classroom to justify the equal pay. You would be 3/5 of an full timer in work *and* pay. You would be more involved in on-campus non-teaching activities, just like full timers, and most of us believe it would improve the overall

numbers, including the all-important student retention rate. Teachers on the ground, not on the freeway, do a better job of helping students.

Further, 100% parity would markedly reduce or even eliminate any economic advantage from hiring part-timers in the first place. If we’re not cheaper per class, it may even be cheaper to hire one full timer (with one medical and retirement benefit) than two or more part-timers. Again, most of us believe that the only way we will ever get to the state mandated ratio of FT/PT of 75/25 – 75% of all WTH done by full timers – is to have parity pay. If there is anything the history of the last 20 years has taught us, it is that as long as schools can save money by hiring part-timers, they will, no matter what the law says. Here at SMC we are at an embarrassing 45/55 now – only 45% of WTH are taught by the 313 full timers, with 55% taught by the 1000+ part-timers. Money talks, and administrators listen. It’s literally a no-brainer locally and statewide, since we are the last and most crucial safety net our society has to keep kids from a life of minimum wage poverty – but don’t get me started.

In any case, parity is a statewide issue among community colleges, with a small amount of money earmarked in the state budget since 2000 to help schools reach parity – with, however, no generally agreed upon definition of what that is, and what duties it should involve. The discussion is ongoing here at SMC during the current contract negotiation, and we have agreement on what we believe to be a fair and progressive definition. Parity pay is set at 100% of full time pay, with proportionally all the same outside class duties. Pay for instruction-only (what most of us now do) is set at 75%, and instruction-plus-office-hours at 85%. Negotiation now centers on the multi-year plan to get up to those numbers.

“Parity” continued from page 1.

To put this issue in perspective, we looked around the state to see what others have done. In Marin, they are already at 95% for instructional faculty, with the obligations including office hours, shared governance, and committee work. Their goal is 100%, and they are close to it. In San Francisco City College, they’re at 85%, with office hours separate and additional, and shared governance and committee work not included. Their goal, too, is 100%.

The Los Angeles Community College District is at 75%, with no agreed on final goal; Foothill-DeAnza is 74%, moving up to 77.5% by 2009, with 87.5% their goal – not including professional responsibilities or committee work. San Jose-Evergreen is 65%, with the salary schedules linked, and office hours included – but not shared governance and committee work. Their goal, too, is 100%.

I think we look good in this comparison, based on our ideals -- and not so good based on our actual performance. But clearly steps are being taken to work to a greater parity pay percentage in the next few years, and it is a solid achievement of the District and our Negotiating Team to have agreed upon such a fair and appropriate set of definitions. It’s the beginning of a model at Santa Monica College for reaching regularization of the part-time workforce, something that in the end we can all be proud of.

And once we do reach 100% parity, many of the presumed distinction between full time and part-timers would be eliminated, as would the economic advantage in hiring part-timers in the first place. They would be hired when it doesn’t make sense (or isn’t possible) to hire a full timer – which is what the job category (of part-timers) was originally created for 40 years ago. And others currently working part-time would become properly paid professionals even if not working at a full load at any one college.

Finally, Proposition 92, the Community College Initiative, if it passes, could provide new money into the system, enough to reach parity everywhere – and certainly here at SMC. Our Faculty Association leadership will thus be asking our Board of Trustees in the near future to resolve to do just that—resolve that a significant percentage of any new Prop 92 money, if we win it, will be used to regularize the part-time workforce here in Santa Monica. It is a Santa Monica thing to do, and I think that a Santa Monica Model could become the model for the entire system.

Whether that happens, however, depends on us. If we don’t fight for that money now, and define what we want it for, we’ll never see it later. So vote “Yes” on Prop 92—and tell your friends.

STRS and Larissa?!

By Becky Curtis

Have you taken a look at your paycheck lately? I for one noticed that deductions were being taken out of my check from both LARISA and STRS—then I was just switched to STRS without my knowledge and without any notification. There are approximately 200 faculty affected by this problem. But what do we do now? Are we in STRS legitimately? Do we want to remain in STRS? These questions need answers and the problems need to be resolved. What is being done about it?

This involuntary switch started at the end of ‘05 and continued for several months before the FA found out what happened. During the Retirement Workshop, Ian Fraser, payroll manager, suggested that an error occurred with a county clerk who apparently applied a state law mandating that if you work over 60 hours in a pay period you have to be moved into STRS. That law was vacated in ‘05 and forward, but the prior law may (or may not) apply for the earlier periods, depending.

No one is really sure what happened then or what’s supposed to happen now. It takes a lot of time to go back and research each problem, payroll manager Ian Fraser says, without stating when they are going to at least start the process. The FA has had several meetings with President Chui Tsang as well as VP Randy Lawson, and the district seems in no hurry to fix the problem. Finally the FA has had to file a claim, which is the first step to filing a lawsuit to get the district to resolve the problem.

I have received emails from scores of very frustrated part-time faculty -- **Now let’s take action.** Part-time faculty should come to the **Monday 11/6 Board Meeting, 7 pm in Business 117,** and fill out a card to address this issue, which will be included on the agenda. We must put pressure on the district to solve the problem. You can also contact Marcia Wade Vice-President of Human Resources, and tell her your story: (310) 434-4010 wade_marcia@smc.edu

Changes to Your Paycheck

HR has changed the calculation process for your paycheck from load factor to hourly pay. You will get the paid the same total amount per semester, however you will no longer get 4 equal payments. Generally speaking you will get two checks for four weeks pay and two checks for five weeks, totaling the same previous amount that had been paid in four equal payments. For specific questions, contact Ian Fraser, payroll manager, at: (310) 434-4327 or email: fraser_ian@smc.edu

EDITORIAL

Proposition 92: What's in it for us?

Martin Goldstein

The Community College Initiative, Proposition 92, will appear on the February 2008 ballot – along with the Presidential primary candidates. It is a good thing, and I hope it will pass, and I'm actually working actively for it. But, as Editor of the *Hourly Advocate*, I have to ask the titular question. What's in it for us part-timers?

I ask the question knowing the answer already, which is, simply, nothing necessarily. That's not the same as necessarily nothing – we *could* get something out of it. In fact, we *should* get something out of it. But there's nothing in it that actually addresses the part-time question. It's not about fixing our problem.

It's about fixing a lot of other problems that need to be fixed, like getting our fair share of Prop 98 money and cutting and capping student fees and generally giving the community colleges a little much needed and deserved respect. None of us would argue with any of it.

But none of it says they're going spend a portion of the increased revenues to the community colleges that will result from the Prop 92 (approximately \$62 million to SMC alone over the next 5 years) to fund part-time pay equity, the only thing that will insure both 75/25 and the full regularization of part-timers on this campus. There are, however, other pieces of legislation already in motion designed to do just that -- but none of them will come to anything if there's no money to implement them.

Which is what the Prop 92 could provide. So my theory at this point, since I don't really know that the Prop 92 is going to help me (and you, and all other part-timers), is that I will work for it with the stated intention that why I'm working for it is to achieve full part-time regularization. There are a lot of good things in it already. But what I want out of it is equal pay for equal work, and all that that implies. I want regularization to come out of it, the full professionalization of the part-time community college workforce. Just like the CSU's and UC's.

If you care what happens about your job, if you want your situation to get better, then I suggest you do the same. There are no guarantees, no promises here. But if we all work to pass the Prop 92, then we all *should* share in the benefits.

It's not a great deal, but it's the best deal on the table right now, the only deal, really, that could possibly improve our situation in the next five to ten years. If enough of us work to pass it, then we have every right and reason to demand that they do the right thing after. The alternative is to do nothing, and get nothing. That *is* guaranteed.

PT Retirement

By Becky Curtis

Yet another successful PT Retirement Workshop was held on Wednesday night, October 17th. We thank Deborah Dahl Shanks, FACCC PT Governor, for her lucid power point presentation, now available on line by going to the *smcfa.org* website, or on DVD at the FA office. There's an article on retirement in the Part-time faculty Handbook, also available on the website, or research the past issues of the *Hourly Advocate* for articles on recent retirement changes or issues.

SMC Hourly Advocate Founder, Jim Prickett

Editorial Board

Martin Goldstein, Editor
Lantz Simpson, President
Kathy Sucher, Vice President
Mitra Moassessi, Chief Negotiator
Kathy Sucher, Website

Santa Monica College Faculty Association
1900 Pico Blvd.
Santa Monica, CA 90405
Phone 310-434-4394
FAX 310-434-3601
Website: <http://www.smcfa.org>

FACCC Conference in Pasadena

The Faculty Association of California Community Colleges held its annual get-together at the Pasadena Hilton this year, and Santa Monica had a significant representation. Lantz Simpson,



Rosalyn Kahn, Margaret Quan Award Winner

Dennis Frisch, Maria Alvarado, Suzanne McDonald, Mitra Moassessi, Fran Chandler, Becky Curtis, Roz Kahn – more on her in a moment – were all there, as well as two of our Trustees, Andrew Walzer and Susan Aminoff, and, of course, FACCC's erstwhile *bete noir*, moi.

It was a rewarding moment for me, honestly, as I felt both welcomed and appreciated, due to what I feel is a kind of perfect storm of events, personal and political, which seem to be marrying the PT movement with the traditional FT establishment. It's shotgun wedding of sorts, but one, I suspect, destined to last.

In a time when the PT movement is starting to reach critical mass, when we have moved from being ignored or even ridiculed, to being respected and even courted, a proposition that can really change and improve the position of everyone in the Community Colleges in the state of California is going before the voters. The more involved you are with the politics of education in California, the more you realize that this is a once-in-a-lifetime moment for all of us – and no one knows this more than the people of FACCC, who helped craft the Prop 92 in the first place.

This one we have to win, and it cannot be won if the CC's are divided, as we are now, by deep structural class distinctions that no one in

their right mind can see as fair. Too expensive to fix, yes, they might say that. But that it needs fixing, no one is arguing anymore. To win it we need to be united, and the PT movement in general is clearly on the same side as the FT establishment on this, with the full understanding that both can gain if the Proposition passes, and movement to parity is one place where we PTers expect those gains to occur.

FACCC gets it, and a blind man

could see – and certainly sense -- that the energy and intelligence and skills honed in the battle for PT parity could well be used to help sell Prop 92. In fact, I heard from several sources that FACCC is finally ready to open up its Board to more PTers – again, I feel, because not to do so is to push out some of the best and brightest activists in the state—most of whom are part-timers. We have to be, after all, if we're not to be simply victims.

Finally, one of our own, Rosalyn Kahn of the Communications Department, won the Margaret Quan Award for PT activism -- in good part because she collected nearly 1,000 signatures on her own to help qualify the Proposition. People like that are good to have on your side.

All in all an historic time. We're all in it to win it, and if we do, if we pass Prop 92 – *and especially if we pass it by a significant margin* – we become players in the world of educational politics, enough to be able to do our jobs well, the way we want to do them. And if not, we are patsies for the rest of our careers. It's that simple.



Mark Drummond, Chancellor of LACCD