



Faculty **A**ssociation **B**ulletin

Volume 17, Issue 1

Negotiations Update

By Mitra Moassessi,
Chief Negotiator

On June 14, 2006, Faculty Association negotiators, District negotiators, and the state-appointed mediator, Draza Mrvichin, met for the first time. The FA presented its salary proposal, which consisted of a 3.5% raise on salary schedules retroactively effective February 2006, an immediate \$1.5 million bonus, and a 2% raise on all salary schedules effective August 2006.

This June 14 proposal modified the FA's spring proposal (2% effective January 2005, 3.5% effective January 2006, and re-openers for 2006-07) by extending it over three years and not asking for a re-opener, even though the college is receiving a 5.92% COLA for 2006-2007. The FA also proposed to extend the life of the faculty contract by one year and to implement a formula for calculating the faculty's raise effective August 2007. The proposed formula, developed by the FA was based on COLA, growth, and the increase in the cost of health benefits.

On July 17, the second meeting with the mediator was held. At this meeting, the District rejected the FA's salary proposal. The District then made its last salary proposal for the 2004-07 faculty contract, which was a 3.5% raise on all salary schedules effective August 2006 and a 4% bonus based on the 2005-06 salary schedules as one-time money.

The FA Negotiating Council met afterwards and recommended rejecting the District's last proposal. This recommendation was based on the following facts:

- The District's proposal was insultingly short of the raise that was received by administrators (2% on schedule effective January 2005 + 3.5% on schedule effective January 2006). In fact, the District's proposal for three years is less than what other employees have received in only two years.
- There is no significant difference between the district's last proposal and the offer that was rejected overwhelmingly by the faculty in December of 2005 (3.5% raise on salary schedules effective spring of 2006, re-opener for 2006-07).

Following the Negotiating Council's recommendation, I informed the state mediator that the District's last proposal was unacceptable. Subsequently, Mr. Mrvichin certified the two sides for fact-finding. In a letter addressed to the Public Employment Relations Board, he wrote: "The parties have been unable to effect a mutually acceptable settlement by utilizing the mediator process. I have therefore released the case to fact-finding in accordance with Section 3548.1 of the Educational Employment Relations Act."

We find it peculiar that despite the fact that the District has received millions of additional dollars in the form of COLA and equalization for the past three years (see tables on page 2), it continues to claim that it has fiscal problems. It is apparent that the District finds it acceptable to resolve these "fiscal problems" by denying the faculty their fair share.

What does the district's last proposal mean to you?

The following examples compare the effects of the district's last salary proposal with a raise matching what other employees have received.

Assuming that Professor Smith's placement on salary schedule for 2004-05 was group 5, step

WHERE PROFESSOR SMITH IS NOW

Salary placement

2004-05: Group 5 step 14: \$76,747

2005-06: Group 5 step 15: \$78,650

2006-07: Group 5 step 16: **\$80,553 Base for future salary raises**

Total over 3 years with no raise: \$235,950

WHAT EVERYBODY ELSE GOT

2% effective January 2005

3.5% effective January 2006

Salary placement 2004-05:

Group 5 step 14: \$76,747

Effective January 05 : \$78,282

Salary placement 2005-06:

Group 5 step 15: \$80,223

Effective January 06: \$83,031

Salary placement 2006-07:

Group 5 step 16: **\$85,040 Base for future salary raises**

Total over 3 years: $76,747 \times (3/10) + 78,282 \times (7/10) + 80,223 \times (3/10) + 83,031 \times (7/10) + 85,040 = \$245,050$

3/10 represents three months of October - December out of 10 pay periods.

7/10 represents seven months of January-July

DISTRICT'S LAST PROPOSAL

3.5% effective August 2006

4% Bonus on 2005-06:

Salary placement

2004-05: Group 5 step 14: \$76,747

2005-06: Group 5 step 15: \$78,650

2006-07: Group 5 Step 16: **\$83,372 Base for future raises**

4% Bonus on 05-06 = \$3,146 **One time money**

WHAT THE COLLEGE GOT

COLA 2004-05 = 2.41% \$1,864,271

PFE 2004-05 \$3,661,884

Equalization 2004-05 \$3,607,904

Total \$9,134,059

COLA 2005-06 = 4.23% \$3,688,212

PFE 2005-06 \$614,476

Equalization \$951,769

Prior year adjustment \$812,352

Total \$6,066,809

COLA 2006-07 = 5.92% \$5,523,368

Equalization \$3,172,562

(one time funding)

General purpose one time funds \$1,897,860

Compton \$1.5million

(Approximately)

Total \$12,093,790

SMRR Convention a Solid Success

By Martin Goldstein
Political Director

The nominating convention of Santa Monica for Renters Rights (SMRR), the city's preeminent political organization, was by all measures a success for the SMC Faculty Association. Our goal was to gain SMRR's support for the four candidates we are supporting for the four Board of Trustees seats up in the November election, and by the end of the convention on August 6, held at Olympic High School in Santa Monica, we had achieved exactly that.

Current Board of Trustee members Herb Roney, Carol Currey and Dorothy Ehrhardt-Morrison all chose not to run again, leaving three seats open, with only current Board Chair Nancy Greenstein running for reelection. When the votes were counted, Chair Greenstein, Andrew Walzer, former part-time faculty member here at SMC, David Finkel, retired judge and current part-timer here, and Louise Jaffe, school activist and founder of the influential Community for Excellence in Public Schools (CEPS), all received the coveted SMRR endorsement.

Chair Greenstein received 125 of the 147 votes cast, Judge Finkel got 119, Ms. Jaffe 116, and Mr. Walzer 92, with Tom Donner, retired Vice President of the college, trailing with 27. All five have qualified for the November ballot, along with Susanna Bracke, a financial advisor, who did not seek the SMRR endorsement.

The often fractious convention proceeded smoothly this year, with a unity slate for city council made up of Kevin McKeown, Pam O'Conner, both incumbents, and Gleam Davis, a lawyer and school activist. The school board race gave the nod to incumbents Oscar de la Torre and Emily Bloomfield, along with newcomers Kelly Pye and Barry Snell, while the Rent Control Board support went by acclamation to SMRR supporters Jennifer Kennedy, Zelia Mollica and Marilyn Wilson. All other decisions were made on the first ballot, all winning candidates receiving the necessary 55% of the votes cast the first time around.

Before the convention, faculty enjoyed a delightful picnic lunch from Bay Cities Italian Deli, while mingling with (and lobbying) the SMRR loyalists. Given that our influence on the convention floor is directly related to the number of people we have there to vote, enormous thanks and appreciation are owed to those who gave up their Saturday afternoon to attend

We thus wish to recognize the efforts of Teri Bernstein, Janet Harclerode, Josh Kanin, Lesley Kawaguchi, Barry Logan, Ruth Logan, Richard Mednick, Bill Price, Ken Rasmussen, Michael Strathearn, Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein, Michael Tracey, and especially Tracey Ellis, who helped us make this effort a smooth and solid success.

But – we still have a campaign to run and an election to win, so mark your calendars for the SMCFA PAC Fund Raiser Beach Party on October 7 from 1:00-6:00 on the beach in front of Josh Kanin's house. There you can join with all our friends from SMRR and the community at large there to enjoy an afternoon of sun and sand, good food and drink, lots of conversation -- and no speeches. Look for the invitations in your mailbox early in September. Everybody cool is coming, so be there or be square!

SMC FACULTY ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

Editorial Board

Martin Goldstein, Editor
Lantz Simpson, President
Dennis Frisch, 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.smcfafa.org/>

THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE INITIATIVE: An Update.

By Dennis Frisch

The California Community College Initiative has been approved by the State Attorney General's Office for circulation to collect signature to place the initiative before California voters in June 2008. After a bit of a false start last spring, the efforts to change the constitutional and funding status of California community college is underway.

What is needed now is a statewide, concerted campaign among faculty, classified staff, students, administrators, and Boards of Trustees to collect 598,105 signatures to qualify the initiative for the June 2008 ballot AND to raise \$1.5 million to pay for the signature collecting campaign. To collect 598,105 valid signatures, it is estimated that the campaign will have to gather 1 million signatures. There is a 150 day window to collect signatures from the time the Attorney General certifies the initiative. This can be done through a combination of both volunteer efforts (faculty, students, classified staff, administrators, Trustees) and paid signature gatherers.

You, as faculty, have a big stake in this effort because current population projections for the next ten years do not look good for community college funding if we continue with the current Prop 98 formula. That formula is based on the K-12 population, which is stagnant and projected to decline. That will mean less money for community colleges, which already are not receiving their fair share of Prop 98 money. Students have a big stake in this initiative campaign because, if successful, the initiative would lower student fees to \$15 and put in place a mechanism to make it much more difficult to raise student fees. Classified staff, administrators, and trustees have a big stake in the success of the initiative campaign because the new funding formula would base community college funding on changes and growth in the population age groups served by community colleges not the K-12 population. This will mean higher funding levels for Santa Monica College.

FUNDING: Starting in 2007-08 (for purposes of calculation), the minimum funding guarantee would increase based on growth and changes in the college-age population. The growth factor would be the sum of the following percentages: 1) the greater of (a) the percentage change in the population of California residents between 17 and 21 years of age or (b) the percentage change in the population of California residents between 22 and 25 years of age; 2) the prior year's unemployment rate less 5% (this would kick in only when unemployment was above 5%). No matter what the above calculations were, the community college growth factor is capped at 5% in any year. And, the growth factor cannot be less than 1% depending on an enrollment formula.

When the initiative takes effect, the initial portion of Prop 98 money allocated to community colleges would be 10.46% (the 2004-05 split).

STUDENT FEES: When the initiative goes into effect, student fees would roll back to \$15, or if lower, the existing fee at that time. Future annual increases in student fees would be capped at 10% or, if lower, the percentage change in per capita personal income in California. The initiative would not require any fee increases.

GOVERNANCE: The initiative would place community colleges on a constitutional standing like that of the University of California and the California State Universities. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges would be established in the Constitution. The number and composition of the Board would change, and the Board's powers would be expanded to include appointing the Chancellor and Vice-chancellors. Currently, such appointments occur in the Governor's office.

In the next few weeks, you will be hearing more and more about the initiative and you will be called upon to volunteer to collect signatures and help to raise contributions for the campaign. There is much at stake for the future of community colleges in California.

