

Fall 2008 data on part-time/full-time salary comparisons

-- Sandra Baringer

The annual update of Chris Storer's salary parity chart, tracking progress toward equal pay for equal work for part-time faculty, has been one of the main features of *CPFA News* for several years. This year, we compare the salary progress toward pro rata pay between fall 2000, when we first started tracking the data, and fall 2008. Data on local district parity definitions, health insurance participation, and office hour pay is from 2007 since that is the most recent data available on those items.

Storer comments, "The top [of the chart] seems to make good sense. The 5.74% closing of the 62.5% gap is about what I calculated" the part-time salary parity categorical fund could accomplish. Some districts have diverted the parity fund to full-time overload pay or other unintended purposes, or simply limited part-time salary increases to what was available in the parity fund while granting full-time faculty salary increases that have made the gap even greater. Other districts have done more

than their share, supplementing revenues from the part-time parity fund with revenues obtained by redistributing other priorities.

Abrupt movements in the ranking are due, for the most part, to more accurate reporting as time goes on. People who see data from their own districts that seems questionable, inaccurate, or missing should complain to their districts (for example, the three districts at the bottom of the chart which failed to report their part-time salary data last fall). Unions have the right to make information requests about data relevant to salaries of the employees in their bargaining units.

This chart utilizes data from the Chancellor's Office Data Mart. The fall staffing reports are not easily accessible from the main website, but the URL - <http://www.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/Divisions/TechResearchInfo/MIS/DataMartandReports/tabid/282/Default.aspx> - can be reached through a general Google search on Chancellor's Office Data Mart. The direct link to the fall staffing reports is <https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/staff.cfm>.

	FT Union Affiliation	PT Union Affiliation	2007 PT Healthcare Participants	2007 PT OffHr Participants	2000 PT Mean Hourly	2000 PT FTE Mean Salary	2008 PT Mean Hourly	2008 PT FTE Mean Salary	2000 FT Mean Salary	2008 FT Ave. Salary	2000 PT Salary % FT Mean Sal	2008 PT Salary % FT Mean Sal	2008-2000 Dif PT % FT Ave. Salary	2007 Parity % Definition
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9	Column 10	Column 11	Column 12	Column 13	Column 14
0 AAStatewide Total:			3,453	23,025	45.01	23,630.25	\$74.30	\$39,008	62,985.00	\$84,789	37.5%	43.26%	5.74%	
1 Los Angeles	CFT	CFT	339	4,886	54.96	28,855.35	\$102.46	\$53,792	64,153.00	\$87,511	45.0%	73.83%	28.85%	80.0%
2 Mira Costa		CTA	9	372	49.49	25,982.20	\$99.08	\$52,017	79,197.00	\$116,577	32.8%	34.89%	2.08%	66.0%
3 Marin	CFT	CFT	54	265	53.60	28,140.32	\$96.52	\$50,673	65,245.00	\$89,343	43.1%	56.08%	12.95%	
4 San Francisco	CFT	CFT	441	416	61.13	32,094.53	\$92.61	\$48,620	64,966.00	\$84,138	49.4%	57.67%	8.27%	
5 Foothill-De Anza	IND	IND	120	1,582	63.30	33,233.27	\$88.33	\$46,373	69,931.00	\$91,899	47.5%	50.43%	2.91%	77.5%
6 San Jose-Evergreen	CFT	CFT	38	1,208	50.23	26,370.75	\$87.03	\$45,691	60,771.00	\$84,370	43.4%	84.43%	41.04%	81.3%
7 San Mateo	CFT	CFT	70	858	53.21	27,937.18	\$85.21	\$44,735	56,759.00	\$80,524	49.2%	55.00%	5.78%	
8 El Camino	CFT	CFT	32		43.05	22,600.80	\$82.56	\$43,344	62,579.00	\$87,410	36.1%	49.54%	13.43%	75.0%
9 Chabot-Las Positas	IND	IND		225	45.39	23,829.93	\$82.34	\$43,229	63,222.00	\$87,285	37.7%	49.13%	11.44%	75.0%
10 Santa Monica	IND	IND	322	166	58.06	30,482.49	\$81.67	\$42,877	69,134.00	\$95,822	44.1%	42.85%	-1.25%	
11 Sonoma	IND	IND	217	962	55.55	29,161.96	\$80.30	\$42,158	65,800.00	\$85,875	44.3%	49.38%	5.06%	87.5%
12 Peralta	CFT	CFT	66	254	56.48	29,652.11	\$78.87	\$41,407	60,136.00	\$81,442	49.3%	53.09%	3.78%	
13 Rio Hondo	CTA	CTA	21		52.26	27,438.68	\$77.51	\$40,693	62,948.00	\$85,482	43.6%	47.15%	3.57%	60.0%
14 Cabrillo	CFT	CFT	34	447	57.27	30,066.75	\$75.83	\$39,811	60,539.00	\$79,407	49.7%	50.20%	0.53%	62.0%
15 Antelope Valley	CFT	CFT	23	720	38.50	20,214.04	\$70.17	\$36,839	68,355.00	\$79,023	29.6%	46.05%	16.48%	
16 Coast	CFT	CTA(50%-)	111		43.45	22,811.25	\$70.15	\$36,829	67,450.00	\$93,681	33.8%	41.67%	7.85%	75.0%
17 Contra Costa	IND	IND	165	818	50.83	26,685.75	\$69.11	\$36,283	65,857.00	\$83,180	40.5%	42.94%	2.42%	
18 Los Rios	CFT	CFT	429	1,215	51.12	26,836.51	\$69.10	\$36,278	56,649.00	\$77,050	47.4%	47.25%	-0.13%	75.0%
19 Mt. San Antonio	CTA	CTA	52	698	43.59	22,887.28	\$66.75	\$35,044	69,982.00	\$92,142	32.7%	37.44%	4.74%	
20 Riverside	CTA	CTA	40	1,038	46.10	24,201.55	\$66.56	\$34,944	63,480.00	\$90,092	38.1%	39.85%	1.73%	80.0%
21 Santa Barbara	IND	IND	4		40.51	21,267.89	\$65.63	\$34,456	63,341.00	\$82,684	33.6%			75.0%
22 Redwoods	IND	IND	5	256	34.65	18,190.03	\$64.92	\$34,083	53,935.00	\$85,977	33.7%	40.12%	6.39%	80.0%
23 Yuba	AAUP	CFT			44.99	23,619.68	\$64.34	\$33,779	65,128.00	\$87,413	36.3%	36.13%	-0.14%	75.0%
24 San Joaquin Delta	CTA	CTA			51.43	27,002.07	\$64.08	\$33,642	72,160.00	\$86,521	37.4%	38.71%	1.30%	80.0%
25 Gavilan	CTA	None		65	37.00	19,425.00	\$63.70	\$33,443	50,453.00	\$82,943	38.5%	40.54%	2.04%	
26 Ohlone	IND	IND			43.16	22,659.00	\$63.39	\$33,280	59,231.00	\$97,667	38.3%	34.03%	-4.23%	
27 Glendale	CFT	CFT	61	391	41.09	21,572.25	\$62.11	\$32,608	59,184.00	\$83,227	36.4%	37.38%	0.93%	
28 South Orange	CTA	CTA	126		50.58	26,556.69	\$62.00	\$32,550	70,753.00	\$88,318	37.5%	36.34%	-1.19%	83.0%
29 Pasadena	CTA	CTA			40.18	21,094.87	\$61.45	\$32,261	61,736.00	\$85,824	34.2%	37.92%	3.75%	
30 Chaffey	CTA	CTA			35.03	18,390.75	\$61.44	\$32,256	63,140.00	\$85,596	29.1%	36.72%	7.59%	70.0%
31 San Luis Obispo	CFT	CFT	67	296	45.66	23,972.63	\$61.11	\$32,083	61,498.00	\$73,847	39.0%	43.97%	4.99%	
32 Southwestern	CTA	CTA	38		44.05	23,128.81	\$60.56	\$31,794	63,360.00	\$59,580	36.5%	55.01%	18.50%	
33 Monterey	CTA	CTA		61	42.22	22,166.22	\$60.50	\$31,763	65,249.00	\$82,777	34.0%	30.04%	-3.93%	
34 San Diego	CFT	CFT	350	452	38.59	20,259.79	\$60.40	\$31,710	55,145.00	\$68,062	36.7%	45.13%	8.40%	
35 Yosemite	IND	IND					\$59.64	\$31,311	62,659.00	\$81,286	37.92%			70.0%
36 Grossmont-Cuyamaca	CFT	CFT	19		41.92	22,005.62	\$59.15	\$31,054	60,921.00	\$76,617	36.1%	38.77%	2.65%	
37 Palomar	CFT	CFT	30	241	38.80	20,370.20	\$58.58	\$30,755	65,110.00	\$92,219	31.3%	32.83%	1.54%	
38 Long Beach	CTA	CTA			39.53	20,754.94	\$57.33	\$30,098	62,047.00	\$88,276	33.5%	36.46%	3.01%	
39 Napa Valley	CTA	CTA		67	38.30	20,106.94	\$57.32	\$30,093	61,770.00	\$78,890	32.6%	37.15%	4.60%	82.5%
40 West Kern	CTA	CTA		58	30.69	16,110.53	\$56.67	\$29,752	62,839.00	\$83,371	25.6%	34.58%	8.94%	81.0%
41 Sierra	CTA	CTA		274	40.54	21,286.08	\$56.52	\$29,673	56,786.00	\$78,231	37.5%	38.45%	0.97%	
42 Hartnell	CTA	CTA			34.35	18,033.75	\$56.31	\$29,563	54,010.00	\$80,639	33.4%	36.67%	3.28%	Lab 85/83% Lec
43 Cerritos	CFT	CFT			41.83	21,960.75	\$55.79	\$29,290	66,349.00	\$86,554	33.1%	33.37%	0.27%	
44 Santa Clarita	CTA	CFT			36.80	19,320.03	\$55.73	\$29,258	62,771.00	\$88,136	30.8%	34.03%	3.25%	75.0%
45 Citrus	CTA	CFT	18	47	38.85	20,397.24	\$55.09	\$28,922	65,500.00	\$82,696	31.1%	34.89%	3.75%	75.0%
46 Kern	CTA	CTA					\$55.00	\$28,875	54,206.00	\$86,119		34.64%		87.5%
47 West Hills	CTA	CTA		17	31.70	16,643.54	\$54.88	\$28,812	51,863.00	\$90,230	32.1%	30.82%	-1.27%	53.0%
48 Imperial	CTA	CTA			24.55	12,888.75	\$54.16	\$28,434	55,068.00	\$76,564	23.4%	34.68%	11.28%	88.0%
49 San Bernardino	CTA	CTA		580	40.23	21,123.16	\$53.56	\$28,119	63,211.00	\$76,207	33.4%	34.90%	1.48%	
50 Shasta-Tehema	CTA	CTA		186			\$52.69	\$27,662		\$82,667		33.71%		
51 Rancho Santiago	IND(Crd)	CTA(Non-Cr)			36.82	19,332.25	\$51.85	\$27,221	74,492.00	\$90,464	26.0%	28.31%	2.36%	
52 Butte	CTA	CWA		206	42.25	22,181.25	\$51.44	\$27,006	63,649.00	\$78,407	34.8%	33.88%	-0.97%	
53 Mendocino-Lake	CFT	CTA		57	34.88	18,310.30	\$50.94	\$26,744	62,516.00	\$84,082	29.3%	33.57%	4.28%	
54 Victor Valley	CTA	CFT			35.61	18,692.86	\$50.60	\$26,565	59,797.00	\$88,889	31.3%	29.53%	-1.73%	
55 Sequoias	CTA	CWA		46	38.22	20,063.20	\$49.76	\$26,124	62,025.00	\$84,053	32.3%	31.88%	-0.46%	75.0%
56 Compton	CFT	CFT			30.63	16,080.75	\$49.01	\$25,730	48,079.00	\$81,703	33.4%	33.60%	0.15%	
57 Copper Mountain	CTA	CTA			38.50	20,212.50	\$48.73	\$25,583	53,967.00	\$78,245	37.5%	30.95%	-6.51%	
58 North Orange	CTA	CFT	80	1,550	35.53	18,652.15	\$48.36	\$25,389	64,844.00	\$102,816	28.8%	24.75%	-4.02%	80.0%
59 State Center	CFT	CFT			34.31	18,014.62	\$47.90	\$25,148	66,616.00	\$91,612	27.0%	28.05%	1.01%	75.0%
60 Desert	CTA	CTA		279	35.74	18,763.50	\$47.39	\$24,880	62,174.00	\$85,670	30.2%	30.06%	-0.12%	79.0%
61 Feather River	CFT	CFT		31	27.52	14,448.00	\$47.23	\$24,796	62,652.00	\$77,910	23.1%	32.22%	9.16%	
62 Siskiyous	CTA	CTA			34.01	17,854.43	\$47.06	\$24,707	53,240.00	\$72,154	33.5%	34.01%	0.47%	
63 Barstow	CTA	CTA			37.08	19,467.00	\$45.14	\$23,699	61,855.00	\$79,329	31.5%	28.16%	-3.31%	ovld + 25%
64 Lake Tahoe	CTA	CTA		39	30.19	15,849.75	\$44.43	\$23,326	49,446.00	\$70,215	32.1%	32.26%	0.20%	66.8%
65 Merced	CTA	CTA			33.80	17,745.00	\$43.91	\$23,053	57,641.00	\$81,910	30.8%	26.55%	-4.23%	
66 Allan Hancock	IND	CFT		136	31.89	16,743.77	\$43.85	\$23,021	57,745.00	\$77,154	29.0%	30.97%	1.98%	76.0%
67 Mt. San Jacinto	CTA	CWA			34.48	18,100.43	\$42.49	\$22,307	55,199.00	\$82,158	32.8%	30.35%	-2.44%	
68 Lassen	CTA	CTA					\$33.66	\$17,672		\$76,936		21.32%		
69 West Valley/Mission	IND	IND	32	737			\$30.89	\$16,217	62,033.00	\$78,892				
70 Ventura	CFT	CFT	40	703	43.43	22,799.86	\$0.00	\$0	65,4					

The Data Mart, once you get to it, has all sorts of other reports as well on administrative salaries, classified salaries, and student enrollment, demographics, financial aid, and success rates.

One interesting component of the fall 2008 staffing report (which was not available until after the spring 2009 edition of CPFA News went to press) is the headcount and FTE (full-time equivalent) data on faculty. We have not included this in the chart below, but as of fall 2008, there were 18,200 tenured and tenure-track academic employees. The number of academic temporary (part-time faculty) employees has reached a record high, now at 45,265. It seems likely that the fall 2009 data, when available, will reflect a reduction in that number, since the hundreds of course sections cut this fall in most districts, with more to come, are implemented by cutting temporary faculty rather than laying off tenured faculty.

Oddly enough, the systemwide FTE for tenured and tenure-track faculty is listed as 20,825, over 2,000 more than the 18,200 headcount. This could be due to misreporting of administrative positions as part of teaching load, and/or it could represent course overloads. Due to space considerations, we have not printed the overload salary data in this year's chart, but the district breakdown of this information is available at the Data Mart website.

Will districts maintain and continue to improve these gains for part-time faculty, or will they use the excuse of the disappearing categoricals to allow part-time salaries to fall behind again? Union strength at the local level – and the commitment of the union locals themselves to part-time equity – will be the likely determining factors.

Higher Ed Crisis

- cont. from page 1

colleges to fulfill lower division requirements that are no longer available at the CSUs and UCs due to a combination of cuts in admissions and cuts in course offerings available to students already enrolled. The squeeze on course availability will be felt all up and down the system and consequently, many existing community college students will be looking for new jobs or increased hours at their existing jobs, impacting the already tight job market even more.

The new faculty majority, those instructors who teach off the tenure track, are on the front lines of the job cuts. Comprehensive data regarding the impacts on staffing and enrollment will not be available from the Chancellor's office for months, but trends are fairly clear: non-tenure-track faculty have lost their jobs, and more will lose their jobs in January. In districts where they were fortunate enough to have access to health benefits, many who are still working have lost their health benefits eligibility due to reductions in course load.

In districts where non-tenure-track faculty have reemployment preference through collective bargaining agreements, jobs are at least being cut in a somewhat orderly fashion, with the victims having some sense of whether they are likely to be reemployed by the district in the future. In other districts, the budget crisis offers irresponsible and vindictive administrators the opportunity to get rid of instructors for questionable reasons: instructors who resist top-down pedagogical impositions which may interfere with academic freedom, instructors who advocate on behalf of non-tenure-track faculty, instructors who are not young, instructors who refuse to accept excess students over the maximum class size. Retaliation and age discrimination may be illegal, but they are difficult to prove in a climate of slash and burn.

The **San Francisco district** has negotiated a priority order for cutting of class assignments that honors its reemployment preference system and also gives priority to the people most likely to be depending on their part-time assignments as their sole source of income. Cuts are being implemented in the following

order: retirees (both full-time and part-time), full-time overload, part-timers with no seniority (2 semesters or less), and finally pters based on seniority (3 semesters or more). With this system, not many part-timers have lost their assignments yet, though job losses are expected to happen in spring semester 2010.

In other districts, non-tenure-track faculty advocates are starting to question the continued access of full-time faculty members to overload assignments when part-timers are going without work. As Stacey Burks, president of the CWA-affiliated part-time faculty union at the **Butte-Glenn district**, has pointed out, districts who are paying a full-time faculty member to teach a course on overload while a part-time faculty member eligible to teach that course applies for unemployment compensation, the district is paying for that course twice. Subsequently, the Vice President for Learning & Economic Development at Butte-Glenn, Ken Meier, issued a memorandum instructing deans and program directors to give priority in hiring to part-time faculty for summer sessions and intersessions, and to discourage full-time overloads larger than one course if part-time faculty are available. "It is unfair and unproductive for full-time faculty to take potential work from part-timers. Huge overloads also undermine quality as do large overloads and second jobs at other institutions," Meier said.

It's hard to say who specifically is to blame for this



mess when so many factors have contributed to it. The legislature is ruled by the tyranny of the minority due to the California constitution's outmoded 2/3 requirement for passage of a budget. Fearmongering continues to feed an out-of-control prison budget while education spending shrinks in comparison every year, and the governor refuses to exercise the leadership necessary to combat it. Inequitable property tax caps for corporate interests, the unplanned offspring of Proposition 13, have become institutionalized in the scenarios of the state's economic power brokers.

In the midst of this storm, the higher education institutions themselves protect their reserves for some future rainy day, imposing cuts on the most powerless: the non-tenure-track faculty, the low-wage workers, and the students. University of California president Mark Yudof persuades the Regents to give him emergency powers, and community college administrators advocate for exceptions to the mandate that at least 50% of expenditures be made for instruction.

Yudof, despite his own misplaced priorities, is right about one thing: "The shine is off of [higher education]. It's really a question of being crowded out by other priorities."

*Where the action is:
UCLA November 19
Student rally for higher education
funding*

College Textbook Publishers Pay You to Create:

Instructor's manuals • Student study guides • Companion web sites
Test questions • Lecture outlines • PowerPoint presentations
Transparencies • Student readers • Booklets • Internet exercises

Learn how to **earn \$25-\$50 per hour and more** in John Soares' ebook:

*Writing College Textbook Supplements:
The Definitive Guide to Winning High-Paying Assignments
in the College Textbook Publishing Market*

**Download the introduction and first two chapters for free.
Buy now, get *Maximum Productivity for Freelance Writers* free!**

Details: www.WritingCollegeTextbookSupplements.com