

## **Show WHO the Money?? The Parity Fund 3 Years Later**

-- Sandra Baringer

The big victory of the summer was getting Schwarzenegger to back down on his budget plan to fold the part-time categorical funds for pay equity, office hours, and health insurance into the general community college apportionment. The earmarked categories were saved.

But where does that leave us? The office hour and health insurance funds are so underfunded that districts are unable to predict the rate of reimbursements they will ultimately get from the state if they agree in their negotiations with their local unions to provide these programs for their part-time faculty.

The bigger issue is equal pay for equal work, the concept behind the \$57 million pay equity fund. According to data recently released from the Chancellor's office, most districts have now established their parity targets, which range from 60% to 100%. What this means is that given adequate apportionments from the equity fund, these districts agree that part-time faculty members are entitled to a given percentage of what full-time faculty members receive for the same teaching load. Why aren't all the parity targets 100%? Because part-time faculty job descriptions in most districts do not include office hours, committee work, and other departmental administrative duties that full-time faculty must perform. What portion of a full-time instructor's time is devoted to these things? That's the big question, and the largest number of districts (14) have decided that it is 25%; thus pay parity for part-time faculty is established in those districts at 75%.

Only one district targets parity as low as 60% (Cabrillo); six districts set it at 70%. Four say it's 80%; three say it's 87.5%; two say it's 88%. Eight districts give percentages somewhere else between 60 and 88%, and ten districts say they have established a parity target, but analysts in the Chancellor's office have apparently been unable to determine what that figure is.

Twenty-two districts either responded that they are "in progress" (including one at impasse [Mira Costa]) or have not responded at all.

Two districts (San Francisco and San Jose/Evergreen) have established parity at 100%, meaning that part-time faculty in those districts are expected to participate in all professional duties on a pro rata basis based on their percentage of full time employment. This is the scenario that CPFA has always advocated, because it affords the full degree of professionalism and respect that all faculty deserve, part-time or full-time, and CPFA congratulates those districts.

So, will parity be achieved in those districts? The jury is still out.

Looking at the data on mean salary comparisons gives a far different picture of the parity game. In Fall 2003, fourteen districts actually reported a DECREASE in pay parity between part-time and full-time mean salaries. Leading the charge here, full speed backward, is Ohlone, which despite utilizing its parity fund allocation to raise the mean part-time hourly rate from \$43.16 in fall 2000 to \$48.11 in fall 2003, somehow managed to increase full-time mean salaries from \$59,231 in fall 2000 to \$74,784 in fall 2003! Calculating that into an hourly rate for classroom contact hours (the standard load is 540 hours per year), those full-time faculty members now make \$138.49 an hour.

That may look like a lot, but as all part-time faculty know, the classroom contact hours are only a small part of the workload. It may be a fair rate for seasoned full-time instructors with graduate degrees, but it leaves their equally qualified part-time colleagues in the dust at \$48.11.

How did they do it? We can only speculate that other funding sources were found for these full-time raises, funding sources that were not shared with part-time faculty. For instance, what if full-time faculty get COLAs and/or growth money and part-time faculty do not? What if full-time faculty partake of the part-time parity fund by teaching overloads on the same salary schedule as part-timers?

And then there is the issue of step advances on the salary scale to which only full-time faculty ever advance, because part-time experience in other districts is not counted. These sorts of funding manipulations violate the intent of the parity fund legislation and they violate the spirit of fair dealing.

Ohlone is not alone in increasing the parity gap between 2000 and 2003. The other districts in this "hall of shame" are, from the largest increase in the gap to the least: Merced, Copper Mountain, Solano, Butte, Mt. San Jacinto, Chaffey, Cerritos, Siskiyou, Compton, Gavilan, North Orange, Pasadena, and West Hills.

We invite these districts to explain how this happened. Maybe there is some compelling explanation, but all we have to look at are the figures reported to the Chancellor's office from these districts.

Some of these numbers do make one pause. Barstow, for example, by its own report decreased the pay parity gap by 13.14%, coming out number one. Part-time mean hourly rate increased from \$37.08 in fall 2000 to \$39.90 in fall 2003. Yay!

But wait – Barstow reports that its full-time mean salary DECREASED from \$61,855 in fall 2000, to \$46,954 in fall 2003. Were full-time faculty members leaping out of buildings? Something seems a little off in these numbers.

Aside from Barstow (and again, maybe there is a compelling explanation), twelve districts reported a decrease in the pay gap of more than 5%. CPFA congratulates these districts and they currently reside in our HALL OF FAME: Feather River, El Camino, San Diego, Chabot-Las Positas, West Kern, Los Angeles, Ventura, Coast, San Francisco, San Louis Obispo, Antelope Valley, Redwoods.

We await the fall 2004 data with bated breath. The complete report from Fall 2003 appeared in the spring 2004 edition of CPFA News and can be viewed at our website, [www.cpfa.org](http://www.cpfa.org).