From: Rodriguez, Ernie Sent: Monday, December 10, 2007 1:36 PM To: All Faculty Subject: AFT 1493 E-News Importance: High



Dear Faculty colleagues:

On November 8, AFT was notified that the Board of Trustees was going to consider an action item entitled "Approval of a New Administrative/Executive Salary Schedule" at its November 13 meeting. Given that AFT had been notified of the proposed salary increases at the last minute (a four day holiday weekend occurred between the 8th and 13th), we asked that this item be listed as information only so that the Union would have time to review the proposal. The District agreed to this request.

Subsequently, on November 28 (and at its request), AFT was provided with additional materials related to the proposed increases in administrative salaries, including a Bay 10 Management Salary Survey, which the District had hired an outside consulting firm, Mercer Consulting, to create.

## Administrative salary increases proposed to the Board

Mercer Consulting and the District administration's joint report recommends to the Board the following increases to the administrative salary schedule:

- The Chancellor's base salary would be increased by 2.7% to \$240,000 (with Perks to \$279,000).
- The Executive Vice Chancellor's maximum salary would be increased by 30.3% to \$214,000.
- The other Vice Chancellors would see an increase in their maximum salary by 16.7% to \$175,000.
- College Presidents would have their maximum salary increased by 24% to \$204,000.

• Deans would have their maximum salaries increased by 26% to \$155,000.

The salaries recommended above are in addition to the raise all administrators have already received for this year (3.5%). The proposed salary schedules for all administrators (except the Chancellor) have 6 steps to get to the maximum salary.

## AFT will ask the Board to vote NO

After reviewing the information provided by the District, AFT has concluded that these significant salary increases cannot be supported at this time. AFT will ask the Board to vote No on this proposal. AFT suggests that faculty consider attending the next Board meeting (on December 12 in the District Board Room at 6:00 p.m.) to make their views known on this matter.

Let us explain why we are urging the Board to vote No at this time.

First, AFT acknowledges the need for the District to maintain administrative salaries that are competitive with those at other community college districts in the Bay Area. In principle this is a desirable goal. If it is true, as the Mercer study indicates, that administrators' salaries have not been adjusted, other than for COLA, for 31 years, then AFT would in principle support adjustments.

But the proposed increases of 16.7% to 30.3% are excessive. No other group of employees in the District has ever received such huge increases. On the proposed new scale, administrators' salaries would be in the range of double (or more) that of average faculty salaries.

Full-time faculty with doctorates who are at the very top of their salary schedule make \$99,000 per year. Yet the consultants focus a lot of attention on very few faculty who make between \$120,000 and \$160,000.

For faculty members to earn this kind of salary, they would need to teach massive overloads. Obviously this is an extremely atypical faculty load. The overwhelming majority of faculty do not have the opportunity to earn this much. Yet the District proposal gives the false impression that all faculty have the opportunity to earn an income greater than that of most administrators.

The truth is most of our faculty are on the part-time schedule and making under \$35,000 a year. The typical full timer is probably making half of what the consultants focus their attention on.

Again, AFT isn't opposed to administrators' receiving raises. But even in a flush period, 30.3%, 26%, 24%, and 16.7% salary increases seem excessive. And we are hardly in a flush period.

In fact, the proposed increase in the salaries of all managers in the District could not have come at a less opportune time. The State budget has accrued an unforeseen, but significant, deficit during recent months. In addition, as the housing bubble continues to deflate, home prices and, therefore, local property tax revenues are shrinking. This means that the fiscal outlook for our District for next year is likely to be quite poor.

The District is already in an austerity mode in terms of hiring faculty and staff. All three colleges are being told to cut their budgets, even while acknowledging that there are grossly under funded needs that are not being met. For example, CSM has just announced that they will only be hiring three new full-time faculty for next year.

For these reasons, AFT recommends that the Board of Trustees should acknowledge that administrators received the same raise as was given to other District employees in the last round of negotiations. Before the Board seriously considers this new proposal to further raise administrative salaries, AFT feels that it is important to wait and see what the fiscal impact on the District will be when the next State budget is approved.

We would like to believe that if the District has to cut its budget for next year that administrators would rather receive a smaller increase in salary than cut a significant number of classes from the schedule. This would, after all, signify that the District administration has its priorities aligned correctly in a district that often proclaims that it is student-centered in its mission to provide quality education to the residents of San Mateo county.

## AFT urges faculty to write to Board members

Finally, AFT urges faculty to write an email or a letter to the members of the Board of Trustees on this matter. We ask faculty to bring their letters to the AFT office at CSM (15-131) by no later than 5 p.m. THIS WEDNESDAY (December 12), so that they can be delivered en masse at the Board meeting that evening.

Or send an email to the Board of Trustees, with a cc to the AFT office.

The Board members have the following email addresses:

Helen Housman can be reached at: <u>hausman@smccd.edu</u>. Richard Holober can be reached at: <u>rholober@yahoo.com</u> Dave Mandelkern can be reached at: <u>mandelkern@smccd.edu</u> Patricia Miljanich can be reached at: <u>miljanich@smccd.edu</u> Karen Schwarz can be reached at: <u>ukareme2@sbcglobal.net</u>