

Chapter 33 Monthly Review

<http://www.smccd.edu/accounts/csea/> 650-524-6968 • Volume 4, Edition 2 • March–May 2013
CSEA Chapter 33 · San Mateo County Community College District

Status Report - Salary Survey for Fiscal Year 2011-2012

Recently, the District informed CSEA that the Board of Trustees rejected implementation of the Salary Survey findings from the 2011-2012 Bay Ten Salary Survey. Naturally, we were shocked, since this would be the first time in over 30 years that the Survey results have not been adopted by the Board *in toto*.

What is even more unsettling is that at NO time during contract negotiations for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 (when the Bay Ten Survey was supposed to have been completed by the District) did Administration even hint that it would not be recommending Survey implementation to the Board.

A Salary Survey is a study of compensation for similar classifications using the Bay Ten community colleges and other institutions mutually agreed upon by the District and CSEA. The survey is way to establish a wage standard for similar classifications in a labor market. This ensures a standard or average wage for each classification making sure that staff that is performing the same work receive similar compensation. CSEA has contract language (8.7) guaranteeing that a Salary Survey is conducted every 4 years, and for 30 years this Survey has been implemented separately from any negotiated general salary increase. For other employee groups, the District performs a similar survey but on an annual basis and implementation is rolled into regular contract negotiations.

2007-2008 Salary Survey

Four years ago when the SMCCD was in deep financial trouble, Administration took the position that if the CSEA 2007-2008 Survey findings were implemented, the District would be forced to lay off positions in the CSEA bargaining unit.

At that time, faced with the threat of layoffs the Chapter 33 E-Board and Negotiations Team concluded that our unit could better serve our students, keep staff employed and continue to serve our community by foregoing any Salary Survey increases for 2007-2008.

2011-2012 Salary Survey

After the 2010-2011 contract negotiations, CSEA began to press Administration for progress reports on the upcoming 2011-2012 Salary Survey. The 2011-2012 Survey was not completed until late 2012. CSEA met with Administration in January, February and March of 2013 to review Survey findings, and the parties came to agreement on those findings.

In March 2013, Administration presented the Survey findings to the Board of Trustees in closed session. Subsequently, Administration reported to CSEA that the Board had rejected the salary adjustments needed to implement the 2011-2012 Survey. The District stated that there were 58 employees in the surveyed job families that were at the 5th or greater ranking and the cost to adjust the salaries of the 58 to the 4th ranking would be \$275,000; The Administration stated that the Board was unwilling to spend a total of 275k on the 58 employees.

One cost factor was retroactive pay back to July 2011. The retro pay liability had increased with time, due to Administration's delay in completing the Survey. Although the District alone was responsible for the increased cost of retroactive pay, CSEA nevertheless made a compromise offer to waive one full year of retroactivity, if that would clear the way for implementation. Administration rejected the Union's compromise offer.

CSEA always has tried to be reasonable and to work with the District in a fair manner. For example, CSEA waived implementation of the 2007-2008 Survey due to the District's fiscal problems. Again, in the current dispute when CSEA was informed by the District that the Salary Survey, retroactive to July 1, 2011, was too costly, CSEA made a compromise offer to change the effective date from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2012, which would halve the back-pay liability.

The District's response has been to propose instead to fold the cost of the 2011-2012 Survey into our up-coming contract negotiations for fiscal year 2013-2014. This proposal has the appearance of a zero sum game, and we are concerned that the District may want the CSEA unit as a whole to forego part of a general salary increase to fund the Survey implementation. Such a result would be unacceptable.

We will keep you informed with periodic updates as the situation develops. **CSEA Chapter 33 Negotiations Team**