

April 25, 2005
Volume 1, Issue 2

Bargaining Update

Meetings update

Meetings to date: Dec. 13, Jan. 19, Feb. 23, March 16, 23, April 1

Upcoming meeting: April 27 at Quinsigamond CC

April 27 preview

Several faculty will testify at the next Bargaining meeting at QCC on the following issues: 5 course workload; science lab ratio; nursing clinical and related issues; and writing intensive courses.

MSCA contract is ratified on April 2

The results of the ratification vote on the tentative agreement for a collective bargaining agreement for the period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2007 are as follows:

Yes 775

No 85

Challenged ballots 18

Total ballots cast: 878

According to Mass.

General Laws Chapter 150E, Section 7(c), the Board of Higher Education must, within 30 days, submit a request for funding of the contract to the governor.

The governor then has an additional 45 days in which he may file a bill with the legislature to fund the contract.

We will keep you informed as to the progress of the contract funding process.

Pat Markunas, MSCA President & Brad Art, Chairperson, MSCA Bargaining Committee

Source: msca.org

Mass. Community College Council/ Day Bargaining Team

Prof. staff issues pushed at April 1 meeting; faculty to testify on April 27

Holyoke CC Librarian Kathleen McDonough gave the following testimony at the April 1 Bargaining session at QCC. Several faculty will testify about a variety of issues at the April 27 meeting. See sidebar at left.

MCCC professional staff currently number about 434. Although they are a minority in the union, they represent about 25 percent of the total membership. They consist of counselors, librarians, coordinators, and others. These employees are absolutely aware that they play critical roles in the academic mission of the colleges.

Many professional staff interact closely with students and develop relationships with students that are pivotal to the students' academic success. There is no doubt in our minds that professional staff stand on equal footing with faculty.

Most professional staff are required to have academic credentials that are parallel to faculty; in other words, a minimum of a masters degree. These professional staff are in no way "less credentialed" than faculty, yet the structure that we operate under in the Massachusetts community college system does not recognize the equal value of the professional staff.

When the classification system was instituted in the 1999-2002 contract, professional staff immediately expressed concern about their treatment on a number of different issues. In the interest of moving the union forward as a whole, prof. staff, for the most part, were supportive of the contract as a way to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number.

Many staff, as well as faculty, realized significant gains in salary. However, that did not erase the justified concerns that classification, as a whole, did nothing to bring equity between professional staff and faculty. It did nothing to address the most glaring inequity of a longer work year for no additional compensation.

The contract extension agreement brought staff some hope when the committee was formed to examine the appropriateness of the classification study. Many professional staff across the state were very vested in the committee and helped out in a number of ways. Perhaps the most significant contribution was that many volunteered to closely examine the language of 170 collective bargaining agreements in the 10 comparison states and Connecticut.

One common practice found in these higher ed. contracts is the creation of a category of non-teaching faculty. In this structure, staff who are integral to the academic experience of students, but do not teach in the classroom, are recognized as such and placed on an equal grid with the faculty. At the very least, these staff are usually counselors and librarians, but there are contracts that include other staff such as health care professionals and coordinators.

The basic contract for non-teaching faculty is 9 or 10 months with a pay differential of at least 10 percent for every month added on to the basic contract. Some contracts refer to days worked rather than months with the basic contract seldom exceeding 190 days with hourly pay adjustments for hours worked beyond the minimum. In other words, there are a number ways to acquire equity between faculty and staff.

The result of this collective work is that prof. staff now are absolutely clear that their treatment under our current contract is far from the norm and that there are many ways to produce equity with faculty. These folk have been radicalized by their research and if they had any doubts about the inequity before, they do not now.

These people feel that they have been patient long enough and are looking to all of us here at the table to start correcting this inequitable condition. They feel that the last contract provided for faculty and that this contract needs to address these long simmering problems for the professional staff.

Team presents overview of prof. staff issues; inequities are cited

Fact Sheet on work year and compensation for professional staff

By Team Member and Northern Essex Librarian Gail Stuart

- JBL Associates, a nationally recognized research consultant, reviewed the contracts of 51 comparable institutions in eleven states and found that only four colleges did not consider counselors and librarians to be faculty.
- The JBL review also found that faculty in the MCCC work 160 days per year. Professional staff work 260 days. At peer institutions, professional staff work an average of 204 days (or forty-one weeks) per year, the equivalent of a ten-month contract.
- According to the JBL review, to be consistent with our peers, the community colleges would need to offer twelve-month professional staff 20 percent of their base salary for the additional months worked, along with pro-rated vacation and sick days.
- A review of contracts from the peer states conducted by MCCC professional staff and faculty found that 64 percent of the contracts agreed with the MCCC position on work year and compensation for professional staff, 28 percent disagreed, and 8 percent were silent on the issue.
- A survey conducted by the American Library Association in 2001 showed that in college and universities of all types, a majority (60 percent) of institutions provided some degree of salary equity between librarians and teaching faculty.
- In 2001, The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) the Association of American Colleges (AAC), and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) reaffirmed a joint statement in favor of faculty status for college and university librarians, excerpted below.
- *"...all members of the academic community are likely to become increasingly dependent on skilled professional guidance in the acquisition and use of library resources as the forms and numbers of these resources multiply, and library technology grows increasingly sophisticated. The librarian who provides such guidance plays a major role in the learning process.... Librarians perform a teaching...role inasmuch as they instruct students formally and informally and advise and assist faculty in their scholarly pursuits."*

Greenfield Senior Academic Counselor testifies about inequities

By Michael Bathory, Greenfield CC Senior Academic counselor

It is my memory that it was a system-wide gender equity study that in part led to A&F's request to BHE and MCCC to pursue a classification study to provide a mechanism to avoid further gender inequities in perpetuity.

- In any case, I believe that we are rapidly sliding into a situation where a class of employees in jobs that are predominantly held by females, the MCCC Professional Staff, are not keeping pace with their peers in the comparison states used in the classification study.

The Classification System is breaking down because:

- We are falling behind the comparison states because a contractually mandated and funded market update has not been completed by the employer
- Global appeal issues have not been dealt with leaving many professional staff members very upset and angry; and when they are resolved it is being done on a campus by campus basis and thus creating the kind of inequities that the classification study was supposed to avoid (Global issues: e.g., academic counselors issues of internal and external experience; librarian and financial aid titles and levels)
- Unit members are being hired at higher rates than the contract allows and thus defeating the purpose of classification study (of course, completing the market update would have gone a long way to dealing with this issue)
- This report offers a way to deal with the inequities in work year and compensation of MCCC Professional Staff when compared to the professional staff in the comparison states (of California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington). Also, it addresses some inequities inherent in the Study's classification of MCCC Professional Staff and provides a way of resolving them. Hopefully this would go a long way toward satisfying an angry group of employees and relieve their sense of being treated unfairly (which has been confirmed by the review of over 170 contacts by the Ad Hoc group of professional staff)

Editor's note: The report referenced in the last paragraph is one completed by the MCCC members of the Joint Committee to study the appropriateness of the classification system as it applies to unit prof. staff. Copies of the report are available on the union's website: mccc-union.org

	75th Percentiles				
	75% AAUP 97-98	IPEDS 97-98	IPEDS 01-02	IPEDS 02-03	IPEDS 03-04
Texas	40,000	40,200	51,200	48,100	48,500
Florida	41,600	46,400	52,600	54,300	52,300
Washington	42,000	42,000	47,700	50,500	51,000
Ohio	48,300	48,200	53,900	57,000	58,400
Pennsylvania	51,300	50,200	54,300	55,200	56,700
New York	56,500	57,800	65,000	63,300	63,900
Illinois	57,100	57,900	60,900	61,300	64,500
New Jersey	57,700	57,500	59,200	60,700	62,400
Michigan	53,750	54,975	61,375	64,200	68,323
California	63,700	63,000	69,900	69,900	78,000
Average	52,130	51,800	57,600	58,500	60,400
Massachusetts	42,200	42,300	55,300	56,200	55,700
Average Salary					

Figure 1

In 2003-04, faculty salaries trail other classification states by 8.4%

Prepared by the MCCC, with the help of JBL Associates, Inc.

This story provides an update of the DMG-Maximus classification study for faculty.

The initial study by DMG-Maximus used data from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The data used for the update is "IPEDS" data. The Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System is at least as acceptable as the AAUP source. The IPEDS system is sponsored by the United States Department of Education.

Also, AAUP does not have current data for many of the schools in the original study, but IPEDS does have that data and is likely to continue to gather that data.

IPEDS and AAUP data are very comparable. In the DMG study, the 75th percentile goal was \$52,100 whereas IPEDS data would have produced \$52,700.

Figure 3, available on the MCCC's website, compares the data points that appear in both AAUP and IPEDS data for 03-04. The difference in the average of these data is \$26.

The methodology for updating the study is the same as that used by DMG-Maximus with two exceptions. We have consciously not used Mira Costa CC in California, as its average faculty salary of \$98,141 seems anomalous. In the same spirit, Henry Ford CC in Michigan is deleted. This would have given the results in Figure 1, which are not terribly different, but done in the interest of "rationalizing" the data.

Analysis

The chart above shows that Massachusetts has not achieved the 75th percentile. The BHE did deliver on its

promise to fund the study – notably, while the faculty did deliver on a 25 percent increase in teaching productivity.

The faculty did see average salary increases of 31 percent from 97-98 to 01-02. The DMG goal of \$52,100 was based on 97-98 data, however. This goal was met, but only in 2000-2001. By this time the 10 comparison states had increased by 11.2 percent in the same period. Even with the across-the-board raises done in the same contract, Massachusetts did not quite catch up.

Using the most recent year available, 2003-2004, the analysis indicates that Massachusetts faculty are paid 8.4 percent below the 75th percentile standard as of 2003-2004.

Figures – faculty data – 9/10 month contracts

Figure 1: In the chart above, see the 75th percentile for each of the 10 comparison states, and the average for the academic years shown. First column source: AAUP (DMG study); other columns are IPEDS data. Also shown – Massachusetts average salary for the same time period.

Figure 2: Percent growth is shown for the 75th percentile in the 10 comparison states, and also for the average in Massachusetts. Also shown is the percent increase needed on Massachusetts salaries to achieve the 75th percentile in that academic year. For example, in 1997-1998 Massachusetts salaries needed a 23.5 percent increase to achieve the 75th percentile. In 2001-2002, Massachusetts still needed a 4.2 percent increase, despite having its salaries rise 31 percent from the 1997-1998 amounts. See next page for details.

Growth of 75th Percentile Over Previous Column

75th Percentile	97-98	01-02	02-03	03-04
Texas		27.4%	-6.1%	0.8%
Florida		13.4%	3.2%	-3.7%
Washington		13.6%	5.9%	1.0%
Ohio		11.8%	5.8%	2.5%
Pennsylvania		8.2%	1.7%	2.7%
New York		12.5%	-2.6%	0.9%
Illinois		5.2%	0.7%	5.2%
New Jersey		3.0%	2.5%	2.8%
Michigan		11.6%	4.6%	6.4%
California		11.0%	0.0%	11.6%
Average		11.2%	1.6%	3.2%
Massachusetts (avg)		31.0%	1.6%	-0.9%
Needed to Achieve 75th Percentile	23.5%	4.2%	4.1%	8.4%

Figure 2

Figure 3
Data points for which there is IPEDS and AAUP data for 03-04.
Note that the AAUP average is actually higher, and where there is a large discrepancy the AAUP data is higher.

