

# APPENDIX C. NEW BOG POLICY STATEMENT COMMUNIQUÉ

## MEMORANDUM

September 25, 2001

Via Email Only

To: Chief Executive Officers  
Chief Business Officers  
Chief Human Resource Officers  
Other Interested Parties

From: Frederick E. Harris, Director  
College Finance & Facilities Planning

Subject: Advisory on the 2001 Budget Act Appropriation for Part-time Faculty Compensation

This memo provides information to districts on how the \$57 million provided in the 2001 Budget Act is to be distributed, and the requirements of districts to receive these funds. For further information on this subject, please refer to the attached copy of a policy statement adopted by the Board of Governors on September 10, 2001, and the July 30, 2001 memo from Chancellor Nussbaum to members of the Part-time Issues Task Force entitled “Materials to Assist Task Force Discussions.” Also attached are the estimated allocations by district, the Request for Allocation form, and the Expenditure Report form.

### BACKGROUND

The 2001 Budget Act appropriates \$57 million to increase compensation for part-time faculty pursuant to the following provisional language requirements:

1. Funds shall be distributed to districts based on the total actual FTES served in the previous fiscal year and shall include a small district factor.
2. These funds are to be used first to assist districts in making part-time faculty compensation more comparable to full-time faculty compensation for similar work, as determined by each district’s local collective bargaining process.
3. These funds shall not supplant the amount of resources each district has used to compensate part-time faculty.
4. These funds shall not be used to exceed parity of part-time faculty employed by each district with regular full-time faculty at the same district, as certified by the Chancellor.
5. If a district achieves parity, its allocation may be used for any other educational purpose.

01/01 2

September 25, 2001

## HOW TO RECEIVE THE MONEY

Before December 3, 2001 and as soon as possible, please have the district's Chief Executive Officer sign and return to the Fiscal Services Unit at the Chancellor's Office the enclosed form entitled "Request for Allocation of Part-time Faculty Compensation Funds 2001-02 Fiscal Year." This form certifies that the district through the local collective bargaining process will determine the specific definitions, policies and amount needed to achieve parity for compensation between part-time and full-time faculty for similar work. If the completed form is not received in the Chancellor's Office by December 3, 2001, that district's unclaimed share of funds will be reallocated to all other districts that have met the deadline.

The allocation of these funds (including any unclaimed district funds) will be distributed in Feb. 2002 and will be included in the 2001-02 First Principal Apportionment. Districts will receive the standard 68% of the Part-time Faculty Compensation funds in the February apportionment and the remaining balance will be distributed monthly until the end of the fiscal year. Districts will have the flexibility to use these resources to support adjustments in part-time faculty compensation improvements settled in anticipation of receipt of these funds in fiscal year 2001-02.

Enclosed with this memo you will find an estimated allocation of these Part-time Faculty Compensation funds calculated using the 2000-01 Second Principal Apportionment Actual FTES. Once districts submit "final" FTES numbers for 2000-01 (due to the Chancellor's Office 11/1/01), the Part-time Faculty allocation will be revised based upon the actual FTES reported for the 2000-01 Recalculation. Since this is an FTES distribution, this ensures that districts receive funds for the students actually served in the 2000-01 fiscal year.

### Accounting for the Part-time Faculty Compensation Money

The Chancellor's Office plans on this appropriation to continue in future years and will add this money to the base for the 200203 fiscal year. Accordingly, this money is treated as Unrestricted General Fund and is generally included within the Current Expense of Education, so long as it is spent on activities and objects of expenditure consistent with California Code of Regulations §59204.

In calculating compliance with the 50% Law, the money spent on compensation of part-time and full-time instructors will count for Salaries of Classroom Instructors to the extent they are performing duties devoted to the instruction of students. The Chancellor's Office needs to collect information on the uses of this money. At the end of the fiscal year, districts will need to report the uses of this money on the expenditure report attached.

For questions regarding the Board policy statement and the Chancellor's memo, please contact Gus Guichard, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources at 916.445.1606 or gguichar@cccco.edu. For questions about the allocations, please contact Theresa Tena at 916.327.6226 or ttena@cccco.edu. For questions about the application and accounting for these funds, please contact Patrick Ryan at 916.327.6223 or pryan@cccco.edu.

### Attachments

- ▶ Request for Allocation of Part-time Faculty Compensation Funds 2001-02 Fiscal Year
- ▶ BOG Policy State on Part-time Faculty Compensation
- ▶ Memo: Materials to Assist Task Force Discussions
- ▶ Estimated Part-time Faculty Compensation Allocation
- ▶ 2001-02 Expenditure Report on Part-time Faculty Compensation Parity

## CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES REQUEST FOR ALLOCATION OF PART-TIME FACULTY COMPENSATION FUNDS

### 2001-02 FISCAL YEAR

District: \_\_\_\_\_

I certify that as a condition to receive the Part-time Faculty Compensation funds appropriated from the Proposition 98 Reversion Account in Item 6870485(5) of the 2001 Budget Act the district will:

1. Determine through the collective bargaining process (or similar process as determined by a district in the absence of a collective bargaining agent) the specific definitions, policies and amount needed to achieve parity for comparable pay between part-time and full-time faculty for similar work at the district.
2. Send the documentation of that negotiated agreement to the Chancellor's Office Human Resources Division.
3. Use these funds in compliance with the 2001 Budget Act and other applicable laws and regulations.
4. Complete and return the enclosed expenditure report on the use of these funds to the Chancellor's Office on or before October 10, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

By December 3, 2001, return this form to:

Fiscal Services Unit  
Chancellor's Office  
California Community Colleges  
1102 Q Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

CCFS367

# BOARD POLICY STATEMENT ON PART-TIME FACULTY COMPENSATION

ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS ON SEPTEMBER 10, 2001

The Board of Governors supports the policy that part-time faculty should be paid comparably to full-time faculty for those in-class and out-of-class responsibilities that are the same. In instances where part-time faculty have fewer of the same responsibilities for out-of class activities, the Board of Governors supports the policy that part-time faculty should be paid comparably to full-time faculty for those professional responsibilities expected equally of full- and part-time faculty.

The specific definitions and policies regarding comparable pay are to be determined locally, through the collective bargaining process. The Board of Governors recognizes that the specific definitions and policies negotiated locally will vary.

The policy of the State and the system should be to enable a closing of the gap in comparable pay. The State funding provided should be in the form of ongoing base revenue, and should be distributed on the basis of FTES (full-time equivalent students). The amount of State funding sought to achieve this policy has been computed for a variety of scenarios and a stated set of assumptions; however, the amount actually sought by the system will be determined annually in conjunction with the system's entire budget package.

After each year in which the State provides new or additional funding to address this policy, the Chancellor's Office will compile the results of how local college districts have applied these funds to achieve their local policies of comparable pay. These results shall be provided to the Board of Governors, the Legislature, and the Governor, and shall be considered by the Board of Governors and institutional and organizational representatives of the community colleges in connection with the system's annual budget development process. At such times, the Board of Governors shall determine what, if any, additional steps should be taken to further advance the Board's policy of comparable pay for comparable work.

## MONITORING THE POLICY:

- a) Districts electing to participate in the system-sponsored program shall determine, through collective bargaining, the specific definitions and policies regarding comparable compensation, and shall report these definitions and policies to the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges.
- b) If a district accepts funds to increase the salaries of those paid through the part-time faculty salary schedule and reports how it has used its entire allotment to do so, it will have complied with the law. However, until the district has adopted (through collective bargaining) a definition of parity, and until a district provides evidence that it has achieved

this definition, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges will not certify that the district has reached parity. Until the Chancellor certifies that the district has reached parity, the district cannot use the funds “for any other educational purpose.”

#### IMPLEMENTING THE POLICY:

- a) If a district applies the funds to increase the salaries of those paid through the part-time faculty salary schedule, reaches agreement on what constitutes “parity”, and achieves parity under that definition, the district will provide documentation of this fact to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, and the Chancellor will certify that the district has reached parity. At this point, the district can use remaining and future allocations from the fund “for any other educational purpose.”
- b) As a condition of participating in the program and being eligible to receive infusions beyond the level provided in the first year, the district must have bargained its definition of “parity” before the middle of the second year (essentially by January or February of 2003, just before the apportionment goes out). A district not reaching agreement regarding “parity” will retain its first year allocation, and will again become eligible for allocations beyond this level when it provides its locally bargained definition of “parity.”
- c) Funds from this program which are applied to the salaries of part-time classroom instructors are intended to count for purposes of compliance with the 50 % Law (Education Code, §84362). A concern has been raised whether the program is of such a categorical nature that the funding will be excluded from the definition of “current expense of education.” The Chancellor’s Office will provide for a legal analysis to ensure that this is not the case. Should this be the case, the parties are in agreement to modify Board regulations and/or the statute to enable funds from this program to count for purposes of compliance with the 50 % Law.
- d) The Chancellor’s Memorandum to the Part-time Issues Task Force (dated July 30, 2001) provides methodologies and sets of assumptions for “closing the gap.” The costs of “closing the gap” have been calculated under five different scenarios: 70 %, 75 %, 80 %, 88 %, and 100 %. Without the Board of Governors recommending which of these or other percentages is most appropriate in terms of locally bargained parity standards, the methodology and stated assumptions for calculating the costs at these various percentages will serve as a reference in determining the system’s request for State funding. However, the amount of State funding actually sought by the system will be determined annually in conjunction with the system’s entire budget package.

# MEMORANDUM FROM THE CHANCELLOR

July 30, 2001

To: Part-time Issues Task Force

From: Tom Nussbaum

Subject: Materials to Assist Task Force Discussions

## I. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DISCUSSION

- A. I believe there is consensus that our intent is to implement the program in a manner that is consistent with local collective bargaining. We believe that terms and conditions of employment, including compensation, will continue to be determined through local bargaining. We acknowledge that the districts vary in the ways they define full-time faculty workload, and we know the same is true for the workload of part-time faculty.
- B. Since the program will be implemented within the framework of local collective bargaining, and since we know the different districts will vary in what they bargain, a single system standard regarding what constitutes “comparable pay for comparable work” is unlikely. With respect to full-time faculty, different districts have bargained different configurations of teaching loads, office hours, and preparation time, committee work, and other assignments. Some bargaining agreements identify explicit numbers of hours for preparation and grading, and others don’t. Some bargaining agreements identify five office hours a week, while others identify three or seven. Thus, we can’t simply say that the system standard *is* 15 hours of lecture, 15 hours of preparation/grading, 5 office hours, and 5 other duties. Nor can we simply proclaim that the system standard *should be* 15 hours of lecture, 15 hours of preparation/grading, 5 office hours, and 5 other duties. To do so could be inconsistent with existing collective bargaining agreements and could undermine the local bargaining process. In addition, fixing a system standard could be interpreted as a mandate, thus raising the issue of state-mandated costs.
- C. While some believe it inappropriate to impose a single system standard on districts, this does not mean we can’t devise a methodology to determine the magnitude of investment the State should make in assisting the colleges to deal with the issue of part-time compensation. While we are not going to impose or expect a single system standard, we can develop *the assumptions* we choose to apply in calculating the request for resources to assist the colleges in dealing with the issue. For instance, we could apply the assumption that a full-time faculty member spends 88% of his/her time on teaching, preparing for class, grading papers, and holding office hours. We could further assume that part-time faculty do these same duties for all of the time they are employed. Without establishing these assumptions as system standards, we could calculate the resources needed to fund these assumptions. The actual determination of comparable pay would be accomplished through local collective bargaining, and each district would report how it used its portion of the allocation to address the district’s comparable pay policy.

- D. In computing the cost of “closing the gap” I think that we need to talk about whether our cost assumptions should include additional assumptions about four other variables:
- 1) The extent to which full-time faculty teaching overload are currently being paid, or may be paid in the future, off of the part-time salary schedule. We have earlier reached consensus that it’s an allowable use of funds for districts to compensate the overload portion of a full-time faculty assignment if the overload instruction is being compensated off of the part-time salary schedule. We don’t know the extent to which districts currently do this; and we have no way of knowing what the practices will be once the new program is put into place. Since we can only speculate as to the outcome of local collective bargaining, it’s virtually impossible to calculate the additional funding necessary to ensure that overload assignments are compensable from this fund.
  - 2) The extent to which districts will be able to achieve their comparable pay policies without having exhausted the allocations they receive from this program. Since the funds are being allocated on a per FTES basis, it’s possible that districts with narrow gaps in pay equity will reach their policy on comparable pay without exhausting the funds available from the program. We earlier reached consensus that when these districts have closed the gap, they should be able expend the extra funds for any educational purpose, and this language is now a part of the budget language. We don’t know the extent to which there will be additional bargaining regarding the local definition of comparable pay; and so it’s speculative to guess whether or not allocations from the system will be sufficient.
  - 3) The extent to which districts will not be able to achieve their comparable pay policies within the resources allocated. Here the situation is reversed: a district may have a very big gap in comparable pay, and its allocation based on its total FTES will prove to be insufficient. Again, it’s difficult to speculate on the outcome of the additional bargaining that will take place.
  - 4) The extent to which districts already compensate their part-time faculty for office hours and preparation time. Because part-time workload is bargained in 72 different environments, we don’t know the extent to which office hours and preparation time are already compensated, nor whether such pay is comparable to that of full-time faculty. For instance, a district could provide \$65 per hour of teaching time, and indicate that with this compensation the faculty member is responsible to be prepared, grade papers, and be accessible to students. Another district could provide \$45 per hour of teaching time, but also separately compensate office hours and/or preparation time. We don’t know the range or extent of current practices, and we can be certain that these practices will change (through collective bargaining) with the advent of the new program. These realities speak against adjusting the State revenue request downward to account for office hours and preparation time that may already be compensated by districts.

## II. CLOSING THE GAP: METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS FOR CALCULATING THE FUNDING REQUEST

The Task Force should evaluate the following approach for deriving the necessary assumptions and calculating the resource request to be included in the system budget:

- A. Establish assumptions regarding the percentage of work that is comparable, as between part-time instructors and full-time instructors. We have a variety of surveys and other work that can help inform this determination.
- B. Establish assumptions regarding “average” salaries for full-time faculty and “average” hourly rates for part-time instructors. Both the State Auditor and CCC/CFT have done some helpful work analyzing salary schedules, and we should start our discussion from this point.
- C. Adjust the average full-time salary identified above in item B, for the percentage of work that is comparable (item A above), and then determine an hourly compensation level for each hour of teaching by dividing the adjusted salary by 525 (35 weeks x 15 hours of teaching per week).
- D. Compare the hourly rate for part-time instructors (item B above) with the adjusted hourly rate for full-time instructors (item C above). This is the “gap” in terms of the hourly rate.
- E. Determine the total number of contact hours taught by part-time faculty during a given year. This number is available through systemwide MIS data—about 5,000,000 part-time faculty contact hours per year.
- F. Multiply the hourly rate “gap” (item D above) times the total number of contact hours taught by part-time faculty (#5 above) during a given year. This will be the cost of closing the gap.

Given this approach, we now deal with each step in greater detail.

- A. Determine the percentage of work that is comparable, as between part-time instructors and full-time instructors. We understand that the “comparable work” performed by full-time and part-time instructors varies from district to district, and that the matter will continue to be addressed through local collective bargaining. The task is to develop an assumption—for resource request purposes—regarding the percentage of time that full-time instructors spend on teaching and teaching related activities. We have several recent studies or reports that help inform this task:
  1. **State Auditor: 88%** The percentage used in the Auditor’s Report was based on the following assumptions about faculty load: 15 hours teaching, 15 hours grading and preparation, and 5 office hours. This is 35 hours out of the assumed 40-hour workweek, or 87.5%. While the State Auditor did conduct a survey of pay practices in eight districts, the percentage used by the Auditor was based on the assumptions rather than on a survey of actual practices.
  2. **CPEC: 81%** based on the response of full-time faculty answering the AB 420 survey. The sample was 22 CCC districts, and the response rate was 24.74% (percent of full-time faculty responding). They were asked to respond to paid number of hours in each of the

following categories, and the CPEC report converts this info to the following percentages: in classroom (33 %); preparation time and grading (37 %); office hours (11 %); advising students (5 %); other activities such as meetings, conferences, research; and nonteaching, departmental, or institutional activities such as committees and the academic senate (14 %). According to CPEC survey responses, full-time instructors indicate they spend between 46 to 52 hours per week on the above activities.

**3. National Center for Educational Statistics (April 2001): 71.9%.**

From the report, “Background Characteristics, Work Activities, and Compensation of Faculty and Instructional Staff in Postsecondary Institutions: Fall 1998”—As to public 2-year colleges, full-time instructional faculty and staff report the following percentage distribution of time on the following activities:

Teaching Activities—71.9 % (includes teaching, grading papers, preparing courses, developing new curricula, advising or supervising students, supervising student teachers and interns, and working with student organizations or intramural athletics)

Research Activities—3.8 % (includes research, reviewing or preparing articles or books, attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences, reviewing proposals, seeking outside funding, giving performances, or giving speeches).

Administrative Activities 11.5 % (includes department or institution-wide meetings and committee work)

Other Activities 12.9 % (includes professional growth, outside consulting or freelance work, service/other nonteaching activities, paid or unpaid community or public service, service to professional associations, and work not listed in any of the other activities)

The average work week for full-time 2-year public college faculty is 49.1 hours, and the average classroom hours per week is 17.2. Thus, classroom instruction comprises about 35 % of their time.

**4. State of Washington: 76 %.** In its pro-rata compensation for part-timers, the State of Washington estimates that 76 % of the full-timers duties are related to teaching assignments, and 24 % to nonteaching activities.

When we look at the CPEC and other studies, we see that the core functions of teaching involve classroom instruction, preparation and grading, and office hours. Almost all our districts explicitly compensate their full-timers for these activities. Thus, in terms of assumptions, this suggests that if a part-time instructor is instructing, he or she should also be compensated for the basic functions of preparing for class, grading papers, and holding office hours or being accessible to students. The State has a reasonable expectation that any faculty member (full-time or part-time) who is instructing should also be preparing for class, grading papers, and holding office hours. Since the vast majority of our full-time faculty perform these functions, and since they are compensated for these functions, the principle of comparable pay for comparable work suggests that we apply an assumption that part-time instructors should be compensated for these functions as well.

Beyond this, we should take care in establishing assumptions that drive up the resource request without any real probability that they will become the practice in *all or most districts*. Instead, local collective bargaining should define the workload of full-time and part-time faculty. For instance, if part-time faculty are given the responsibility to advise students, they too should be compensated in accordance with the principle of comparable pay for comparable work; if they are not assigned to such work, they need not be compensated, nor should they be expected to do the work. The fact that some districts compensate full-time faculty for certain activities does not mean that all districts should be expected to do so. Similarly, the fact that a district collectively bargains for its full-time faculty to do certain work doesn't automatically mean there must be a bargaining agreement for its part-time faculty to do the same work.

- B. Establish assumptions regarding “average” salaries for full-time faculty and “average” hourly rates for part-time instructors. Both the State Auditor and CFT have done some helpful work analyzing salary schedules, and we should start our discussion from this point.

CFT has done a salary schedule comparison of 36 districts, indicating the salary level for “step 5, class IV” full-time faculty, and the same salary level (step 5, Class IV) for part-time faculty. First, in terms of full-time salaries, the sample average full-time faculty salary was \$45,515. The State Auditor looked at eight community college districts (based on bargaining agreements in effect for fall of 1999), and found the full-time average salary to be \$47,763. Given that these salary figures are now over a year out of date, they should be adjusted upward. Overall, for purposes of our assumptions, this suggests we should establish the average full-time salary at somewhere between \$49,000 and \$50,000. For purposes of discussion, I'm asking that the Task Force consider the figure of \$50,000 (a 4.68 % adjustment over the State Auditor's figure of \$47,763).

In terms of part-time hourly rates, the CFT study of 36 districts found an average hourly rate of \$40.58. This figure is for each hour of teaching. The State Auditor found an average hourly rate of \$55.22; however, this figure includes separate compensation for office hours that are being paid for (in addition to the hourly instruction rate) in four of the eight districts studied. Data from the Chancellor's Office MIS system indicate that the “mean hourly rate” for part-time instructors was \$42.27 in the fall of 1999. Given that these salary figures are also a year out of date, they should be adjusted upward (probably by the same percentage that the full-time salaries are adjusted). For purposes of discussion, I'm asking the Task Force to consider the figure of \$44.25 (a 4.68 % adjustment over the fall 1999 MIS figure of \$42.27).

- C. Adjust the average full-time salary identified in B above, for the percentage of work that is comparable (A above), and then determine an hourly compensation level for each hour of teaching by dividing the adjusted salary by 525 (35 weeks x 15 hours of teaching per week).

$$\frac{\$50,000 \times .70}{525} = \$66.67 \text{ per hour of teaching time}$$

$$\frac{\$50,000 \times .75}{525} = \$71.42 \text{ per hour of teaching time}$$

$$\frac{\$50,000 \times .80}{525} = \$76.19 \text{ per hour of teaching time}$$

$$\frac{\$50,000 \times .88}{525} = \$83.81 \text{ per hour of teaching time}$$

$$\frac{\$50,000 \times 1.00}{525} = \$95.24 \text{ per hour of teaching time}$$

It is important to recognize what these hourly rates represent. It is an hourly rate per hour of teaching time, and this compensation also covers the time the full-time faculty members spend on preparing to teach, grading, and holding office hours. The rates displayed above would be more than cut in half if each hour of teaching, preparation, grading, and office hour time was compensated separately.

- D. Compare the hourly rate for part-time instructors (B above) with the adjusted hourly rate for full-time instructors (C above). This is the “gap” in terms of the hourly rate.

$$70\% \text{ Assumption: } \$66.67 - \$44.25 = \$22.42$$

$$75\% \text{ Assumption: } \$71.42 - \$44.25 = \$27.17$$

$$80\% \text{ Assumption: } \$76.19 - \$44.25 = \$31.94$$

$$88\% \text{ Assumption: } \$83.81 - \$44.25 = \$39.56$$

$$100\% \text{ Assumption: } \$95.24 - \$44.25 = \$50.99$$

Again, it is important to recognize what these figures represent. It means, for instance, that if a part-time instructor is paid \$71.42 per hour for each hour of teaching time, his/her compensation will be comparable to the compensation paid full-time faculty, assuming that these full-time faculty spend 75 % of their time on teaching and teaching related activities. The hourly rate paid to the part-time instructor thus covers preparation for teaching, grading, and office hours.

At the local level, if a district continues to separately compensate for office hours and/or preparation time, the district would have to determine total compensation before calculating the hourly rate. For instance, let’s assume a part-time instructor teaches a three-unit course for a semester. Using the 75 % assumption, the pay would be \$71.42 per hour times 3 hours per week times 17½ weeks, or \$3,749.55. If the part-time faculty member was paid \$55 per hour for teaching and one paid office hour per week, the total compensation would be \$3,822 (\$55 per hour times 3 hours per week times 17½ weeks, plus \$55 per hour times 1 hour per week times 17½ weeks). This second arrangement would also be comparable pay, using the 75 % assumption.

- E. Determine the total number of contact hours taught by part-time faculty during a given year. This number is available through systemwide MIS data—about 5,000,000 part-time faculty contact hours per year.

The CFT analysis uses Chancellor’s Office MIS data on average teaching loads to estimate 5,072,256 contact hours of instruction by part-time instructors (based on 26,640 part-time instructors with an average load of 5.6 WFCH. MIS data available in the Chancellor’s Office records the total annual contact hours taught by part-time instructors, and the fall 1999 number is 4,607,624. However, this number does not include three districts (West Hills, San Diego and Riverside). For purposes of assumptions, we believe the figure of 5,000,000 contact hours is appropriate.

- F. Multiply the hourly rate “gap” (D above) times the total number of contact hours taught by part-time faculty (E above) during a given year. This will be the cost of closing the gap.

70 % Assumption:  $\$22.42 \times 5,000,000 = \$112,100,000$

75 % Assumption:  $\$27.17 \times 5,000,000 = \$135,850,000$

80 % Assumption:  $\$31.94 \times 5,000,000 = \$159,700,000$

88 % Assumption:  $\$39.56 \times 5,000,000 = \$197,800,000$

100 % Assumption:  $\$50.99 \times 5,000,000 = \$254,950,000$

There is reason to have some degree of confidence in these numbers. The CFT estimate for closing the gap (using the 88 % assumption) is \$205.8 million, and the difference in the total contact hours taught by part-timers (5.072 million vs. 5.0 million) makes up a good part of the \$7 million difference in estimates. The State Auditor’s estimate was \$145 million (also using the 88 % assumption); however, the State Auditor used lower average full-time salary figures than we have used in preparing our estimate.

## CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES ESTIMATED PART-TIME FACULTY COMPENSATION ALLOCATION

BASED UPON 2000-01 P2 FTES<sup>1</sup>

District	FTES	Allocation <sup>2</sup>
Allan Hancock	8,481.37	467,306
Antelope Valley	8,188.94	451,194
Barstow	1,900.00	111,000
Butte	10,847.32	597,665
Cabrillo	10,206.86	562,377
Cerritos	16,478.92	907,955
Chabot-Las Positas	15,002.78	826,623
Chaffey	12,156.54	669,801
Citrus	10,479.47	577,397
Coast	32,318.98	1,780,710
Compton	5,686.16	313,296
Contra Costa	28,444.07	1,567,210
Copper Mountain	1,310.18	111,000
Desert	5,784.26	318,701
El Camino	17,265.60	951,299
Feather River	1,320.68	111,000
Foothill-DeAnza	30,452.48	1,677,869
Fremont-Newark	7,478.65	412,058
Gavilan	4,307.78	237,350
Glendale	14,268.83	786,183
Grossmont-Cuyamaca	15,977.41	880,323
Hartnell	6,498.49	358,054
Imperial	4,699.13	258,912
Kern	16,569.52	912,947
Lake Tahoe	1,515.29	111,000
Lassen	2,246.18	123,760
Long Beach	19,267.05	1,061,575
Los Angeles	91,909.66	5,064,034
Los Rios	41,400.22	2,281,068
Marin	6,489.87	357,579
Mendocino-Lake	2,521.78	138,945
Merced	8,370.46	461,195
Mira Costa	6,840.20	376,881
Monterey Peninsula	8,275.54	455,965
Mt San Antonio	23,457.47	1,292,459
Mt San Jacinto	6,517.34	359,092

Napa Valley	5,370.85	295,923
North Orange	31,866.22	1,755,764
Palo Verde	1,222.88	111,000
Palomar	16,023.27	882,849
Pasadena	20,414.60	1,124,803
Peralta	16,120.64	888,214
Rancho Santiago	28,586.93	1,575,081
Redwoods	5,260.76	289,857
Rio Hondo	10,552.52	581,422
Riverside	20,920.71	1,152,688
San Bernardino	13,033.12	718,098
San Diego	39,578.28	2,180,682
San Francisco	34,543.83	1,903,294
San Joaquin Delta	13,387.82	737,642
San Jose	13,582.15	748,349
San Luis Obispo	7,950.84	438,075
San Mateo	17,226.31	949,134
Santa Barbara	12,711.19	700,361
Santa Clarita	8,634.54	475,746
Santa Monica	20,222.74	1,114,232
Sequoias	8,023.94	442,103
Shasta	7,359.60	405,499
Sierra	11,414.70	628,927
Siskiyou	2,401.73	132,330
Solano	7,568.41	417,004
Sonoma	18,890.83	1,040,846
South County	20,366.86	1,122,172
Southwestern	13,443.33	740,700
State Center	22,506.09	1,240,040
Ventura	24,815.00	1,367,256
Victor Valley	7,799.98	429,763
West Hills	3,349.32	184,541
West Kern	1,503.15	111,000
West Valley	16,130.08	888,734
Yosemite	15,676.94	863,767
Yuba	7,810.11	430,321
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,031,205.75</b>	<b>\$57,000,000</b>

<sup>1</sup>These allocations will be revised based upon the 2000-01. Actual FTES reported for the recalculation.

<sup>2</sup>The small district factor is \$111,000 and is determined by calculating a per FTES amount for the \$57 million and multiplying that amount by 2,000 FTES.