

Violations of Board-Approved Procedure in Development of Management Salary Proposal approved by Board of Trustees at September 10, 2015

Paragraph II.B of the Procedure 6C2 describes a “KCCD Confidential/Management Study Committee” that is supposed to meet at least once a year. Criteria that will be used in deciding the rank of positions and salary grade: “know-how, problem-solving, and accountability”.

Changes were made to the business managers at Cerro Coso and Porterville: from “Director” to “Vice-President”. Doesn’t Paragraph II.C of Procedure 6C2 mean a reorganization or structure change has in fact occurred with this salary proposal package? However, couldn’t one say that the management salary proposal falls under the “temporarily factored by the Chancellor/designee and at least two (2) representatives from the confidential/management study committee” part of the Paragraph II.C and the CFO and VC of HR are two reps from that confidential/management study committee? Well, only if the confidential/management study committee actually meets. In fact, it hasn’t met in several years and hasn’t met yet. This proposal was not discussed with any of the management at the colleges. In fact, management at the colleges did not even know it was going to be on the agenda until the agenda was posted to the public just a week before the September 10th meeting. Furthermore, VC of HR has made it clear that he feels the management salary proposal does not fall under Procedure 6C2, so this is not considered a “temporary factoring of salary grades” by the district office.

Paragraph VI.B talks about a downgrade in salary grade of an employee’s position. The management salary proposal means someone did a study that said some positions would get a pay grade change. For example, BC’s Director of Information Technology and BC’s Director of Equity and Inclusion. The original proposal also downgraded BC’s VP of Finance and Administrative Services but subsequent conversation with VC of HR says that was a mistake and the VP Finance and Admin Svcs should remain at original salary grade (Board will need to approve that correction).

Paragraph VII.C talks about an upgrade in salary grade of an employee’s position because of an increase in duties and responsibilities. The management salary proposal means someone did a study that said some positions would get a pay grade change. Someone determined that job descriptions at the colleges would be equal. For example, business managers at Cerro Coso and Porterville were promoted from “Director” grade to “Vice-President” grade despite their much smaller scope of duties than what exists at Bakersfield College. Bakersfield College is over twice as big as Cerro Coso College and Porterville College *combined*.

Paragraph IX talks about Position Titles. It says that responsibilities determine salary grades.

Based on these paragraphs, it looks like factors such as complexity, extent of responsibilities, number of employees supervised, size of institution, etc. are supposed to be used in determining salary grades but were not and that the KCCD Confidential/Management Study Committee process was not used to determine the salary grades. Also, it looks like an organizational reorganization has taken place without going through the KCCD Confidential/Management Study Committee process.