

2014 – 2015 Initial Issue Framing

During the ratification process for the 2014 – 2015 RFP, Faculty Association members were invited to respond to the question, “As a member of the Faculty Association, what issues would you like the Faculty Executive Council and the Meet and Confer Team to consider during the 2014 - 2015 issue prioritization process?” Of the 541 Faculty Association members who participated in the ratification process, 239 members responded to this question.

The faculty members on the Meet and Confer Team reviewed all of the submitted issues and framed the six issues identified by **five or more** Faculty Association members. Additionally, the issue Conflict Resolutions Policy (Section 6 of the RFP) was framed. (Recent experience by faculty and the Faculty Association leadership working on behalf of faculty has revealed that our existing conflict resolutions policy lacks sufficient consistency and clarity to protect faculty rights.) Issues where faculty offered conflicting viewpoints (e.g. appointive faculty evaluation) were not framed. The framed issues will be presented to the faculty at-large during the August issue generation process. Faculty will be able to rate the relative importance of each framed issue in addition to submitting additional issues that they view as a priority for the 2014 – 2015 negotiation year.

Informed by the feedback from faculty at large, college Faculty Senates will identify the top three issues for their college by a process determined by their Faculty Senate. We encourage you to reach out to your Senate President and to be involved in this process. Those top three issues from each college will then be brought to the Faculty Executive Council, which will prioritize the issues identified by the Senates. The Faculty Executive Council will provide this list of issues to the faculty on the Meet and Confer Team, which will seek to advance the priority issues.

There were 40 major issues identified during the ratification process. Of these, seven issues have been framed. The approximate number of faculty identifying each issue is listed in parentheses after each issue. (The Team sought to interpret and group issues accurately but acknowledges that there may be an unintentional degree of variance between the intentions of the respondent and the interpretations of the issue reviewers.)

1. Issue: Steps - Predictable Salary Advancement (63)

Description: MCCCCD was once known nationally for its commitment to salary progression for employees. Between 1994-1995 and 2005-2006, steps were approved in 15* of 16 years. This national reputation allowed MCCCCD to attract top faculty talent from across the country. In recent years, MCCCCD has not made employee salary progression a priority. Between 2006-2007 and 2014-2015, steps were approved in 2 of 8 years. The lack of predictable salary advancement is impairing the ability of MCCCCD to attract and retain top faculty talent from across the country.

*In 1991 – 1992, a 5% increase was allocated to restructure the faculty salary schedule. Because other employee groups received a step that same year, this year is being counted as a year in which faculty received a step.)

What changes, if any, should be made to MCCCCD's salary advancement practices?

2. Issue: Lab Loading (59)

Description: Under current practice, faculty who teach courses with laboratory components are paid a reduced amount of load for each period of student contact. For example, a faculty member that teaches a lab section that meets for 3 50-minute periods is paid 2.4 instructional load. A lecture course that meets for the same number of periods (2 hours and 30 minutes) is paid 3 instructional load. Furthermore, student tuition revenue is based on credit hours. For lecture classes, each 50-minute class period of weekly class time results in 1 credit hour of tuition revenue. In contrast, lab classes typically generate substantially less tuition revenue. A typical 1-credit lab generates 1 credit hour of tuition revenue but meets for the equivalent of three 50-minute class periods weekly. That is, each 50-minute class period of weekly class time results in 0.33 credit hour of tuition revenue. Put another way, the lab class generates 67% less tuition revenue than a lecture class with the same number of class periods and equal enrollment. To resolve this problem, two key issues need to be addressed:

1. What changes, if any, need to be made to ensure that lab classes are fiscally viable?
2. What changes, if any, need to be made to our loading practices to ensure that instructional faculty receive an equitable amount of instructional load whether teaching lectures or labs?

3. Issue: Master of Fine Arts Horizontal Salary Placement (23)

Description: Faculty from all disciplines may advance to the final column of the salary schedule by completing a doctoral degree. Although not a doctoral degree, the Master of Fine Arts degree (which is typically a 60+-credit program) is widely viewed as a terminal degree. Some MCCCCD faculty with the MFA degree have advanced to final column of the salary schedule by completing a doctoral degree in a field outside of fine arts. Many institutions, including community colleges, give salary placement credit for the MFA degree above and beyond that received for an MS or MA degree. Some institutions equate the MFA degree with a doctoral degree for salary placement purposes.

What changes, if any, should be made to MFA salary placement to ensure that faculty are appropriately compensated for their academic qualifications? [This issue is being actively worked by the Meet and Confer Team. It is listed again here because it was again submitted as an issue by multiple members of the Faculty Association.]

4. Issue: Permissible Overload for Residential Faculty (14)

Description: Under current policy, residential faculty may teach up to 22.5 load hours per semester (150% of the 15-load hour contractual load). Because of the variation in how classes are loaded, not all faculty can attain the maximum overload permitted by policy. For example, a faculty member teaching seven 3-credit lecture classes can only attain 21 load hours. Adding an eighth class would exceed the 22.5 load hour limit. For a faculty member teaching the two lab sections that are associated with a lecture section, getting close to the maximum permissible load is even more challenging. For example, a science faculty member receives 15.6 load hours for teaching two 3-credit lecture section and four 1-credit lab sections. Adding another lecture section plus two lab sections would result in 7.8 load hours and 23.4 load hours, which exceeds the 22.5 load cap. Some faculty believe there should not be an overload cap.

What changes, if any, should be made to the overload policy?

5. Issue: Horizontal Pay Advancement for PhD Faculty (6)

Description: Faculty not initially placed in the Ph.D. column of the salary schedule receive horizontal salary advancement for approved professional development activities. Faculty who start in the IP column on the salary schedule may increase their salaries by more than \$12,000 through active involvement in professional development. In contrast, faculty with doctorates receive no horizontal salary advancement for professional growth activities.

What changes, if any, need to be made to our horizontal salary advancement practices to acknowledge the benefit the institution derives from faculty active in professional development?

6. Issue: Summer Teaching Load Limits (5)

Description: Under current policy, residential faculty may teach up to 15-credits during the Summer Session, of which no more than 9 credits may be taught concurrently. Due to the way summer classes are scheduled, this means that many faculty will be unable to teach more than 9 credits in the Summer Session.

What changes, if any, should be made to the load limits for Summer Session?

7. Issue: Conflict Resolution Policy (Section 6 of RFP)

Description: Section 6 of the RFP covers grievances, resolutions of controversy, informal resolution and mediation, administrative evaluation, conflicts between students and faculty members, and internal investigations. Although there are elements in each of these policies that protect faculty rights, the lack of a fully integrated, comprehensive policy has created confusion regarding which conflict resolution method is appropriate in a given situation. Additionally, the lack of a statute of limitations clause in some of the policies has permitted complaints to surface years after the event in question.

What changes, if any, should be made to the Conflict Resolution policy (Section 6)?

- 8. Issue: 60:40 Ratio**
- 9. Issue: Faculty Feedback on Administrator Performance**
- 10. Issue: Competitive Pay Rates for Adjunct Faculty**
- 11. Issue: Changes to the Academic Calendar**
- 12. Issue: Length of Probationary Period**
- 13. Issue: Teaching Workload and Compensation**
- 14. Issue: Assistant Chairs**
- 15. Issue: Reassigned Time**
- 16. Issue: Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)**
- 17. Issue: Peer Assistance and Review Process**
- 18. Issue: Supervision Pay**
- 19. Issue: Day/Evening Distinction**
- 20. Issue: Movement of an Accountability Day from Spring to Fall**
- 21. Issue: Appointive Faculty Evaluation**
- 22. Issue: Maximum Horizontal Salary Advancement for Faculty Without Doctorates**
- 23. Issue: Salary Increases for Faculty at Top of Salary Schedule**
- 24. Issue: Faculty Professional Growth**
- 25. Issue: Technical Support Staff Allocation**
- 26. Issue: Reassigned Time for Dept/Div Chairs and Occupational Program Directors**
- 27. Issue: Benefits including Life Insurance, 403(b) contributions, cell phone allowance**
- 28. Issue: Occupational Program Director selection process**
- 29. Issue: Shared Governance**
- 30. Issue: Credited Classes Taught by Non-Faculty**
- 31. Issue: Pension Equality for Those Impacted by Salary Inversion**
- 32. Issue: Health Insurance Bridge for Retirement-Eligible Faculty**
- 33. Issue: Sabbatical Funding**
- 34. Issue: Restructure Salary Schedule**
- 35. Issue: Definition of Hours of Accountability and Office Hours**
- 36. Issue: Effectiveness of Online Instruction**
- 37. Issue: Unused Sick Leave Buy Back**
- 38. Issue: Scope of Faculty Duties**
- 39. Issue: Faculty to MAT Policy**
- 40. Issue: Faculty Accountability**