

Brief Description of Submitted Issues

1. Compensation Inequities

Current salary placement and advancement policy has resulted in many faculty expressing concern that they are not compensated equitably when compared to other MCCC faculty. What adjustments, if any, should be made to our compensation practices to increase salary equity among faculty?

2. Inversion

Salary inversion occurs when new employees are paid more than comparably qualified existing employees. MCCC salary placement policy and salary advancement practices have resulted in salary inversion for hundreds of residential faculty. Many of the affected faculty fill important leadership roles at their colleges and are actively involved in hiring and mentoring fellow faculty. What steps, if any, should be taken to address salary inversion?

3. MFA (Terminal degrees)

In recognition of the achievement of a doctorate degree, faculty with doctorate degrees are advanced to the maximum horizontal step on the pay scale. In terms of compensation, many colleges and universities treat the Master of Fine Arts degree like a doctorate degree. Faculty completing the MFA typically earn significantly more graduate credits (e.g. 60 - 69 credits) than a MA or MS degree (e.g. 30 credits). Unlike a Ph.D., MFA graduates do not complete a dissertation. In terms of salary placement, how should we treat the MFA degree?

4. Lab Loading

Faculty teaching labs are compensated at a lower rate than faculty teaching lecture classes. For example, a faculty member teaching a 3-credit lecture class that meets 150 minutes per week is credited 3-load hours but a faculty member teaching a 1-credit lab class that meets 150 minutes per week is credited 2.4 load hours. What changes, if any, should be made to our lab loading policy to ensure faculty are equitably compensated for their work?

5. PhD+

Faculty placed in the IP column on the salary schedule are able to increase their salaries by more than \$13K through professional growth activities (see salary table).

Step	IP	IP+12	IP+20	IP+24	IP+36	IP+40	IP+48	IP+60	IP+75	IP+85	Ph.D.
1	\$44,012	\$45,755	\$46,917	\$47,498	\$49,241	\$49,822	\$50,984	\$52,726	\$54,905	\$56,357	\$57,084
2	\$47,093	\$48,836	\$49,998	\$50,579	\$52,322	\$52,903	\$54,065	\$55,807	\$57,986	\$59,438	\$60,165
3	\$50,174	\$51,917	\$53,079	\$53,660	\$55,403	\$55,984	\$57,146	\$58,888	\$61,067	\$62,519	\$63,246

In contrast, faculty with doctorate degrees are placed in the Ph.D. column and can only advance if steps or COLAs are awarded. What changes, if any, should be made to allow faculty with doctorates to increase their salaries through completion of professional growth activities?

6. Internship load

Faculty teaching internships are compensated with pay on a per student basis (see policy below).

C.9. CO-OP/INTERNSHIP (HEALTH OCCUPATIONAL, CLINICAL AND PRACTICUM NOT INCLUDED IN THIS SECTION)

For 2013-2014, the rate of pay will be two hundred fifty-seven dollars and fifty cents (\$257.50) per student.

What accommodations, if any, should be made for faculty who want to receive load credit in lieu of additional compensation?

7. Step 15 IP + 48

The maximum vertical step for faculty with fewer than 24 professional growth credits is Step 13. Faculty with 24 or more professional growth credits may advance to Step 14 (see salary schedule).

Step	IP	IP+12	IP+20	IP+24	IP+36	IP+40	IP+48	IP+60	IP+75	IP+85	Ph.D.
12	\$77,903	\$79,646	\$80,808	\$81,389	\$83,132	\$83,713	\$84,875	\$86,617	\$88,796	\$90,248	\$90,975
13	\$80,984	\$82,727	\$83,889	\$84,470	\$86,213	\$86,794	\$87,956	\$89,698	\$91,877	\$93,329	\$94,056
14				\$87,551	\$89,294	\$89,875	\$91,037	\$92,779	\$94,958	\$96,410	\$97,137

Should an additional step be added to the salary schedule for faculty who have earned 48 or more professional growth credits?

8. Create a market-competitive, equitable salary schedule that provides faculty the opportunity to progress economically over their careers. Salary advancement should be predictable.

Fundamentals of Higher Education Compensation Practices published by the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) is a resource for compensation professionals at colleges and universities. The book identifies the following important goals for HR Compensation Departments.

- develop, implement, and effectively communicate a **compensation package that attracts and retains quality employees**;
- improve the alignment of employee and institutional goals;
- develop systems that encourage staff to enhance skills and abilities best suited to meet institutional needs;
- develop and operate a **compensation process that supports implementation of the institution's compensation philosophy**;
- provide the benefits employees need and want in a cost-effective manner;
- establish systems to effectively measure employee performance;
- provide cash and non-cash recognition; and
- **adapt or revise compensation systems in response to changing employee or institutional needs or market conditions.** (http://www.cupahr.org/newsroom/cupahrnews_archives/vol02-4-02/compensation.html)

The MCCCDC Compensation Philosophy states:

*We are committed to a **fair, consistent, flexible and competitive** classification and compensation program that supports the mission and vision of MCCCDC. Our classification and compensation program is designed to attract and retain high - quality and diverse workforce through **competitive and progressive pay practices** that are **externally competitive and internally equitable**; and supports a **fiscally responsible** pay program.*

What changes, if any, should be made to our salary practices to ensure that faculty compensation practices align with the MCCCDC Compensation Philosophy and the goals identified by CUPA-HR?

9. Steps

Under current policy, steps are used to advance faculty on the salary schedule. Over the past seven years, only two steps have been awarded. In contrast, between 1994-1995 and 2006 - 2007 steps were awarded every year. What changes, if any, should be made to our salary practices to ensure predictable, meaningful salary advancement for faculty?

10. COLA

Inflation diminishes the buying power of faculty salaries resulting in a reduced standard of living. What changes to our pay practices, if any, should be implemented to counteract the negative effects of inflation?

11. Probationary Faculty Evaluation - Revisit

In the 2012-2013 negotiation year, the Meet and Confer Team revised the probationary faculty evaluation process. The new process, entitled Peer Assistance and Review, is scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 2014. While some faculty support the new process, other faculty have expressed significant concern. Some faculty have requested the new process be repealed. What changes, if any, should be made to the Peer Assistance and Review process scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 2014?

12. Reduction in Force (RIF)

Maricopa Priorities is likely to affect instructional programs. In light of this what changes, if any, should be made to the Reduction in Force policy?

13. Day/Evening Distinction

A number of policies in the RFP are based on the number of day students despite that fact that evening and weekend students have comparable needs to day students. What policy changes, if any, should be made related to the day/evening distinction to ensure that student needs are met regardless of the time of day of their classes?

14. Increased compensation for unused sick time

Faculty compensation for unused sick time differs from that of other employee groups. What changes, if any, should be made in compensation for unused sick time?

15. Faculty governance in district-wide initiatives

Faculty Governance in District-wide mandates including priorities, budgeting and strategic planning; governance in performance reviews for Chancellor and Executive. What changes, if any, should be made to our existing governance practices to ensure that faculty have an appropriate voice in decision-making?

16. 25-load cap

Faculty have a contractual obligation for 15 load hours per semester. Under current policy, faculty may contract for up to 10 additional load hours, 7.5 hours which may be teaching. What changes, if any, should be made to the 25-load cap policy?

17. Service Faculty - Appendix D

Appendix D in the Residential Faculty Policies covers Division/Department Chair duties, remuneration, overload teaching, administrative reassigned time, clerical support, and summer extended contract hours. Additionally, duties and remuneration for Occupational Program Directors are discussed. Reassigned time, clerical support, and summer extended hours for Departments/Divisions are based on day FTSE. Although some service faculty teach FTSE-generating classes, many service faculty do not. Consequently, the formula for determining clerical support, reassigned time, and summer extended contract hours is biased towards divisions with faculty teaching FTSE-generating classes. What changes, if any, should be made to Appendix D to address this issue?

Proposed Meet and Confer Issues Submitted by Faculty Senate Presidents (verbatim) - Sep 2013

CGCC

1. Compensation inequities, including the following issues: Salary inversion, Lab loading, PhD +, Internship load, MFA, and Step 15 IP +48.
2. Create a market-competitive, equitable salary schedule that provides faculty the opportunity to progress economically over their careers. Salary advancement should be predictable.

EMCC

1. Service faculty..Appdx D
2. Salary inversion
3. Lab loading.

GCC

1. Salaries - Steps/Inversion/COLA (53/42/21)
2. MFA Initial Placement on Salary Schedule (25)
3. Probationary Faculty Evaluation Process (16) - I promised to bring this forward to underscore the distress about how it has been changed, and worries about how it will be implemented - we can clearly adjust/fix some of this through clean-up language this year, but we will need to be VERY intentional about how we communicate such language clarification *and* how it will be operationalized starting next year

GWCC

1. salary inversion
2. equalize lecture and lab loading
3. address 25 load cap
4. 60/40 calculation

MCC

1. Compensation Inequities - Specifically inversion and the inequity with respect to the MFA degree.
2. Reduction in Force (R.I.F.) Policy
- 3a. Day and Evening Distinction
- 3b. Probationary Evaluation Plan (implementation and transparency)

The third ranked issues were tied with the RIF issue, but the RIF issue is already number 2. A few faculty have suggested I put forth issues which received votes across the rankings (voted for as first, second or third but not coming out on top within a particular ranking count). And my understanding is that the "Day and Evening Distinction" is a non-issue at this point. So here are the others which ranked higher in terms of total number of votes (first, second and third cumulative) received :

4. Steps (consistent increases)
5. Post Tenure Review Process
6. Staffing Ratios (Service Faculty Staffing Ratio, administrator to staff ratio).

We definitely struggled with the interpretation of the survey. As a representative of our faculty, I feel compelled to report the results without judgement, and if an issue which is already on the table is indicated by the faculty through the number of votes it received, then I am reporting it as such.

We may want to revisit the process and the message communicated with faculty at a later date.

PC

1. Fix salary inversion
2. Provide steps for faculty
3. Fix the lab loading inequities

PVCC

1. Salary inversion – We wanted this to be an issue separate from steps, cola, class loading, etc.
2. Steps – Faculty's only advancement path are steps. We have no other way to advance as MAT and PSA do by taking other positions.
3. Repeal of the new probationary evaluation – We felt this was an unnecessary additional burden on both the probationary and appointive faculty.

RSC

1. Comp inequities (Salary Inversion, mandatory steps, PhD+, lab loading, MFA, etc.);
2. Increased compensation for unused sick time (faculty comp differs from other employee groups);
3. Faculty Governance in District-wide mandates including priorities, budgeting and strategic planning; governance in performance reviews for Chancellor and Executive.

SCC

1. Compensation inequities (Inversion etc.)
2. RIF policies
3. Terminal degrees (MFA etc.)

SMCC

1. Compensation inequities
2. RIF
3. Day/Evening Inequities