

**1. Having Instructional Councils define Faculty Service Areas (FSA) is an appropriate way to classify faculty within an instructional discipline/service area.**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	8.5% (27)	10.4% (33)	20.9% (66)	<b>46.5% (147)</b>	13.6% (43)	3.46	316
	answered question						316
	skipped question						14

**2. The FSA Reduction Process described in (3) of the General Outline for Comments, provides faculty in at-risk Faculty Service Areas the opportunity to engage in the decision-making process related to the potential reduction of the Faculty Service Area.**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	8.1% (25)	12.9% (40)	22.9% (71)	<b>42.3% (131)</b>	13.9% (43)	3.41	310
	answered question						310
	skipped question						20

**3. The Layoff Order described in (6) of the General Outline for Comments is the appropriate order for layoffs.**

	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither disagree nor agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Rating Count</b>
	13.5% (42)	8.0% (25)	19.3% (60)	<b>39.2%</b> <b>(122)</b>	19.9% (62)	3.44	311
	<b>answered question</b>						<b>311</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>						<b>19</b>

**4. The option to pursue additional education and/or other forms of retraining (as described in (7) of the General Outline for Comments) should be a integral part of the college's policy related to layoffs.**

	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither disagree nor agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Rating Count</b>
	3.4% (11)	1.6% (5)	12.5% (40)	35.9% (115)	<b>46.6%</b> <b>(149)</b>	4.21	320
	<b>answered question</b>						<b>320</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>						<b>10</b>

**5. When a Residential Faculty member is identified to be laid off and a position in the faculty member's Faculty Service Area is open at another college in MCCCDC, how should the laid off faculty member's request for a transfer to the open position be handled?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
The laid off faculty member should be given the open position.		68.3%	218
The laid off faculty member should be allowed to interview for the position but the college should determine whether or not to give the open position to the laid off faculty member.		30.7%	98
The laid off faculty member should not be given any preferential treatment in regards to the open position.		0.9%	3
	Other (please specify)		58
		<b>answered question</b>	<b>319</b>
		<b>skipped question</b>	<b>11</b>

**6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

	Response Count
	144
<b>answered question</b>	<b>144</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>186</b>



**Q5. When a Residential Faculty member is identified to be laid off and a position in the faculty member's Faculty Service Area is open at another college in MCCCCD, how should the laid off faculty member's request for a transfer to the open position be handled?**

1	I am for allowing a residential faculty member to transfer to an open position at a sister college without re-interviewing. However, in the future, hiring committees should include one or more representatives from the same discipline from sister colleges.	Feb 9, 2014 9:57 PM
2	Entitlements need to have conditions for relevancy and integrity of quality in our institutions which I believe is lacking.	Feb 8, 2014 2:12 PM
3	Keep it the way it is written in the current policy. Seniority should count for something! It is not fair to lay off an experienced faculty member, while adjuncts, OSOs, OYOs, are still being hired by other colleges!	Feb 8, 2014 12:04 PM
4	As with our currently process of internal transfers, the faculty member should be interviewed by the receiving college and that college should have the choice to offer the position to the candidate.	Feb 8, 2014 10:45 AM
5	Keep the current policy! There is no reason to change it. We are DISTRICT employees; If there is a layoff, it should be district-wide! We shouldn't have one college laying off employees while everyone else gets a raise or is expanding programs!	Feb 8, 2014 10:34 AM
6	Before laying off faculty non-instructional positions need to be eliminated first.	Feb 8, 2014 9:07 AM
7	Retain the current policy. It is NOT in the interest of faculty to change this policy. We should NOT make it easier to get rid of residential faculty members and positions so the college can spend the money on anything it wants.	Feb 8, 2014 8:20 AM
8	seniority show prevail over OSO, OYO and adjuncts	Feb 7, 2014 7:38 PM
9	If we were or are actually honest and do not play favorites, then the second box would be great. The first box, can create resentment, so don't try, unless the faculty person was steller.	Feb 7, 2014 4:20 PM
10	One Maricopa means one employer and the employer has a responsibility to all employees.	Feb 7, 2014 3:41 PM
11	David Rubi's email at 9:55 Friday 2/7 said it all!	Feb 7, 2014 1:48 PM
12	We should not allow rifting to be encouraged or practiced with any regularity. If no open position is available, the faculty member should be given an option to retire early with points accrued and compensation for rifting	Feb 7, 2014 1:39 PM
13	The faculty member should interview but not using the normal interview process. They should interview with the department chair and respective dean and then a choice can be made, but they definitely should not have to endure the entire process. If this is not possible then they should be given the open position.	Feb 7, 2014 1:20 PM
14	The current policy, with the current bumping rights, makes it less likely that the district or college will actually initiate a RIF. The current policy should be retained.	Feb 7, 2014 1:18 PM
15	What happened at GateWay with regards to CIS faculty members was wrong.	Feb 7, 2014 12:49 PM

**Q5. When a Residential Faculty member is identified to be laid off and a position in the faculty member's Faculty Service Area is open at another college in MCCC, how should the laid off faculty member's request for a transfer to the open position be handled?**

There was sufficient load to keep those faculty members. The faculty association needs to make sure that if there is sufficient FTTE, then they keep their jobs. With regard to retraining, we need to make sure that the cost of retraining isn't placed on the faculty member. There shouldn't be any layoffs in MCCC. We are big enough to take care of everybody. With new positions and retirements each year, there should be no need to lay anyone off. The policy needs to address this and find places for everyone. If retraining is needed, then so be it and the district pays. The faculty member may need to go on paid leave for that training. Once again, we are big enough to take care of everyone!!!

- |    |  |                      |
|----|--|----------------------|
| 16 | I would even be in favor of giving the laid off faculty member an advantage in the scoring process, such as an additional 10 points. The college with the open position should be able to make a decision on whether new hires will fill the needs that they are looking for. In most cases, if the laid off faculty member has stayed up to date in his/her field, with the additional points, they will be hired by the new college. The conditional, "if they have stayed up to date" is the important part. Years of experience doesn't necessarily correlate with quality of instruction. | Feb 7, 2014 12:19 PM |
| 17 | Laid off faculty members should have priority placement for any open position in the district.   | Feb 7, 2014 11:37 AM |
| 18 | I can see why you wouldn't necessarily want to "bump" another faculty member, but why wouldn't laid off faculty members be placed in open positions for which they are qualified?  | Feb 7, 2014 11:26 AM |
| 19 | Only if qualified for the job  | Feb 7, 2014 10:24 AM |
| 20 | There should not need to be an open position of there is currently enough adjunct load at another college (15 load hrs per semester) to cover the required full load of a residential faculty member. The residential faculty member should be able to take their line to another college and bump the adjuncts.   | Feb 7, 2014 10:22 AM |
| 21 | If a Reduction in Force (RIF) is going to be a college HR process, why not return all HR processes to the colleges?  | Feb 7, 2014 10:15 AM |
| 22 | The laid off faculty member should be given the open position WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THREE INDIVIDUALS: The dean of the laid off faculty member's previous department, the chair of the laid off faculty member's previous department, a colleague of the laid off faculty member's discipline.   | Feb 7, 2014 9:48 AM  |
| 23 | See below.   | Feb 7, 2014 9:37 AM  |
| 24 | Interviews should only be held if there are 2 or more faculty with the same amount of time with Maricopa who are interested in the same position   | Feb 7, 2014 9:01 AM  |
| 25 | Division Chairs and Administrators are afraid of getting "problem" faculty members from another campus. However, we need to have integrity and NOT make a RIF about performance. It should be made for legitimate reasons that are not about employee performance. If we do this, then other colleges should welcome experienced faculty members.  | Feb 7, 2014 7:44 AM  |

**Q5. When a Residential Faculty member is identified to be laid off and a position in the faculty member's Faculty Service Area is open at another college in MCCC, how should the laid off faculty member's request for a transfer to the open position be handled?**

26	We are DISTRICT employees. We are ONE Maricopa. A Reduction in Force should be done on a DISTRICT wide basis, not just at one college.	Feb 7, 2014 7:32 AM
27	A guarantee for any open position that matches an identified FSA at a sister college is NOT what we do today, and for very good and defensible reasons. Changing this would be a disservice to the greater good.	Feb 7, 2014 6:13 AM
28	Faculty are District employees, not college employees. A Reduction in Force should look at seniority for all faculty members in a discipline district-wide. Our HR Department is being negligent if they don't point this out. HR needs to be OUTSOURCED. I believe the majority of faculty are dedicated and do a good job. If there are a few poor performing faculty, HR needs to support their termination for cause. BEFORE you do any kind of RIF, poor performers need to be eliminated. That way, colleges wouldn't be opposed to accepting employees from another college. It is morally wrong to eliminate positions based on performance, hiding under the guise of a "reduction in force." It is also illegal.	Feb 7, 2014 5:19 AM
29	Based the years of teaching and experience, no interview needed.	Feb 6, 2014 9:02 PM
30	also the rif faculty should be given a position if a position is justified by enrollment	Feb 6, 2014 7:38 PM
31	The laid off faculty should also be given the opportunity to take any positions that open within two years of the layoff. Otherwise, the administration can play games waiting a month or so until after a layoff to advertise their "new" position.	Feb 6, 2014 5:56 PM
32	The laid off faculty member should be given the open position provided that the faculty member is in good residential faculty standing and not on probationary status with the faculty, administration or the department from which they reside. No passing of lemons from college to college and no one should be retired in the classroom and get paid for it!!!!	Feb 6, 2014 2:25 PM
33	It is crazy that a laid off faculty member should have to interview for an open position in any area in which they qualify.	Feb 6, 2014 11:14 AM
34	There should be some provision for faculty members being in good standing with regard to teaching and learning--are they effective? Perhaps this is why the program failed at the last college. Perhaps there should be a professional review by peers to determine why the program or discipline declined or was it administration who decided to close down the courses--for ?? reason, which could include faculty personality clashes.	Feb 6, 2014 10:55 AM
35	I think we should be ONE FACULTY not college faculty. The rules should then allow the same standards for RIF district wide not just in one college. If a program is small at one college and deleted the faculty should have seniority etc over others in the district. Maybe a third option that allows some veto by the "college" but is based on some more objective data.	Feb 6, 2014 10:42 AM
36	I was recently part of a program that was closed by MCC. It affected 9 RFP faculty. Two of the faculty retired, four transferred to MCC main (a 50 mile	Feb 6, 2014 10:36 AM

**Q5. When a Residential Faculty member is identified to be laid off and a position in the faculty member's Faculty Service Area is open at another college in MCCCDC, how should the laid off faculty member's request for a transfer to the open position be handled?**

distance from the original site), one was moved in a "handshake agreement" to another campus (as we were all told would happen if a position was available) and the last two were made to go through the interview process. Actually 3 people went through the interview process but one was not hired and ended up going to the Mesa main campus. There was a huge disparity in the way we were treated. If an RFP has a good track record and solid recommendations there is no reason they should not be allowed to move to another campus when being RIF'ed.

37	Faculty member should be given the position subject to the approval of the new college's Department Chair and President.	Feb 6, 2014 8:27 AM
38	If they have reached tenure they should be given the position. If not tenured, they should be interviewed for the position.	Feb 5, 2014 2:47 PM
39	If the laid off faculty member meets all of the qualifications, then the hiring college must provide rationale for not giving the open position to the laid off faculty member. The laid off faculty member should be interviewed before outside candidates.	Feb 5, 2014 6:55 AM
40	The laid-off faculty member should certainly be considered an internal candidate.	Feb 3, 2014 4:35 PM
41	This is the only equitable answer as long as we continue to define "appointive" in the current manner.	Feb 3, 2014 4:14 PM
42	Since the faculty member is employed by the DISTRICT, not the college, the faculty member should be given the open position within the FSA, or be allowed to interview for any position for which the candidate is qualified outside the FSA, as an internal candidate. If there are more than one laid off faculty applying for the same open position, then the layoff order should be observed for placement.	Feb 3, 2014 4:07 PM
43	This needs to be openly discussed among faculty.	Feb 3, 2014 2:31 PM
44	I do not believe the faculty being RIFed should be able to bump OSO, OYO or Provisional faculty. That simply takes rights away from another group and is probably against labor law. They should be allowed to take any open positions in their areas of expertise and assume any classes being taught by adjuncts to make up a full load. If a department is closed at a campus the faculty should have first call on staying at that campus ... if there are no open or pending positions or loads available from adjunct classes in other disciplines where they qualify they should be allowed to take positions at another college by their choice.	Feb 3, 2014 2:24 PM
45	The faculty member should be given the open position unless the college having the opening can provide compelling evidence that this should not be done, in which case the second option would apply. The decision to judge the evidence should be afforded to a neutral district committee consisting of administration and faculty.	Feb 3, 2014 2:17 PM
46	A distinction must be made for appointed (tenured) faculty members. If the laid off faculty member was tenured, he/she should be placed in an equivalent open	Feb 3, 2014 2:05 PM

**Q5. When a Residential Faculty member is identified to be laid off and a position in the faculty member's Faculty Service Area is open at another college in MCCCDC, how should the laid off faculty member's request for a transfer to the open position be handled?**

position. If not tenured, the laid off faculty member should be allowed to interview for an equivalent position, but the determination to hire should be up to the college.

47	MCCCDC is a district that promotes the idea of "One Maricopa." The option that aligns the best with this vision is that the faculty member should be given the open position at another campus. Interviewing for positions at other campuses defeats the purpose of One Maricopa. Also, not giving preferential treatment to the affected faculty at the college and district level disregards the seniority policies in the RFP. Disregarding seniority contradicts section 8 IV of the transfer plan in the Retain/Retrain proposal.	Feb 3, 2014 11:47 AM
48	* If they have a record of active service and appropriate teaching at their college. Those who do not should not be passed to another college simply for the sake of maintaining a position or passing along an inactive, non-serving faculty member.	Feb 3, 2014 10:33 AM
49	This may be encapsulated in one of the above. It would seem fair that the RIFd faculty member would have an opportunity to interview as an internal candidate for a number of years beyond the RIF. They should be given every opportunity to be rehired, and not subjected to the protocols of the external search process. However, departments and the college presidents should also have some say in the hiring of the RIFd faculty member. The idea should be to get the RIFs faculty back into a full-time line balanced with respecting the right of departments and colleges to shape their cultures.	Feb 3, 2014 10:25 AM
50	The laid off faculty should be given the open position if the faculty meets the needs and qualifications of the open position.	Feb 3, 2014 9:07 AM
51	In addition to point #2 above, the laid off faculty should not have to wait through the lengthy HR process to be given an interview or a decision.	Feb 3, 2014 8:52 AM
52	Almost all operational revenue comes from student fees and local property taxes. Administrative ability to remove bad faculty who denigrate a college's reputation is existential.	Feb 2, 2014 11:03 AM
53	We are DISTRICT employees, not College employees, right? What about ONE Maricopa? Smaller colleges might have only one or two faculty members in the "Faculty Service Area." The layoff order should be district-wide. A RIF should NEVER be based on performance. (That is illegal. If someone needs to be terminated for cause, that is what should happen.) Therefore, any faculty member subject to a RIF should be PLACED (not "given"--sounds like you are doing them a favor) in an open comparable position. In addition, if faculty members subject to RIF are qualified to teach in OTHER disciplines, if there are open positions in those disciplines, they should be PLACED in those positions as well. Take out the "veto" power of the receiving College President. If we are "ONE Maricopa" everyone and every college can and should be affected by the RIF of ANY faculty member! This should NOT be a decision made lightly and College Presidents SHOULD consider how this will impact their sister colleges!	Feb 2, 2014 7:56 AM
54	The interview should be conducted before the position is opened to external applicants as a courtesy to the internal candidate. The position should be	Jan 31, 2014 7:45 PM

**Q5. When a Residential Faculty member is identified to be laid off and a position in the faculty member's Faculty Service Area is open at another college in MCCCCD, how should the laid off faculty member's request for a transfer to the open position be handled?**

opened to external candidates only after the decision has been made that no internal candidates are acceptable for the position.

55 If the faculty is in good standing, they should be given the position if they are qualified. Jan 31, 2014 4:13 PM

56 Justification should be required, such as the individual hired in place of the faculty member must have a significantly higher set of skills needed for the position (metrics should be established for this). In other words, the college should have to document why the laid off faculty member lacks the qualifications to perform the duties of the open position. The hiring college should not be allowed to hire someone else simply because they have skills or qualifications that permit them to do more than the open position requires. Jan 31, 2014 3:32 PM

57 I find a rewriting of the current RIF policy completely unnecessary. I doubt it really represents the point of view of most faculty and this is an example of our FEC accommodating the Administration, i.e., the FEC doing what is in the interest of the Administration and not in the interest of the faculty. The current RIF policy is fine. Jan 31, 2014 2:30 PM

58 Seems harsh to do otherwise. Jan 31, 2014 2:01 PM



**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

1	<p>The current RIF policy should remain in place. The proposed changes to the RIF policy are of benefit only to the Administration. This is just one more illustration of how the Faculty Meet and Confer Team has turned its back on faculty and is working harder for the Administration than it is for the faculty. It would be in the best interests of the faculty if the faculty M&amp;C team went back to the old philosophy of representing faculty instead of thinking they have the right and the authority to independently decide what is best for faculty.</p>	Feb 10, 2014 12:23 AM
2	<p>Meet and Confer need to incorporate a lot of the feedback from the email strings in addition to the survey. There is one comment I can not move past that truly needs to be considered heavily in determining the RIF policy -- every job position is NOT EVER apples to apples. This currently is demonstrated by GCC with their Economics position posted. It requires the candidate to have a presentation and academic publishing record. These are not traditional requirements to teach community college economics courses throughout MCCCDC. All of the sudden you could be a tenure economics faculty member at South Mountain, and, after your RIF, you aren't even "qualified" to teach economics at Glendale.... there is NO incentive or motivation for a bigger college to consider a RIFed faculty member from another college. The bigger colleges are known to 'pad' positions to favor their own internal candidate...I was once at a big college and I've actually seen this happen. The other comments with regards to District-wide adjuncts are critical to this conversation as well.... If there is a RIFed faculty member, they should be able to teach their discipline load at multiple colleges if needed. They technically would be affiliated for the District faculty -- this way quality faculty are kept within their disciplines.... The issue that I have with "retraining" is two-fold. One: I have a PhD. -- I am a part of the 1%, and yet now you are telling me that I need more education... why not value what I have and utilize my knowledge and skills.... instead you are saying that I'm not worthy because I'm not teaching English or Math or Reading... Two: Another Masters degree to 'retrain' me may not be an option -- what if I don't get into the program, what if there are waiting lists from the area schools (ASU, UofA or NAU) and finally, WHO is going to absorb the COST???? My final years of ASU PhD program was about \$1,000 / credit hour.... It may not be cost effective for me to dump another \$30,000 - \$40,000 getting another masters degree to teach in a discipline that I can't get a guarantee that I will be able to teach long enough to even recoup my initial investment.... AND, I personally don't have \$40,000 lying around in disposable income to dump into another degree....</p>	Feb 9, 2014 8:56 PM
3	<p>Re: bumping My concern is the reason someone is laid off, in the first place. Bad apples, bad colleagues, and ineffective teachers should not be allowed to bump another less senior faculty at a sister campus, who is doing a great job. For example residential faculty who has been teaching 5-10 years and in their prime, should not be bumped by a 'bad apple' with 12-20 years. seniority should only be one of the factors determining what happens to laid off faculty.</p>	Feb 9, 2014 8:01 PM
4	<p>First, we do not need to change the RIF policy. Secondly and very importantly, we need to remove all of the faculty who have been on the Meet and Confer Team starting with Frank Wilson. The faculty on the Meet and Confer Team have lost the trust and respect of the MCCCDC RFP Faculty. Many of us do not think that Frank and his team are negotiating in the best interests of the faculty for whatever reasons that might include ideological differences and personal self-interest. We have had an RFP that has been hard fought by faculty through the years, has served the faculty, students, and greater community extremely</p>	Feb 9, 2014 12:03 PM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

well, and has been the envy of faculty across the world. This team has been "managing by exception" for several years; i.e., punishing the many for the sins of the few. If we have faculty members who are underperforming, then we need the division chair and the Academic VP to conduct an administrative review. We have an outstanding faculty who are being terribly disrespected, disconfirmed, and disgraced by the actions of the Meet and Confer Team and by the MCCCC Faculty Association Leadership in the past six years. If you want to save the Faculty Association, then you need major changes not only on the Meet and Confer Team but also with the MCCCC Faculty Association Leadership. Again, they have lost credibility with the faculty at large and need to be replaced.

- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 5  | I believe that faculty members should be able to define the areas that they can teach in, based on their educational and experiential backgrounds, and when faced with a possible RIF, should be given every opportunity to fill other instructional needs within the MCCCC. Classifying faculty under particular service areas should not be used as a means to keep them from pursuing related areas of instruction!  | Feb 9, 2014 11:11 AM |
| 6  | No area should be "forced" to accept an unqualified or non-competitive faculty.   | Feb 8, 2014 2:12 PM  |
| 7  | Why change the current policy? I think we are better off with things the way they are. The option to pursue additional education and/or other forms of retraining is important but it should be done on a district-wide basis. It should NOT be only the college. If the college is laying someone off, they have already decided that they don't have a place for the person.  | Feb 8, 2014 12:04 PM |
| 8  | I guess I would rather have Instructional Councils define Faculty Service Areas (FSA) than have anyone else do it! Administrators should not have an incentive to get rid of faculty members so they get \$100K to spend on anything they want! We are better off keeping the current policy. Please do NOT change it.  | Feb 8, 2014 10:34 AM |
| 9  | I don't think it is necessary to change the RIF policy...   | Feb 8, 2014 9:07 AM  |
| 10 | Retain the current policy. The current policy puts all faculty at risk for being bumped, so it becomes a district-wide faculty issue. To be successful, we will need to unite. This will strengthen the faculty association. The proposed "college-specific" policy will pit one college against another and create fighting and distrust within the faculty ranks. I truly believe that this could lead to the downfall of the entire faculty association. If an administrator decides to eliminate a faculty member as retaliation or punishment (as was the case at GateWay), he or she will certainly not offer any "retraining" options!   | Feb 8, 2014 8:20 AM  |
| 11 | Please follow the RFP as it is written and make sure that admin does too. Adjuncts, OYOs and OSOs should be laid off first from any college that has an opening for a residential to transfer to. Residential should NOT have to interview. We are district employees! Stand up for all residential faculty against arbitrary admin decisions in transfers. Take care of us and keep us informed. Put important issues on the table now. Salary inversion has been going on for years, yet every year it is tabled. It is most important for many faculty. You demoralize us with this crap. No wonder more of us want an early retirement window. You are losing many dedicated faculty with this IBN crap. Get back to real negotiations on issues that have the greatest impact for the most faculty. And review this idiotic PAR process you are jamming down our throats. It is an | Feb 7, 2014 7:37 PM  |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

albatross. When you have to hard sell it at 10 colleges you know you screwed up.

12 I suggest you fight for the FT Faculty who TEACH those who pay all of our paychecks. Feb 7, 2014 6:17 PM

13 Actually discussing this issue with Dr. Glasper with each discipline would be most beneficial. Considering more technical or vocational courses with an already existing industry or facility would be so practical and provide options for the low B and C students who can really work with their hands. Feb 7, 2014 4:20 PM

14 I could not find the documents to be able to answer #'s 1-3.... I wish you would have provided a link or attachment to this survey. Feb 7, 2014 4:08 PM

15 We actually work for the District, not a college. Any assignments made are for the District, not a certain college Feb 7, 2014 3:54 PM

16 I responded once so did not respond to questions above so I don't vote twice. I have formulated a couple of thoughts. Presidents should not have veto!!! Period. RIF'ed faculty should have district rights in some form to bump other faculty. One Maricopa and all of that. We need protection for small department and small colleges. This RIF policy seems to support more college level autonomy than I am comfortable with and sounds like a President's view not the Chancellor or Faculty point of view. Thanks for the opportunity to respond!! Feb 7, 2014 3:52 PM

17 The campus should not be able to RIF faculty when the campus has FTSE to support the retention of the faculty member. Feb 7, 2014 3:41 PM

18 Hope for the best but prepare for the worst. Negotiate as though it was your job on the line... Feb 7, 2014 1:48 PM

19 Why would there be any discussion of rifting if there is a 60/40 initiative? Is this a way to circumvent that and punish people for time of service? I hope not. Feb 7, 2014 1:39 PM

20 Our faculty district wide is a tremendous and offers an unlimited resource of talent. Faculty should not be restricted to what an IC determines their area is alone. There should be multiple factors involved as well as the faculty member themselves. Many faculty get pigeonholed by this and therefore never get the opportunity to share the wealth of knowledge and resources they can provide to our students and our institutions. Feb 7, 2014 1:20 PM

21 If a new policy is adopted, it must include proof that there is a valid reason for the reduction in force. A RIF should not be used in lieu of disciplinary action. A RIF should be a weapon of political payback. A RIF should not be conducted at one college when all employees district-wide are given STEP and . or COLA increases! District "emergency funds" should be exhausted before faculty are eliminated in a Reduction in Force. Feb 7, 2014 1:18 PM

22 We are part of ONE Maricopa. We serve the people of Maricopa County and our paychecks come from MCCD. If a sister college has oyo, oso, or adjunct faculty positions, they should be replaced by full-time faculty who are rifted. If a program is eliminated, then the employee line from a transfer should go with the faculty. If the new rift policy being discussed is enacted, then large colleges that have Feb 7, 2014 1:06 PM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

declining enrollment will benefit from eliminating programs and full-time faculty positions. (They will become the "rich" colleges). This should not be allowed. Many colleges are bloated with administrators. It would be in the best interest of MCCCD to have a study done to assess each college for excessive administration costs (This is what the private sector does). It is OK to consider --- early retirement incentives for faculty who are at the end of their careers. If this is done, it gives the colleges and the District more options to move people around, eliminate faculty positions, and control costs.

- |    |  |                      |
|----|--|----------------------|
| 23 | Do not lose any of our rights. WE do need to make our position stonger. Make sure that no employee is RIF'd. Really, there is no need for it in our district with all the retirements and new positions each year. There is a place for everyone.  | Feb 7, 2014 12:49 PM |
| 24 | Good luck. Tough discussions ahead. There will always be exceptions to the rule. Don't get caught up in all the little "what ifs" that have never happened when we need to worry about the "what now".   | Feb 7, 2014 12:48 PM |
| 25 | Item #3 does not include the department. The department that is looking to be removed needs to be the first one contacted and allowed to make a case or increase numbers etc. Also, there should be language that requires administrators to show the actions that were taken to retain that area, (ex. recruitment, meetings, with specific steak holders in the community, etc.) Item #6 This language needs to language needs to have more creativity for the campuses and district to work together. For example, move faculty to different campuses if a department is no longer needed on one campus with their line. We see administrators being moved to other campuses with their budget lines all the time. It may also be of benefit to create a position for faculty to work at 2 different campuses. Creativity and options should be exhausted before removing full-time faculty from their positions. Item #9 This needs to say if a faculty position is created at ANY campus the faculty member gets recalled not just the campus they were hired at.           | Feb 7, 2014 12:36 PM |
| 26 | The emails are frightening in regard to senior faculty and positions being eliminated in some areas. I would hate to be eliminated after serving 15 or 20 years with the district. Retraining and transfers are certainly a good option.   | Feb 7, 2014 12:34 PM |
| 27 | The emails are frightening in regard to senior faculty and positions being eliminated in some areas. I would hate to be eliminated after serving 15 or 20 years with the district. Retraining and transfers are certainly a good option.   | Feb 7, 2014 12:34 PM |
| 28 | The policy seems to offer a fair means of handling situations where faculty will be laid off. I understand there are constraints in the district structure that don't allow Residential Faculty lines to cross from one college to another. I know that's outside of the purview of this Meet and Confer question, but the Geology faculty member example from the email distribution list discussion does point to a flaw in the system. Why should one college have multiple adjuncts in an area when one Residential Faculty position could solve the problem? Also, Instructional Councils are a good avenue for defining "Faculty Service Areas," but for big disciplines like English, the IC might decide to not recognize the breadth of the degrees that can filter into the ENG track. The minimum qualifications are broad now, which is good. But, I can see the minimum qualifications and thus the FSA being narrowed to avoid having members of other disciplines making the justification that they are capable of teaching college English. Basically, I'm wary | Feb 7, 2014 12:19 PM |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

of people setting policy based on the very rare possibility that a laid off Residential Faculty member might come knocking on their door one day. This is a small concern, but Maricopa's ICs are often made of of reactionary, "prisoner of the moment" people.

- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 29 | 1) the retraining policy needs to include stated limits (to protect colleges and faculty, I think) around the duration allowed for training, the assumption of costs associated with retraining, and guidelines for compensation during the retraining process. 2) Faculty facing layoffs should have the right to other positions in the district based on seniority. They should be eligible to teach in any FSA for which they have demonstrated credentials and expertise. 3) Some comparative analysis of FSA areas should be provided by the college. It should include measurable criteria. GWCC's frustrations with the RIF process stemmed from the fact that the FSA targeted was producing demonstrable successes, especially compared to other programs on campus.  | Feb 7, 2014 12:12 PM |
| 30 | Question one should be removed. FSAs are not appropriate for CIS and I'm sure that faculty at other colleges/Universities are not defined this way. Having a Master's Degree in CIS covers a broad range of technological areas including Programming, Networking, Multimedia. Because we have focused on Networking does not mean that we couldn't teach all of the introductory Multimedia, Programming courses. When Faculty are pigeon holed into these FSAs they lose value. Is it the case in Math that if you teach trig you can never teach calculus? Surely not. Also, CIS is a field that changes quickly and faculty must change and evolve with those changes. 15 years ago CIS did not teach Adobe software (Photoshop, etc), now we have several certificates that only deal with Photoshop - these certificates are taught by CIS faculty who evolved - they were not forced out of Maricopa because this software wasn't originally in their "FSA". Question 3 - Layoffs should not occur if classes are available at other colleges. Faculty should be transferred before being RIFed. Seniority rules should remain. I am VERY DISSATISFIED WITH THE WAY THIS IS BEING HANDLED BY FS. | Feb 7, 2014 12:11 PM |
| 31 | It would be appropriate to "bump" faculty at another college to retain the faculty member within the district. "One Maricopa" What procedures exist for the RIF of administrative positions--at both the district and college level? Are administrative positions receiving the same amount of scrutiny--as we are finding for programs in the Maricopa Priorities study?   | Feb 7, 2014 12:07 PM |
| 32 | I sense a lot of anxiety in the email discussion of this issue. This is the result, I think, of several years of at least perceived erosion of faculty rights by district. As a long-time faculty member, I am disheartened by what I see as the obliteration of the colleges' individual identities and connections with their unique communities. As someone said in one of the emails, this is a different district than many of us were hired into. On a related matter, not only is there no incentive for early retirement, but the district--in overcomplying with provisions of the ACA--has actually created a disincentive by forcing retirees after 7/1 to sit out a six-month period (which is actually an 8-month period depending on one's retirement date and the timing of semesters and summer terms). It's as if senior faculty are constantly having the rug yanked out from under us by the bean counters. I wonder if administration has ever heard the story of what happens when you kill the goose that lays golden eggs for you.   | Feb 7, 2014 12:07 PM |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

- |    |  |                      |
|----|--|----------------------|
| 33 | If I were an administrator at the district, this provides an opportunity to save a lot of money by hurting a lot of faculty members. Just find the programs in each discipline that have the largest number and percentage of adjunct faculty. Keep only those programs. Eliminate ALL other programs in every discipline. Since the reduction in force will be done at the college level, the eliminated faculty will have nowhere to go. There will be no openings at the college to train them for. They can't bump the adjuncts at the other colleges. We saved a fortune! Sure, a lot of experienced faculty members are now unemployed...but they might be able to apply to work as adjunct faculty member at the college that still has the program! To make this strategy politically feasible, make everyone work on something called, "Maricopa Priorities" before rolling out this decision so the accountability for the decision is obfuscated. Then, have the Faculty Association propose the policy that ensures that the faculty will lose their jobs! "It wasn't us, it was the faculty association who came up with the RIF policy." Oh wait! It seems like someone already came up with this idea.... | Feb 7, 2014 11:37 AM |
| 34 | The reduction process and layoff order seems to imply RIF of adjuncts first then OYO's and so on in the District. The RFP is for all faculty district wide- therefore- layoffs should occur in this order district wide to protect small colleges. The policy does not state within each college- which is fine. I believe if you have a faculty member in a small department at a small college with 20 years seniority over an OYO in the same department at another college- the layoff should occur with seniority in mind district wide.  | Feb 7, 2014 11:37 AM |
| 35 | If we are indeed "One Maricopa," and "Working as One", faculty in good standing who are no longer needed in one college should be offered the opportunity to do their same job, or a similar job that utilizes their strengths and skills, at another college.   | Feb 7, 2014 11:35 AM |
| 36 | The option to pursue additional education and/or other forms of retraining should be based on district-wide needs, not just at the college level. Otherwise, faculty at small colleges are at a huge disadvantage.   | Feb 7, 2014 11:26 AM |
| 37 | Go back to the drawing board..... Put faculty in control of any implemented process.   | Feb 7, 2014 11:16 AM |
| 38 | the budget line should move with the faculty member, since the faculty works for the district.   | Feb 7, 2014 11:15 AM |
| 39 | It seems to me that it only makes sense to have the laid off faculty member keep their faculty line. We are in the process of priorities right now, and the decisions we make should be about what is best for the students in our service areas, not dollars and cents. We should not just shut down areas to save money. If we are laid off, we should be able to transfer to another college where we can keep our position if another college is currently hiring adjunct faculty members to cover load, then the full time person should be able to replace the adjuncts. To address the money... the receiving college could send to the sending college the money they were spending on 15 load hours of adjuncts and the receiving college gets the faculty line. This seems fair and gives the sending college some savings over what they were spending before, though not the entire faculty line. To have one college employing adjuncts in a service area when another college is laying off faculty members makes no sense. Of course this would be an extraordinary circumstance so I don't think this would be something that would  | Feb 7, 2014 10:22 AM |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

happen frequently so why not protect the faculty lines wherever they may end up? Why would we give up faculty lines and have them evaporate into thin air? That makes no sense to me.

40 If each individual college gets the financial benefit of eliminating a faculty member, and district HR leaves everything to the individual colleges, what do we need a district human resources or a district financial department for? If these functions will be shifted to the colleges, why not ALL human resources functions? There is a very large number of human resources employees at the district office and they hire more human resources employees all the time. I have never seen them add any value to the hiring process. I have never seen district HR add value to our mission of education. How many people are employed by district HR? If we eliminate the district office, lay off the staff, and sell the building, we would free up lots of money for Fund 1 budgets at all the colleges! That would probably negate the need for colleges to lay off faculty.

Feb 7, 2014 10:15 AM

Feb 7, 2014 10:06 AM

41 Bumping across the district is already part of the existing policy. Please do not dilute the existing rights of faculty. DO NOT CHANGE THE POLICY.

42 When I was hired by Maricopa I understood RIFing would only occur across the District (not just at the college level) by seniority...I am appalled to realize I was given wrong info about this policy. It should be based on seniority in the discipline as a whole...a 15 yr Geology faculty should not be RIFed if adjuncts, OSOs, OYOs, and even full time faculty w/ less seniority at other colleges are retained. I feel / sense that faculty rights are being eroded. MP is scary to most at my college, as is the new PAR/PARC. Too many changes not in the interest of faculty. And yes, I voted against the COLA so I could vote against PAR/PARC.

Feb 7, 2014 10:05 AM

43 The creation of Faculty Service Areas adds a ridiculously bureaucratic level to an already laughable structure: the notion of "Qualifications" that MCCC currently uses, a legacy of the pointless and very un-higher-education former State Community College office. Investing more power in Instructional Councils, too often staffed in part by people who could not avoid the responsibility, and many of which do not regularly meet to take care of the business that they already have (I know of several that have not met even once yet this academic year), is foolish. Further subdividing disciplines presumes that we have faculty on ICs who are themselves qualified to identify every possible subdivision (my ICs has repeatedly declined to acknowledge that my area of scholarship exists, largely because they weren't aware of it when they were in graduate school). I understand the reasoning, but the solution is not to take the very K-12 like system we use for "Qualification," which fails to account for anything faculty do outside of transcribed credit hours (way to walk the talk on "lifelong learning" and professional development), and make it even more cumbersome. The current RIF system is clumsy and potentially very unpleasant, and, frankly, it should be. We should be able to find better solutions in all but a tiny handful of cases. But if you enact the draft policy, it will have far-reaching consequences on who can be hired, and how sections can be staffed. Such a system will not be confined to RIF once it is created. It will have implications that do not seem have been thought through. We are told repeatedly that we are "generalists," so lets not get into taxonomic hair-splitting as a strategy for figuring out who to lay off. As a related aside, I just want to point out that nowhere does this scheme seem

Feb 7, 2014 9:37 AM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

to account for quality of teaching, commitment to the college and district through service, or any other factor that looks like merit. That's sad. We continue to be guilty of the rankest hypocrisy: we tell our students that they will be rewarded according to their achievement, but we faculty want to be rewarded on the basis of pulse-maintenance. I understand why. We have resisted any kind of meaningful faculty evaluation for so long that we would have no way to accurately assess any faculty member's quality. Shame on us, who so confidently sit in judgment of our students.

- |    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 44 | While we are each individually accredited colleges, we also One Maricopa. All of us have rigorous application processes that were vetted by the district, for faculty positions. As the population of the valley changes shape and size we should be flexible with transferring faculty throughout the district. At the very minimum faculty should be given the opportunity to transfer. And then worst-case scenario, be given the opportunity to work for five years at the new college to learn to become part of that new community.   | Feb 7, 2014 9:15 AM |
| 45 | I believe the current policy is fine. We do not need to change this now!!!!!!!!!!!!!!   | Feb 7, 2014 9:01 AM |
| 46 | The proposed policy seems like a step backwards compared with current language in RFP. Faculty are employees of Maricopa, not an individual college, so they should be able to take an open position at another college without going through an interview process. "One Maricopa" should apply up and down the ladder of issues, not just down, as seems to be current practice. Voluntary transfers are a different issue, and the requirements to interview should apply.  | Feb 7, 2014 8:36 AM |
| 47 | If this is all about the money, then the "retain and retrain" policy--which sounds nice--is really just a deception. If the college is trying to save \$100K by eliminating a faculty member, it will have no incentive to find a position for that faculty member, and even less incentive to invest in training. The college has a financial incentive to pay \$47,000 for an OYO, rather than \$100K for a residential faculty member. The Faculty Association is putting itself in jeopardy by spearheading the effort to rob faculty members of their jobs! As elected representatives, you should be PROTECTING hard-working, qualified faculty members. If you are truly representing and protecting the rights of faculty members--not district or college administration--then a RIF should be done on a district-wide basis. Seniority, bumping, etc., should be done district-wide!  | Feb 7, 2014 7:44 AM |
| 48 | The option to pursue additional education and/or other forms of retraining (as described in (7) of the General Outline for Comments) should be a integral part of the DISTRICT'S policy related to layoffs. Is each COLLEGE going to have its own RIF Policy? I hope not! So, basically, the only option to be "retrained" is for and "open" position at the same college? If there are no "open" positions at a college that is laying off faculty, all those faculty just lose their jobs? They have no rights with respect to positions in other colleges? That seems really unfair. If HR functions will become strictly the domain of each COLLEGE, does that mean that all the HR staff at the district can be eliminated as part of a Reduction in Force? How much money would THAT save? (By the way, if this is the case, HR employees shouldn't have any bumping rights nor should they be given any preferential treatment for HR positions at any of the colleges!) Really, would Human Resources leadership stand for this to happen to them? Of course not! So, why are we, as faculty, trying to do this to ourselves? | Feb 7, 2014 7:32 AM |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

49	First in Last out.	Feb 7, 2014 7:30 AM
50	We need an early retirement package to eliminate some of the highly paid old dudes like myself. THIS would certainly open up positions.	Feb 7, 2014 6:25 AM
51	I agree it is unfortunate this has to be considered and articulated. But sometimes we need to acknowledge that, even in higher education, we are part of the real world in which resources can shrink, and we need a reasonable plan to deal with this; one that minimizes overall harm and disruption.	Feb 7, 2014 6:13 AM
52	We are one college district with one district budge. I have always wondered why we are not just called Maricopa Community College and each sister college just consider a campus site. Since all of the funding we receive at the college level comes through the district the faculty lines actually do NOT belong to the college but to the district. Our College Presidents have transferred faculty salary lines to other colleges as a way of moving a faculty member they no longer want working at their college. This practice has been happening in the district for many year so why wouldn't we just transfer faculty (and faculty lines) to campuses where they are need. The MCCCCD budget is one pot of money. Another cost saving measure would be to treat each campus as just one branch of the Maricopa Community College and then you could eliminate an entire administrative level at the top of each college saving the district almost two million dollars.	Feb 7, 2014 6:03 AM
53	A result of Maricopa Priorities might be to consolidate nursing programs. Instead of 8 or 9 programs, we may end up with 2 or 3. The colleges that end up retaining their nursing programs will keep their existing faculty. The faculty at the colleges that close their nursing programs will be eliminated due to a reduction in force (RIF). Under the proposed policy, the colleges that still have nursing will have no obligation to accept any of the RIFed employees. The college that still has nursing MIGHT hire some of the nursing faculty through a competitive process, or they might choose NOT to hire ANY of the displaced nursing faculty members. Colleges seem to believe, and the tradition seems to have been, that only "problem" employees are transferred. Is it negligent for an employee association to be an accomplice in helping administration to eliminate so many people without any due process? Is the goal of this really want to take away the jobs of a large number of faculty members? I like the focus on "retain and retrain" but if no college will accept any employee from any other college, this won't result in anyone actually being "retained," will it?	Feb 7, 2014 5:19 AM
54	RIFd faculty should be given a position at another college with the enrollment to sustain them, even if there are no oyo or oso positions at the receiving college.	Feb 6, 2014 11:21 PM
55	I personally believe that tenure is anachronistic and that seniority is not a good way to manage who gets to continue to teach in challenged disciplines. If we had followed the current RIF policy recently, a senior faculty at one campus who had trouble making classes (colleagues at same college didn't have same issue) could've bumped a new faculty at our campus (whose classes close during the first week of being open). Luckily, the other campus chose not to pursue the RIF. In this case, the discipline wasn't challenged, the senior faculty was.	Feb 6, 2014 9:36 PM
56	Faculty who is producing low FTSE can be laid off.	Feb 6, 2014 9:02 PM
57	This is difficult across the board. I think everyone is doing their best in these lean	Feb 6, 2014 8:53 PM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

times.

58	I strongly believe that a laid off faculty should be considered at an alternate college with a "thriving" program to fulfill the 60/40 staffing ratio. For example, if Professor Blue teaching Art History at Estrella Mountain, and EMCC cuts the ARH program, Professor Blue can be offered a job at another college that is below 60:40 staffing ratio in ARH. I also feel that Rio Salado should be a part of this, as their curriculum and design suffers due in part to a full-time dedicated faculty per discipline.	Feb 6, 2014 7:44 PM
59	I'm uncomfortable with the lack of protection this policy provides to long time faculty members.	Feb 6, 2014 7:28 PM
60	Why are we discussing laying off faculty when we are so understaffed?	Feb 6, 2014 7:26 PM
61	This policy change is terrible for faculty in small programs at small colleges. We are the vulnerable ones. I am a one person department at SMCC with no adjuncts, and I frequently teach in other departments to make load. I have been here for 14 years and have more seniority than all but 2 faculty within the district in my discipline. But now, if my college decides to eliminate my discipline, I have no real options.	Feb 6, 2014 5:56 PM
62	I do not approve of the proposed changes. Residential faculty at one college should be able to bump faculty at another college if the college or district decides to eliminate a program.	Feb 6, 2014 5:28 PM
63	This is a difficult issue because faculty have too much power in MCCCCD, and they are the most common barrier to student success. However, at the same time, there is the philosophy of the "college experience," and this model is assuming that students are selecting the best classes that they need for their futures. At SMCC, we have very few humanities classes that make, but humanities are crucial to the world and our society: race, gender, equality--how do you make it in the rest of your education, job, and life without this knowledge? What about the complete college experience? Aren't colleges supposed to expose to courses and majors that you didn't even know were options to you? I see many students who think they "know" what they want to do with their lives, but have no idea about any other options or what that choice would actually look like. This seems so much more complicated than this survey.	Feb 6, 2014 5:06 PM
64	Seniority/Date of Hire should be the first thing that gets looked at in a discipline/Faculty Service Area. If a faculty member is able to teach in more than one area then all areas should be considered. For example, 1) A list from HR is generated of faculty in each service area according to their date of hire. This will indicate placement on the seniority list. 2) HR obtains from identified faculty to be laid off what other service areas they are qualified to teach. 3) Rankings are generated in each discipline according to the new information now giving a clearer picture of where the faculty rank. 4) Faculty are placed at a college where the position has been identified as needed. 5) If the position, is not needed, but there is a lower ranking faculty member in that discipline, the lower ranking member gets bumped by the higher ranking member. 6) Faculty that get bumped that are willing to retrain in another area, are given this training. If a position opens up, these faculty are guaranteed internal candidacy and interviewed. If the faculty member chooses to not be retrained, then he/she is	Feb 6, 2014 5:01 PM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

laid off. 6) Adjuncts, OSOs, OYOs are not given priority in this process because they are not RFP faculty and are not covered by the RFP. The seniority ranking should not be considered by college. Faculty are employees of the Maricopa District, not an individual college. It does not make sense to rank by college. I am personally qualified to teach in three very different disciplines, and would hope that this breadth of education, knowledge and experience would be considered.

65	"The District is committed to try to retain faculty whether through retraining and/or transfer." If this is true, then any faculty member whose current position is being eliminated should be moved into any open position (at any college); be used to replace OYOs, OSOs, and/or adjuncts (at any college) where the load is sufficient to support a FT faculty; be assigned to teach at more than one college where the combined load is sufficient to support a FT faculty. To do any differently renders that statement patently false. The transfer system as currently constituted is not always fair to the potential transferee. Thus, the option of a transfer to another college wherein the college has the ability to refuse the transfer applicant is not a reliable and fair method for this policy! I fully recognize that there are occasions where I might be unhappy to receive a known "problem faculty" from another college in such a n=manner as a "forced transfer", but that is the price we pay for fair and equitable treatment of the majority who are deserving.	Feb 6, 2014 4:54 PM
66	RIF'd residential faculty from one college should NOT be allowed to bump residential faculty at another college just because they have more seniority within MCCCDC.	Feb 6, 2014 4:00 PM
67	I checked disagree in question 2 only because of the way the FSA Reduction Process, item (3) in General Outline, was worded. If you remove the parenthesis and add the word "all" in front of "faculty within the FSA" then I would be OK with the statement that FSA faculty have the opportunity to engage in the decision-making process. Has M&C discussed the possibility of Early Retirement Incentives in cases where RIF is to occur? It would remove faculty from the upper end (at least in theory) of the compensation scale while allowing other faculty to potentially retain their job...should someone in the FSA be contemplating retirement.	Feb 6, 2014 3:58 PM
68	Appointive faculty at colleges with program reduction should be automatically transferred to an institution with the sections to support them, open position or not. With the district commitment to have a 60% Full Time Faculty to 40% Part Time Faculty ratio there is no reason why a program that has multiple part time faculty cannot support the full time position being eliminated at another institution. Faculty transfer should be determined by sections needing to be taught, not by open faculty positions, not when the faculty member is already an operational cost inside the ONE MARICOPA system.	Feb 6, 2014 3:48 PM
69	Questions: How do we keep the adequate, good, outstanding faculty? What guidelines are place for those faculty that fall in the minimal adequate or inadequate category	Feb 6, 2014 3:33 PM
70	I am a bit confused about #1. Is that the existing model or is this a newly proposed model? If proposed, what is wrong with the current model? There isn't enough information provided in the document to compare it with current versus	Feb 6, 2014 3:23 PM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

proposed. I marked disagree, because I don't feel I have enough information to agree. It is not clear how the broad or narrow approach (subset classification) could impact some faculty more than other faculty. For #2 poll question, in relation to #3 FSA Reduction Process, the language is too vague for me to agree. Clear verbiage that indicates the impacted faculty member would have a right to participate in the project should be included. As written, it only suggests that the Senate leadership and faculty within the FSA (not necessarily the impacted faculty member) could meet and participate. Also, why is the wording "and faculty with the FSA" within parenthesis, like a side note? Again, that doesn't mean that the person who has been identified for Reduction would have any opportunity to participate in the decision.

- |    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 71 | Laid off faculty member should be able to transfer to open position at another college without a formal interview process.  | Feb 6, 2014 3:09 PM |
| 72 | It is very sad day in education when we kill educational programs and departments based on just money. It is very dangerous when you have administrators who are not educators and have spent little or no time in a college classroom deciding whether or not to kill educational programs. Why can't we for once help a department grow or repackage or stimulate interest or work with the universities to save some of the smaller departments like geology or geography or physics for example. Since when did a department like geology not become important in a person's education? Really? Aren't a variety of programs and course offerings on each campus what makes MCCCDC so great as a district? Also why is the focus always on faculty what about downsizing and realigning administrators? There have been so many hired the last few years that have little or nothing to do with our students but they do push a lot of paper. We are all here to service students and without them nobody has a job!!!! | Feb 6, 2014 2:25 PM |
| 73 | Employees have always been considered District employees. We need to look at solutions as District solutions. If a faculty member is to be RIFed they should have the option of transferring to another college where: (1) there is a current opening, (2) the load taught by adjunct faculty is sufficient to support their 30 hours, (3) or to displace a probationary faculty member. In the event that a program is to be reduced where none of these options exist seniority is used to determine the order of RIF to preclude favoritism. Residential faculty should NOT have to go through an interview process. Dormant faculty lines: colleges that are holding unfilled faculty lines should be required to use these lines to provide opportunities for transfer. If budget is a concern, let's work to allow natural attrition to provide that opportunity. All of us were once probationary faculty and need to remember that the impact on them being RIFed is just as severe as it is for a tenured faculty. | Feb 6, 2014 2:07 PM |
| 74 | Faculty seniority should be district-wide and not at each individual college - "One Maricopa". I think it is also important to create an identification process of which FSA's each faculty member are qualified/certified and are able to teach ASAP. There should be a database with this information that can be used in the event that a lay off occurs. It will be helpful to have this information prior to when/if it is ever needed. Faculty should be given one year to recertify/requalify (take additional classes) for another area in the event that there is a layoff AND there are no open positions to transfer into at their college or district-wide.   | Feb 6, 2014 1:42 PM |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 75 | Currently, Residential Faculty who CHOOSE to apply for an open faculty position in the District for which they are qualified are automatically granted an internal interview. This preferential policy for internal hires recognizes the faculty member's right as a Board-approved, District-employed faculty member. However, if a Residential Faculty member is being FORCED out of their position against their will (laid off, Riffed) the faculty should not only retain their preferential rights, but should be given additional automatic PLACEMENT in any open position for which they are qualified throughout the District. If we truly are "One Maricopa", and faculty are employed by the District not the individual college, then the faculty should be automatically placed at any open position in the District if they are forced out of their current college and they should not have to interview to keep their job with the District simply because of the location. If there are ANY adjunct, OSO, OYO at any college teaching in the discipline for which a Residential Faculty is being laid-off, those temporary faculty must be eliminated first to protect the rights of the Residential Faculty or should be able to "bump" any residential faculty with less seniority in the District. That "bumped" faculty should also then be able to "bump" faculty with lesser seniority and so on until the lowest-seniority faculty is the one to be laid off. "Last-in, first-out". | Feb 6, 2014 12:38 PM |
| 76 | It's kinda sad that I can loose my job while adjuncts and OYO's at other college will still be working after I've been here for 15 years. I honestly don't understand why I wouldn't replace the adjuncts and OYO's at another school and why we are not fighting for that at least. Do you know how often a geology position becomes available in the district - hardly ever. To be honest I think this new policy is designed to protect the big colleges with plenty of adjuncts and is targeted to destroy the little colleges. Most of the people working on this new policy are at the big schools and they don't really care about people in my position. It's so easy to tell me to go get retraining in a new area. My views of MCCD as a great place to work is certainly diminishing when we only write policy to protect the bigger colleges. So sad.   | Feb 6, 2014 11:37 AM |
| 77 | I spent quite a few years in industry before teaching. So, while I appreciate the spirit behind "tenure" I still believe that we are employed to do a particular job. If the need for that job goes away, then the employer should not have to guarantee continued employment for a specific individual. This particularly applies to when that employment would mean forcing someone else to be laid off, or requiring that a department in another college accept a faculty member that may not fit their particular needs. I appreciate the opportunities you're giving for retraining, but I still believe that we're hired to do a job that meets a need of our employer, and we can't demand that that means employment for life.   | Feb 6, 2014 11:29 AM |
| 78 | I do not think it is fair for probationary faculty to be bumped out of their jobs. They are not the same as adjuncts, OSOs an OYOs.   | Feb 6, 2014 11:14 AM |
| 79 | I do not believe a faculty member who is laid off should automatically be moved into an open position. They should get preferential treatment, but the faculty at the school they are being possibly moved to should get final say.   | Feb 6, 2014 11:13 AM |
| 80 | Just make sure certain faculty are not being targeted to be laid off because they are vocal and offer dissenting opinions--some administrators have been known to be vindictive. Also I have added some other comments: Alternatives to Reduction a. Formal solicitation of voluntary retirements--what is the incentive? Especially if there are limited opportunities to retire and teach adjunct, which is   | Feb 6, 2014 10:55 AM |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

how many faculty make up the difference in their retirement paycheck. Will the District offer some incentive--like a "window?" Or, could there be a xx year contract, guaranteeing the retired faculty xx adjunct hours if they retire? There has to be some incentive for faculty to retire, not just out of the goodness of their hearts. b. Voluntary transfers; or c. Multiple college assignments/transfers.-- colleges formally share a faculty position. This is a viable option and attractive to some faculty. d. What about a reassignment to a project or even an open MAT or PSA position, if faculty are open to that? \*Some faculty may just be trying to get more years toward their retirement (25 or 30) and would be okay with working in any capacity to get those years. There seem to be lots of options if we determine individual faculty goals.

- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 81 | There should be a "bump" system. Probationary faculty should not be retained while Appointive faculty are RIFFED without very specific cause, preferable a trail of causes that began before it was necessary to have a RIF.  | Feb 6, 2014 10:49 AM |
| 82 | Faculty members targeted for a RIF should have the first right of refusal for PLACEMENT in ANY open faculty position district-wide in all disciplines in which they are qualified to teach. If there are no open positions, affected faculty members should then have rights to "bump" any adjunct, OSO, OYO, or probationary faculty teaching in these disciplines district-wide. Affected faculty should be given priority PLACEMENT for open positions for which they are qualified. They should not have to interview or compete for positions. There need to be clear rules for seniority and "bumping." Seniority rankings should include ALL the disciplines in which a faculty member is qualified to teach district-wide.  | Feb 6, 2014 10:46 AM |
| 83 | A two edged sword, seniority seems the best and most fair policy but I do understand that values longevity over quality in some cases. Neither answer is 100% perfect. As long as every effort is made to retain all full time residential faculty one way or another I will support it.  | Feb 6, 2014 10:42 AM |
| 84 | While the FSA is a logical grouping, it is not fair in terms of a RIF policy. The problem with the FSA classification is greatest for people in small service areas, which are the areas with greatest concern for a RIF. This is not fair for those individuals, and will impact occupational programs much more dramatically than academic programs. If a person is to be part of a RIF, their seniority across the college should be taken into consideration, not just in their FSA. Especially if they are qualified to teach in another discipline and there are adjunct/OSO/OYO and faculty with lesser seniority in those areas. #5 While I think it would be nice for a person in this situation to automatically be given an open position in another college, it is not fair to the other college if the person is not a desirable person or does not fit well with the team. There are individuals working for MCCCCD who meet qualifications on paper, but are just not good for the organization or the students. | Feb 6, 2014 10:38 AM |
| 85 | I am very mistrustful of the district after the shenanigans noted above. The disparity in treatment should not occur in a business who labels itself as "One Maricopa". That has become a joke now...   | Feb 6, 2014 10:36 AM |
| 86 | Under no circumstances should a laid off faculty member "bump" (cause to be laid off) a full-time faculty member, probationary or appointive, from another college. Just because that member is senior at his or her college does not mean  | Feb 6, 2014 8:27 AM  |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

he or she is more qualified than someone who has -- by definition -- built a more successful program at a different college. Bumping of contract faculty (adjunct, OYO, OSO) at another college after their contract has ended is appropriate, and of course open faculty positions should be available, subject to approval of the new Department and President.

- |    |  |                     |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 87 | <p>It seems very suspicious and curious to me that this topic is being discussed/negotiated at this time. When I was hired, it was pretty much promised that RPF faculty members would probably never get laid off. And in my somewhat lengthy tenure, I have observed that to be true. No faculty member at my campus has ever even been close to being laid off or RIFed. Coincidentally, the district administrators recently came up with the Maricopa Priorities initiative. When it was introduced, they ensured us that it was not intended to create any reduction in force or layoffs. About a year ago, they asked us what we thought about performance-based funding. We, the faculty, had concerns, not the least of which was the idea of layoffs resulting from the process. They (administrators) assured us that there would be no job-reduction consequences of performance based funding, if that model ever became a reality. Well, here we are negotiating the how we would handle RIFs and layoffs. Gee, since when did that become such a reality? I'm fine with generating a plan for if it ever happens (like making a plan for what to do in the case of a nuclear attack or hurricane). But, it sure seems strange that these contingencies are being discussed and negotiated at the same time that we are undergoing the Maricopa Priorities initiative.</p> | Feb 5, 2014 2:32 PM |
| 88 | <p>Retraining should also be allowed to bring faculty current in a specialty area of an FSA for transfer to another District college. Training should also include industry internships for occupational faculty. FSA reduction process specifies IBN as the resolution process. However, an impasse is possible. What happens if an impasse is reached? Senior Faculty should also be able to "bump" adjuncts, OSOs, OYOs. non-tenured and junior tenured faculty in an FSA at other District colleges. Periods of unemployment and under employment are growing longer-and-longer in today's economy. Recall period should be 5 years.</p>   | Feb 5, 2014 9:55 AM |
| 89 | <p>I feel very strongly that laid off faculty should NOT be given any open position. Every campus has its unique flavor, in no small part because of hiring committees and the role those groups play in finding a person that is qualified- But also in finding someone whose goals, vision, and collaborative skills are compatible with the plans of the dept/division and it's faculty.</p>  | Feb 5, 2014 1:17 AM |
| 90 | <p>A few things: I would like to see more of a focus on merit and performance when it comes to layoffs. Instead of "d" and "e" in the order based on years of service, I would prefer to see performance as the factor. How is keeping longer term faculty as a priority over better quality faculty as a priority in the best interests of our students? For the retraining plan, could it say qualification in another FSA area or admin area? This is mentioned in "e", but could be more emphasized. In my opinion, a reason why the RIF process has not been followed in the past is that most, if not all, of recent RIF's were actually done for performance reasons, not budget. Rather than go through the disciplinary/termination process, administration used the RIF process and budgetary reasons as an excuse - but then did not follow the RIF process. If this distinction is not changed, I see no reason why the administration would be more likely to follow the new process than the old one they ignored. Perhaps there could be a statement in the policy that budgetary impact needs to be clear, and the process changed to termination</p>  | Feb 4, 2014 1:54 PM |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

for cause if this is not the case. Just a few thoughts, hope this can be taken into consideration.

91	Follow seniority. Don't allow job descriptions to fit just one or two individuals. Faculty should have the right of first refusal.	Feb 4, 2014 1:45 PM
92	What happens when a program is closed and/or moved to another college through Maricopa Priorities? Faculty are DISTRICT employees, not college employees.	Feb 4, 2014 1:28 PM
93	I thought this process was specified in the RFP. These FSA's will have a lot of power. Will the faculty still be employed while they are retraining? Between this and the Maricopa Priorities Initiative it sounds like our colleges and district are in a big dysfunctional mess. It is very disheartening, demoralizing and disruptive to the art and work of teaching.	Feb 4, 2014 12:46 PM
94	What will happen if two (or more) faculty members identified for RIF have the same tenure track date, but there is only one open position?	Feb 4, 2014 11:05 AM
95	1. Address the issue of lab loading. 2. Address the issue of lab loading. 3. Address the issue of lab loading. 5. Address the issue of lab loading. 6. Address the issue of lab loading. 7. Address the issue of lab loading. 8. Address the issue of lab loading. 9. Address the issue of lab loading. 10. Address the issue of lab loading. Current loading for teaching labs is GROSSLY UNFAIR AND DISCRIMINATORY. I am fed up with the Faculty Association for NEVER BRINGING THIS ISSUE TO THE TOP OF THE PRIORITY LIST AND NEVER ADVOCATING FOR IT IN A VIGOROUS, STRONG AND CONVINCING WAY. As a science professor, I have been cheated out of equal pay for my work during the 16+ years I have worked at MCCCCD. This has affected not only my yearly income, but also my retirement income and is a considerable hardship for me and others who have been dedicated, hard-working professionals for all this time. Because of this discrimination and the failure to correct it (and other issues as well), I am no longer as loyal to the FA as I have been in the past, even I have served as a senate president for two years. PLEASE GET SOMEONE TO SERVE ON M&C WHO UNDERSTANDS THIS ISSUE AND IS WILLING TO ADVOCATE FOR IT AND PLEASE PLACE IT AT THE TOP OF THE PRIORITY LIST.	Feb 4, 2014 10:56 AM
96	Policy does not address the following scenario: if the laid off faculty member is qualified to teach in another discipline (or FSA). How would this situation be treated? Can they qualify for an open position in this other discipline and be offered the open position? I believe they have a right to a position in another FSA in which they are qualified to teach. I would appreciate if the team addresses this scenario.	Feb 4, 2014 6:34 AM
97	All processes in reduction should be in writing with the information available to ALL	Feb 4, 2014 6:10 AM
98	Faculty should not be linked to one FSA if in fact their experience and education make them candidates for more than one. If one FSA is being eliminated or reduced at a college and a faculty RIF is being considered, first consideration should be to allow that faculty to teach in one of his/her alternative FSA's. If that's no positions exist in an alternative FSA, then the faculty should have the	Feb 3, 2014 4:40 PM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

option of filling a position at a sister college (without having to go through a new hiring process).

99	My comment relative to the IC is because some areas may be involved in more than one and therefore it is difficult to establish the governing FSA in the case of unequal distribution. Another issue is the possibility that a faculty member has qualifications in another FSA, not the one they are working in currently, especially due to occupational classifications.	Feb 3, 2014 4:14 PM
100	In regards to item 2, the meeting should include the division chair of the FSA along with the faculty.	Feb 3, 2014 4:07 PM
101	If MCCCCD is serious about retaining talent, then laid off faculty or staff members should be given open positions at other colleges, provided that the open position is identical or nearly identical to the faculty member's previous position. My opinion applies only to faculty terminated due to RIF, not to faculty terminated for disciplinary reasons.	Feb 3, 2014 3:56 PM
102	I am concerned about the order favoring appointive faculty over probationary faculty. We might be losing faculty who bring energy and innovation to a department while keeping faculty members who are just waiting for retirement. I would prefer to lump probationary and appointive together and have some sort of peer review process to determine who goes and who stays.	Feb 3, 2014 3:04 PM
103	In #6 why do we need the distinction between 6a and 6e. Seniority is seniority regardless of appointive status or lack thereof.	Feb 3, 2014 2:40 PM
104	I don't like how "(and faculty within the FSA)" is written in a parentheses. This seems to diminish their role in the reduction process. Also, it is not clear on who is "generating options for solutions" - - it is truly a collaborative process? If so, then say so. Or, will the solutions presented by the college president or designee have greater weight. Just be honest and straight forward in this section. Where is the "check" that the VC of Human Resources is following the layoff order correctly. If Jim Bowers is our next VC, we absolutely need someone to check that he is following the RFP. He is dishonest.	Feb 3, 2014 2:31 PM
105	Concern about "seniority" in a new FSA. For example, if an engineering faculty with considerable seniority is deemed (by the IC) to have FSA in math or physics, would he then have the same seniority in the math department, perhaps bumping most of the department?	Feb 3, 2014 2:19 PM
106	For Seniority, it should be clarified whether or not this applies to when a faculty member was hired by the District, when he was part of a particular college or a particular FSA. For example, there are faculty members who start at one college and move to another. Within the FSA, does it matter when that person moved to the new college?	Feb 3, 2014 1:17 PM
107	The draft document has a spelling error in the title. it is Retain and Retrain not Retrain and Retrain. I do think there should be some component of consideration of contributions to the college if there are questions about who is RIFFed once tenured. (although those criteria should be clearly laid out)	Feb 3, 2014 1:04 PM
108	RIF should not be used as a way to get rid of a faculty position/line or person by	Feb 3, 2014 12:16 PM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

administration at the college or district office. There should be safeguards to protect against this type of retaliation. I hope I answered correctly as I did not have the General Outline comments at hand. I think they should have been attached to the letter concerning the survey so that we did not have to look for them to review. Sorry we are all time poor at work and to keep going back to refresh our memory on a particular point takes more time than I have. Not sure where I would look it up, either.

109	Residential faculty should always be given preference and should not have to compete with adjuncts, OSO's, OYO's, or applicants from outside the district. Residential faculty should have the option of being placed in other areas for which they are qualified if there are no openings in the area in which they are currently employed or if there no openings in their current area at their current college and they would prefer to stay at their current college. On #2. Reduction in an FSA, Add language: "f. Impact of reduction of the FSA on students affected by the reduction in a service area, i.e., counseling and library" On #7. Retraining Plan, language should be added to clearly specify that retraining becomes an option only if no positions are available in the faculty members' current FSA or all other FSA's for which the faculty member is qualified. On #8. Transfer Plan, replace "would" with "will" as follows: b. The plan WILL give preference to a faculty member remaining at the college they are currently employed... Also on #8 I'm concerned with presidents' veto of transfers. I'd like to see some parameters on the presidents' justification for not accepting a transfer, and I'd like to see language reflecting that the presidents' written justification goes to the faculty member seeking the transfer, not just the VCHR.	Feb 3, 2014 11:01 AM
110	I believe the faculty that could be RIF'd should have consideration in all FSA areas they are qualified for. For instance i am qualified to teach in AJS and Public Administration, if they are going to RIF my position in AJS and there is an opening in PA, I should be allowed to transfer into it.	Feb 3, 2014 10:42 AM
111	While this is semantic, is there any thought to the language and its impact on all parties? Why not form Action Teams (or any "team") - rather than a "Committee will be formed" the "purpose of the Committee is to", etc. It reads cold and bureaucratic and leads us down the path to complain that there is no shared governance, simply per-determined, mandated committees, etc. Wouldn't their be move mileage in using terms that reflect the joint goals of all parties and the intention that these 'teams' are formed to help both the faculty member and the college adapt to the changing landscape and needs of the college? Couldn't faculty then be given the opportunity to select a MCCD employee (departmental peer? colleague?, etc) to be "on their team" through this process with the Faculty Senate President (or designee), the department chair, FSA representative, and the VPAA (or designee) for the purpose of evaluating the academic and/or experiential credentials of the faculty member? Also are we really going to say that a person has "gaps"? Can we please move into the 1990s and use win-win language to actually promote a culture that is adaptable, team oriented and shares end goals? Please consider the implications of the "word choice" in the document as it relates to the support and adoption of this process. Thank you for your consideration.	Feb 3, 2014 10:33 AM
112	Good luck!	Feb 3, 2014 10:25 AM
113	Re: # 1 This creates some perplexing issues, as FSA's can have various needs	Feb 3, 2014 10:20 AM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

within a particular Area that are not well defined by earned degree. Nursing has requirements for a Master's (MSN) but it does not all nurses with a masters are competent to teach pediatrics, obstetrics, Critical Care or perioperative. Fine Arts also has similar breakouts (Dance vs Sculture vs Drama?) Re: # 5 above, I actually sit somewhere between the first and second options. The College should be required to interview and actively reject the LOFM before any further interviews of other candidates take place. Not all people are a fit with a department Also, if the new position is at a campus that creates a commute of more than 15 miles greater the current campus, the LOFM should be entitled to "displacement" compensation for a period of 2 semesters

114	Thank you for your efforts!	Feb 3, 2014 9:43 AM
115	As a service faculty member I feel more vulnerable to layoffs than the academic and occupational faculty. I have heard so many rumblings over the years about us being reclassified and becoming 12 month employees or converting us to MAT and PSA to save money. My degree in counseling required that I completed a minimum of 60 credits. I know social work also has that requirement. Why is this not part of the MFA discussion? It is highly offensive that it is not part of the conversation.	Feb 3, 2014 9:41 AM
116	Why bother with this, 1 we will never get laid off and 2 the District will do whatever it wants regardless	Feb 3, 2014 9:34 AM
117	Why are we changing the existing policy? What are the specific problems with the old policy? This needs to be addressed before I agree to vote on a new RIF policy. Also, 7a-7e cost money. Are the district and the colleges ready to fund retraining, conferences/workshops, and sabbaticals for multiple faculty who may or may not be returning?	Feb 3, 2014 9:15 AM
118	Why is there absolutely no mention of performance??!! What is the point of the Faculty evaluations (regardless of appointive or probationary) if you would not include it in key decisions such as this one? You could have a fabulously performing new probationary faculty but some other appointive faculty who rarely performs at all. Criteria in #2, and in the Layoff Order #6, there should be some value of performance!	Feb 3, 2014 8:52 AM
119	There are a few faculty who don't fit into a specific FSA. A member of my division is the E-learning coordinator for campus and she is a full-time permanent faculty member. There is no E-learning Instructional Council and there are CTL directors at other campus locations in a similar situation. How would these "miscellaneous" faculty be handled?	Feb 3, 2014 8:50 AM
120	M&C Team - since I am the only faculty left in the district that a RIF has ever affected please carefully read and consider my response here. There are faculty members who are qualified to teach in more than one discipline. I hold a PhD in Business, Organization and Management, I am teaching CIS due to my Bachelors degree and industry experience and I hold a Master's degree and industry experience that qualifies me to teach in Manufacturing Technology. I even have the old board certificate stating I am qualified in these areas. During the GateWay Faculty RIF experience, I and my colleagues were told that we had no rights to be considered for any discipline other than Computer Information Systems (CIS). For example, John Zanazzi was qualified to teach GPH prefix	Feb 3, 2014 8:36 AM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

classes including Geography and Meteorology. In fact, we were told that we would have to apply for any and all positions in the district and that we would be required to compete against all other applicants. When we discussed the RIF policy as written in the RFP, VC HR Bowers stated that the district would not follow the policy - that no one would be bumped - that no OYO, OSO or adjunct would be moved to make a place for us. - we were on our own... Without this protection, any faculty can be dismissed from their job and have to interview for any opening. There was only one when the three of us were Riffed. We each had to interview for the single position. One other position opened and we each interviewed for it - NONE of us were chosen for that position. The final result - one faculty moved to another campus, and GateWay administration was told by district they could not RIF the other two. After 18 months of poor treatment by administration, they chose to retire. Faculty members targeted for a RIF should have the first right of refusal for PLACEMENT in ANY open faculty position district-wide in all disciplines in which they are qualified to teach. If there are no open positions, affected faculty members should then have rights to "bump" any adjunct, OSO, OYO, or probationary faculty teaching in these disciplines district-wide. Affected faculty should be given priority PLACEMENT for open positions for which they are qualified. They should not have to interview or compete for positions. There need to be clear rules for seniority and "bumping." Seniority rankings should include ALL the disciplines in which a faculty member is qualified to teach district-wide. Would you please include the language of "Faculty members targeted for a RIF should have the first right of refusal for PLACEMENT in ANY open faculty position district-wide in all disciplines in which they are qualified to teach" in your policy? We should not have to compete for a job we have been doing for years - does our service to the district and our students count for nothing?

- |     |   |                      |
|-----|---|----------------------|
| 121 | All efforts to retain said faculty member must be made including transfers.   | Feb 2, 2014 1:58 PM  |
| 122 | Mandatory transfer of militant faculty who were Riffed because they were horrible teachers who students hated had an extremely bad impact on the quality of instruction, student satisfaction and overall organizational climate at PVCC in the late 80s, to early 90s. Saw the same thing happen at PC. There are currently bad faculty who need to be removed from GCC. Faculty control is a two-edged sword. Enrollment decline is in large part a result of academically oriented faculty buying into the ASU mission to be biggest in the United States by relegating CGCC, MCC, PC, SCC and GCC to junior college status. Going along with ASU is going to be disastrous for students, our communities and The Maricopa Community College District. | Feb 2, 2014 11:03 AM |
| 123 | Since the Residential Faculty is an employee of MCCCCD, not individual colleges, he/she should be transferred to an open position at another college. (re: #5)  | Feb 2, 2014 8:17 AM  |
| 124 | Nice job providing the option to pursue additional training! The "Criteria for Reduction" need to be strengthened and made more objective. It also needs to include data regarding OTHER programs and HOW the targeted program was selected. In the GateWay experience, there were AT LEAST ten other programs/disciplines at GateWay with lower enrollment, higher costs, lower FTSE generation, and lower graduation/completion rates than the program targeted for elimination. Some of these programs have continued to decline, and two had ZERO students enrolled in Fall 2013. Yet, these programs continue to be funded. We need to protect faculty from a situation where an administrator   | Feb 2, 2014 7:56 AM  |

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

	AND/OR Faculty Senate President has a personal vendetta against a faculty member. A RIF should not be threatened or carried out as retaliation for purely personal or political reasons!	
125	Steps and COLAs should be placed at a higher priority than MFA issues.	Feb 1, 2014 3:34 PM
126	Why is there a two year limit on a laid off faculty member's ability to be considered for a new position? They should be able to stay on the "list" as long as they want. Additionally, they should be given preference for any adjunct positions within their teaching area.	Feb 1, 2014 2:42 PM
127	Thank you for your good work	Feb 1, 2014 12:49 PM
128	- #7 (Retraining Plan) indicates that a committee will be formed that includes among others, the Department Chair. We might consider who will serve in the place of the department chair if the residential faculty member whose position is eligible for a reduction in force is also the department chair. - The Layoff Order is appropriate until it reaches the level of appointive residential faculty members. An alternative system for determining the layoff order should be established within appointive faculty members because seniority may not indicate the most cost / benefit effective way to manage layoff decisions and other reasons outlined below: 1. Faculty who have reached appointive status after other faculty may carry the lions share of course sections (teaching overloads), therefore meeting the needs of a greater number of students. 2. Newer appointive faculty may teach a wider range of courses within the FSA, making it more difficult to meet the needs of students if their positions are eliminated. 3. Newer appointive faculty may also serve the college / district in greater capacities than more senior appointive faculty such as quantity and quality of work produced on councils and committees. 4. Newer appointive faculty positions are likely more cost efficient to retain than senior appointive faculty positions. 5. Faculty who have reached appointive status after other faculty may have more expertise within the FSA based on degree (PhD vs. MA vs. BA) - and recency of the degree earned may indicate a difference in expertise.	Jan 31, 2014 9:29 PM
129	This is great work on a difficult topic. Regarding Q5, Why would we agree to anything other than giving the laid off faculty an open position? The only reason a college president with an open position in the FSA would have for not accepting the laid off faculty member is if s/he is a dud. Someone who is truly unacceptable should have been separated from employment for performance or conduct reasons prior to a layoff. If a dud is still employed, that is the fault of the college president, and allowing a RIF process to subvert tenure protections doesn't make that any better. In fact, it provides a perverse incentive for college presidents not to discipline (through the proper channels) those who need it. In short, allowing the college president to make the call on taking the laid off faculty member can only be justified by the lack of faith college presidents have in one another to do the right thing in taking employment action against those faculty whose performance or conduct merit correction. So, some options to align incentives: 1. Faculty member gets position automatically UNLESS s/he has been formally disciplined in last X years. 2. Faculty member only gets position through interview, BUT IF (1) the laying off president targets a person in bad faith or (2) the rationale provided to deny the position is found to be in bad faith, the guilty college president(s) would face termination for cause. 3. Faculty member only gets position through interview, BUT college that denies the laid off	Jan 31, 2014 8:22 PM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

person the new position pays 50% of the retraining cost. 4. Exercise BATNA. Another thought. I very much like building in IBN into the process. Why not go all the way? Having the administration bring a position to the table to get the ball rolling on a RIF triggers positional attitudes, distrust, etc. Maybe a college-wide, shared governance committee using IBN principles should certify the need for a RIF using the data suggested, then this other body should examine the supposed need to ensure it is not erroneous, to find alternatives, etc.

130	Find out whether another campus at maricopa need his expertise (talents)	Jan 31, 2014 6:47 PM
131	The District either is committed to retaining faculty or they are not. The veto power of the College President in the case of a RIF provides no protection or continued employment for at risk faculty.	Jan 31, 2014 5:04 PM
132	I have difficulty following the information. I am unable to agree or disagree.	Jan 31, 2014 4:13 PM
133	Thanks to the team for working on this and coming up with what I feel seems to be a fair system.	Jan 31, 2014 4:08 PM
134	You will not retain quality instructors as long as there continues to be a step increases.	Jan 31, 2014 3:27 PM
135	Just a "Thanks" for what you are doing.	Jan 31, 2014 2:54 PM
136	I find a rewriting of the current RIF policy completely unnecessary. I doubt it really represents the point of view of most faculty and this is an example of our FEC accommodating the Administration, i.e., the FEC doing what is in the interest of the Administration and not in the interest of the faculty. The current RIF policy is fine.	Jan 31, 2014 2:30 PM
137	I like how you prioritize layoffs process, especially making solicitations for retirement. Keep up good work!	Jan 31, 2014 2:01 PM
138	For #1 (instructional council define . . .), it might be 100% appropriate if this were a system-wide process; however, if it is truly at the college level, department/division chairs should have some level of input on this. For #3, the layoff order for probationary and appointive faculty should not be based solely on seniority by residential faculty hire date. Some consideration should be taken in account for seniority based on years of service with the District. For example, a 10-yr employee of the District in her/his first year as residential faculty could very well be more valuable to the college/District than a second year probationary faculty with only those two years of experience with the District. For #5, if you are going to call the policy the Maybe Retain or Retrain Policy, then the last two options might be valid. A plan to avoid a reduction should be required if there is a plan to implement a reduction. Both should be discussed with the division(s)/faculty that will be affected. Reduction in Force of Residential Faculty should always be the last option. So, is there anything that requires the college administration to provide proof that the Reduction in Force is not due to the mismanagement of college resources? You'd hate to run into the situation where "oops, we overspent. let's just get rid of a few faculty to make up the difference." The president has the right to veto? Are you kidding me? If that stays in the policy language, it truly would be the Maybe Retain and Retrain Policy.	Jan 31, 2014 1:57 PM

**Q6. What additional feedback would you like to provide the Meet and Confer Team as related to this issue.**

139	Sufficient time should be given to the faculty in jeopardy in order for the faculty to assess the possible layoff and decide whether to retrain or look for other transfer opportunities.	Jan 31, 2014 1:56 PM
140	This is an alarming proposal. Are there expectations that with the new Maricopa priorities, we might experience lay offs? Is that why we are doing this?	Jan 31, 2014 1:42 PM
141	I think we need a specific outline of how FSAs are assigned in a department and it has to be based on more than the classes a faculty is currently teaching. Several faculty rotate what they teach based on their interest and current needs.	Jan 31, 2014 1:28 PM
142	Why is this even an issue? Is there some information the rank and file are unaware of that necessitates changes in rfp language?	Jan 31, 2014 1:05 PM
143	The clarification of tenure track date to determine layoff order is appropriate as it empowers faculty to transfer between colleges without a fear of resetting their standing within One Maricopa for layoff vulnerability.	Jan 31, 2014 1:04 PM
144	IBN as employed in MCCC'D's meet and confer process is nothing less than a disaster. Accountability to faculty is completely lacking. The meet and confer reps, despite their intentions and commitment, are simply unqualified to represent the best interests of a large and diverse faculty districtwide. FEC continues to focus on preserving its current status while ignoring the consensus of faculty. See membership declines!	Jan 31, 2014 1:03 PM