

1	Ratification Ballot for the 2016-2017 Residential Faculty Policies
2	As a member of the Faculty Association, which issues, in addition to those described above, would you like the Faculty Executive Council and the Meet and Confer Team to consider during the next negotiation cycle?
3	
4	Responses
5	
6	Residential Faculty Overload
7	Just keep pushing the five you have on the list.
8	Lab Loading
9	Salary increases Arbitration as last step in grievance and resolution of controversy
10	The issues that are in progress are those of most importance to me.
11	None
12	Reassigned time for FPG reps. It's too low for the small colleges
13	For Residential Faculty serving as Program Directors and Department chairs, an additional 3 hours of reassigned time is needed (programs where there is only one faculty). Maricopa saves considerably by not paying for the program direction work. Most of that work is done in the evenings and on weekends. It is not fair compensation.
14	predictable salary advancement some professional growth advancement for those with a doctorate
15	Protections for new faculty so that they don't get forced into teaching 4 preps including new preps during their first two years. There is no extra pay for four preps even though it is a lot more work than the usual 2 or 3 preps. It makes it even harder when you are teaching new preps with the four different preps. It's not fair to the faculty or the students.
16	#1 - equitable
17	Although personal time is nice, it would be better to be able to draw on unused sick time if we need to take care of family stuff! There is a word for that and the HR folks are working on it...
18	MFA advancement
19	Nothing at this time.
20	No co-payments for health insurance. The District should pay 100% for all of the insurances (for instance: health, & dental) at least for the employees.
21	Please continue efforts to support the recognition of the MFA as a terminal degree deserving of higher salary placement and advancement.
22	Work with Curriculum office to better define other load formulas (special projects, internships, etc)

23	<p>Expanded definition of Occupational Program Director (OPD)</p> <p>OPD Term of office OPD Selection to include faculty/Divison Chair/faculty senate/VPAA collaboration OPD Accountability OPD Reporting Structure OPD Roles/Responsibilites (Standard) OPD Roles/Responsibilities (Unique) OPD Compensation</p>
24	<p>Increasing reassign time for FSP and FPG, adding reassign time for FSPE, make load limits the same regardless of teaching or non teaching reassignments why are they different?, buy back of unused sick leave, step for anniversary years, tuition assistance as well as horizontal movement, use of travel funds within the phx area (ex. if live in chandler and conference is in goodyear). I know this is on the list but I must include again, lab loading- equal pay for equal work and predictable salary advancement.</p>
25	<p>Salary Inversion continues to be a huge issue for those who did not receive steps. New hires are being provided steps for their experience, yet those who have been loyal MCCCCD employees are not receiving steps for their experience. In my department a faculty member with 14 years of experience at MCCCCD will be at step 10 next year while two probationary faculty with 4 and 3 years of experience at MCCCCD will be at step 11.</p>
26	<p>*Lab Loading</p>
27	<p>Release time increase for Clinical Coordinators, Program Directors and other coordinators.</p>
28	<p>workplace climate/bullying</p>
29	<p>I am still very committed to seeing a positive resolution on the MFA issue. I am also interested in seeing the infusion of Technology resources for flipped classrooms, such as videotaping lectures as a right for all faculty members</p>
30	<p>Salary advancement, I am not interested in MFA advancement.</p>
31	<p>The roles and responsibilities of Instructional Councils need to be reviewed. This isn't an RFP issue, and it may not even be an FEC issue. But, ICs need to be put on a regular review process to make sure that they are keeping up to date and using College and District initiatives as a litmus test for whether proposals are approved/not approved. Currently, many of the ICs work on a parochial system that doesn't often consider the big picture. Some don't even meet on a regular basis. If One Maricopa is going to be the law of the land, the lack of movement in some ICs is going to be a huge problem in the not too distant future.</p>
32	<p>Not sure if this falls under the Faculty Association but the release time for such duties as clinical coordinator and occupational program direct vary greatly at our institution. Shouldn't there be a formula that is used to calculate an equitable release time that can be shared with the the VPAA who ultimately approves the release time?</p>
33	<p>Acceptance of the MFA as an advanced degree beyond a masters.</p>
34	<p>Lab loading!!!!</p>

Though this is related to supervision, I want to share that I think our division chairs (at least at my campus-EMCC) don't get near enough reassign time with all of the meetings they are required to attend and the other duties they need to perform. Though many of the duties do depend on the number of faculty, attendance at meetings does not and I think the minimum should be set to at least 9 hours reassign time for chairs. As an aside, I am not and have never been a chair, but I have held other leadership roles, have attended some of the meetings they attend regularly, and see what chairs do on a regular basis.

I also feel the same way about our faculty senate president and president elect. With the faculty senate president, our administration has recently agreed to increase the reassign time, but it may not always be that way. And our faculty senate president elect is not so lucky. We have negotiated some spring reassign time, but not any in the fall even though he or she is still expected to attend all meetings then. Without at least 9 hours reassign time, it becomes almost impossible to have a teaching schedule and attend all of the FEC and campus meetings without missing class.

These are important jobs that deserve the right amount of reassign time. I think a more tiered approach would be better where there is a higher minimum no matter the number of faculty or association members especially at smaller schools.

I think the FEP structure and format needs to be revisited and revised to be more user friendly and to provide a smoother transition from probationary faculty who complete an IDP and then will later have to complete an FEP. As an appointive faculty member who is a PAR facilitator, the FEP structure concerns me for multiple reasons. Last year, I had to complete my FEP and as it was the first year of PAR, I completed the sections of the IDP that pertained to me (no classroom or mentor evals/observations). I much prefer the format of the IDP for the applicable sections and I have heard from some other faculty on my campus that they prefer it as well, but right now it isn't an option to use to complete the FEP.

Another concern I have is that we are getting close to the point where our probationary faculty who have now done PAR will soon need to complete the FEP as required of appointive faculty members. I have heard from some faculty that they dread having to go back and do an FEP after using the IDP format. Then we also have the issue of our first year faculty from last year who have never done an FEP. While I know their first FEP is years away, the inconsistency in the formats of the IDP and FEP need to be addressed so that there is a smooth transition between them. Please note that I am not advocating for the PAR process to be applied to appointive faculty. I only want there to be more consistency in the FEP and IDP structure so that completing the FEP will not be so different. I think we can use some of the good parts of the IDP to update the FEP. I think it would also be great to make the FEP a fully online document. We have been considering that at EMCC this year but haven't made much progress as I have advocated for something more similar to the IDP, but some faculty hear IDP and worry that if we use a format similar to the IDP that the PAR process will be forced on appointive faculty. I think this will be a sensitive and difficult issue to tackle, but I think it is important for the FEP and IDP formats to be better aligned.

35

36

retraining opportunities for faculty

37

None

38

Salaries and steps

	<p>In 4.12.1.6 of the RFP, there needs to be some clean up done. As written, the subsection can be logically incompatible with itself. The subsection clearly states that "standard rounding rules will apply" to the calculation. However, the subsection also clearly states that the number of OYO/OSO faculty covered by this subsection permitted "will not exceed 2% of the total number of filled Residential lines..." However, if your college has 290 filled Residential positions, 2% of this number is 5.8. Standard rounding rules require rounding the number to 6 OYO/OSO positions. However, in rounding you exceed 2% of the filled Residential Positions since $6/290 = 2.07\%$. It is my understanding that the M&C team that was in place when this section was added to the RFP fully intended for colleges to be able to round. So, perhaps language along the lines of "The number of OYO/OSO faculty at the college permitted under section 4.12.1.6 is the greater of two (2) positions or 2% of the total number of filled Residential Faculty positions after standard rounding rules have been applied to make the result of the calculation an integer number."</p> <p>Also, I was talking with another faculty member about the fact that we are losing many of our leaders at our college (and I would guess throughout the District). We came up with an idea to help our newer faculty be stronger leaders earlier in their careers. FPG is a focus of the PAR process. So, what if in Years 3 and 4 (or Years 4 and 5), the PAR process incorporated the Probationary faculty attending a Leadership Academy (through the Chair Academy)? The District would have to foot the bill for an ongoing District-wide Leadership Academy, but they benefit from having faculty ready to step into leadership positions for the rest of their career. My suggestion would be for this Leadership Academy to be offered during weeks of accountability in the fall and spring semester of the two-year period.</p>
39	If you have any questions about my comments above, please don't hesitate to contact me at [name redacted]
40	1. Salary increase for MFA Degree.
41	Restoration of steps.
42	Those five are enough for now.
43	Lab Loading and salary advancement are the 2 biggest to me.
44	Salary advancement for Ph.Ds
45	Salary placement and advancement. Two steps in 7 years is better than one step in 6 years, but there is still room for improvement in this area.
46	We really need to come up with a way to incentivize/encourage faculty to apply for administrative positions. The current processes don't encourage this. If you leave faculty, there is no guarantee that you can return. For example, after a 3-year period, the college and the faculty member could evaluate how it is working out, if the faculty member and the college decide it is time for change, the faculty member can return to being faculty. There is plenty of research that indicates we need to do a better job at community colleges in developing future leaders. This is a way to do it. The current leadership vacuum across the district is evidence of this. Several interim administrators at top levels and a number of failed searches. We are having difficulty finding solid folks with the knowledge, skills and abilities to lead.
47	Please continue to work on salary placement. I'm one who has the MFA. Thanks!

	<p>I would like FA to review the language in RFP 6.4. It includes ambiguities that appear to bias the Administrative Review process against the faculty member being accused. A couple of issues:</p> <p>1. Within the 40 day fact finding period, receipt of report, and 14 days for college president to review and issue appropriate action, there is no specific time mentioned for the accused to respond. "Right to respond" should be officially incorporated into the process to avoid bias against the accused.</p> <p>2. I met with [name redacted], and the lawyer agreed with my initial interpretation of 6.4.2 that the person who the complaint is being made about has the right to receive a written, signed copy of the complaint. Upon reviewing the language again, I see it does not specifically say that. I have been told that the written signed complaint is received by the appropriate VP, the is informed so the process is commenced, and that the VP is the one officially initiating the AE on behalf of those making the complaint. This is not clearly explained in the language of 6.4.2. I results in someone being accused, and not knowing who made the complaint or what the scope/specifics of the complaint are. This creates an environment ripe for abuse including baseless complaints being made based on political relationships in order to harass/retaliate, all the while not having to indicate who they are as the complaintent, what the scope of the complaint is, and providing initial evidence so the VP can made an unbiased judgement as to the merit and whether it warrants an AE or is harassing/relaliatory. If [name redacted] disagrees with how MCCCCD is using 6.4.2, then it makes me wonder what I am paying for in my FA dues, because the process is ambiguous in its language and again thus ripe for abuse based on political motivations. I would be happy to meet and discuss, and I will bring to my Faculty Senate next year.</p>
48	Senate next year.
49	Salary has to be the top priority.
50	Step + COLA; Further "catch up" steps for those of us below max; Lab loading
51	Lab loading and salary placement/advancement
52	Salary scale, lab loading
53	Persist in seeing that the MFA counts as a terminal degree (Note: this issue doesn't affect me)
54	Lab Loading.
55	<p>I believe salary placement and advancement is the most important because it affects all faculty and not just a few. I believe there should be limits on the number of hours of load a faculty member can have each semester. In my department there have been faculty members who have had loads in the high 20s and into the 30s. This would go on semester after semester, year after year. If these people were working as hard as they claimed there is no way they could have done this. I think a maximum load limit of 21 hours is appropriate!</p>
56	<p>I think to continue to work on the issues above that have not yet been resolved. Perhaps looking at having a consistent loading model for classes that all colleges can use for face to face and online.</p>
57	The issues above are priority to me.
58	<p>Considering the lack of step increases for faculty - please continue to work on this. It was wonderful to get the increase this year but there is so much work to do to offer some sort of catch-up for so many years it wasn't approved.</p>
59	<p>If the objective is to consolidate and to be fiscally responsible there should be a retirement buy-out plan for those who have their points. Not required, but an opportunity.</p>

60	Training for faculty to move into administration roles.
61	Increased shared governance for faculty in the district.
62	Can we make the first day of accountability for the spring semester be a Monday instead of a Friday?
63	As part of salary, anniversary steps like the other policy groups.
64	Lab loading
65	Absolutely nothing but compensation issues for one entire cycle
66	Steps, eliminate the 25 load limit, get rid of the oppressive and humiliating Par and Parc process, break up the clique that has been running the Faculty Association for the past ten years and let new leadership emerge, let all Faculty Association Members vote for the President-Elect, go back to the old meet and confer process that proved successful whereas IBN has set us back 20 years or more, stop thinking that the Administration are our friends because they are playing you like fiddles, and stop thinking that you know best and listen to the faculty's ideas.
67	Salary advancement is a major issue. I realize this is not an additional one, but having worked for the district for several years and not having steps and raises while the cost of living and benefits continue to rise is detrimental to the faculty. So please keep making that a major priority for all faculty. Thank you!
68	<p>Better communication from the District on changes that can impact teaching in the classroom. Especially changes such as requiring google drive for all files and not allowing USB drives etc? (may be a mis interpretation, but that is the gist of what I got from it) They should be asking us what we DO and what we NEED before making changes to how we access technology.</p> <p>Also, for the 12 month pay issue, my first vote is leave it alone, it doesn't need to be fixed, if we have no choice, then adjust it by one paycheck a year for 3 or 4 years, and give the faculty plenty of warning. We have over 900 faculty who use this, and you will lose a ton of members if you just toss faculty under the bus on this one.</p>
69	<p>We need to work on negotiating for better health care coverage. MCCCDC employees don't have the option, for instance, of going to the Mayo Clinic. The coverage for state employees (e.g., ASU) is much superior to what we have, in terms of options and lower co-pays. We're a large institution. We belong to a large county with a large number of employees. So, why are we settling for so much less? Here are some web pages for comparison:</p> <p>\$8058.24 per year, Dec 2015 to Dec 2016 - MCCCDC PPO (dependent: additional \$671.52 PER MONTH) over 12 months https://hr.maricopa.edu/sites/default/files/Flex%20Rate%20Chart%20for%20Web%20FY%2015-16_0.pdf</p> <p>(the price for which is going up next year): https://hr.maricopa.edu/sites/default/files/Flex%20Rate%20Chart%2016-17%20for%20Web%20page.pdf</p> <p>\$432 per year, Jan 2016 to Dec 2016 - ASU PPO (dependent is an additional \$36.00 PER MONTH) over 12 months https://www.asu.edu/hr/documents/2016benefitsbooklet-health.pdf (page 6)</p>
70	We need to come to closure on our salary system. Not having any career path for faculty is the only issue we should be talking about next year.

71	Remove all current issues and address only salary advancement. Steps must be granted on each year on a consecutive basis to continue the retention of current faculty.
72	<p>I would like to see the FA work towards faculty salary advancement being replaced with a Merit System instead. Faculty should move to a Merit System that is based on Evaluations, Service, and Professional Development. Faculty must be evaluated anonymously by each student in each class every semester. This is standard at most colleges and universities. We are teaching based institution. Quality of teaching is an issue at each of the Maricopa campus. Service is important but many faculty do not do any notable service. However, many faculty will teach overloads.</p> <p>A second issue is transparency in terms of Reassigned Time. Some faculty are being given reassigned time at one college that would be considered Service at another. This is also happening at the department level as well. What is considered Reassigned Time, who is selected, how much, how long and not to mention what kind of accountability is involved seem to vary widely.</p>
73	Stairstepping: Step 14 IP+48, IP+75
74	#2 - Lab Loading
74	#3 - Residential Faculty Overload
75	Continue to work on Advancement of Salary Placement.
76	Consider less power in the hands of the chancellor and more power in the hands of the board. It seems that the chancellor must be involved with too many decisions.
77	<p>I don't know if it can be addressed in M&C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Disability resources. Who is responsible for what aspect? What is the expectation of faculty and the Disability Services 2) Administration evaluations. Why are faculty not allowed to evaluate faculty? We get to evaluate Division Chairs and OPD's (who are "supervisors"), be we don't get to evaluate admin? I think many problems would come to light (which is probably why we don't evaluate them") 3) I think this isn't possible, but some how address the culture of Admin vs. Faculty. I laugh at the ads stating MCCCCD is a great place to work. For whom? The culture is horrible. 4) I think all administrators should also teach. I keep hearing how important teaching and learning is to the District - why don't all administrators teach? I think [name redacted] teaches at ASU. Maybe if administrators who have never a taught a single class had to teach a class we would have less problems between Admin <--> Faculty. 5) Get a real handle on the district finances. Either the District is poor or it is drowning in cash. Seems I keep hearing there is no money, there is no money until the admin wants something - like more admin. <p>I realize many of these are out of the scope of M&C, but perhaps the FA in general could consider them.</p>
78	Reconsider the PAR process - requirements, length of probationary period

	Removal of the 25 load hour cap
79	Removal of the PAR PARC system
80	Please take a look at the fpg travel guidelines. Some changes should be made because the application process is totally online now. Also the workload our faculty fpg college representatives must be reviewed as a result this exhaustive new FMS.
81	"Fall" Break at least similar to A.S.U Monday & Tuesday off; or Thursday & Friday Off in October.
82	Thank you for your efforts. They are greatly appreciated.
83	Those listed above are the priority.
84	I am most interested in a rapid resolution to the lab loading and its implementation to the reported 1:1 ratio making it equitable with lecture loading.
85	Lab loading
86	Compensation for faculty who have already earned a PhD for non-academic advancement on the salary schedule, i.e. clock hours for attending trainings, workshops, learning sessions.
87	Reduce the days of accountability by 1 day and eliminate returning for spring semester on a Friday
88	Continue to work on lab loading issue.
89	Regular salary increases thru annual step or 2% for those off the salary schedule
90	At MCC our administration is now preparing the documentation to submit this fall for a RIF. When our President was asked about an early retirement incentive to encourage old faculty to retire and thus mitigate any RIF, he responded that early retirement was not an option because that is under District control. Would someone please propose to the appropriate District authority that an early retirement incentive package be considered as an attempt to reduce the number of faculty that might have to be RIF'd.
91	Keep working on the predictable salary system.
92	Salary adjustment for Master of Fine Arts degree holding faculty in recognition as being a terminal degree.
93	I still believe the new PAR process is overly burdensome and will not accomplish the goals it was supposed to attain. And, regardless of the process we use, the probationary period MUST be reduced from 5 to 3 years. There is no legitimate reason for a 5 year probationary period. The 2% COLA for only those at the top of the scale needs to be converted into a new top step (Step 15?). To not create a new step means we now have a new salary inversion between those at the top of the scale and anyone not yet at the top. In effect, this 2% "COLA" is already a "pseudo step".
94	COLA plus steps. During good economic times, the district hasn't been able to give us a COLA because enrollment is down. During bad economic times with enrollment is up, the district couldn't give up a COLA because the economy was bad and the district didn't want to upset the voters. So with that logic, no or very little COLA ever.

95	Regular salary advancement (steps)
96	Remove consideration of MFA from list
97	No new issues - the plate is full!
98	Separate the Faculty Association from Administration. They are not our friends. Fight against standardization efforts of "One Maricopa" that inhibit College and Faculty best practices in the classroom and thus damper learning through administrative mandates.
99	none, the 5 above are important
100	District IT do not communicate system failures to students effectively. As soon as failures are known, for example when CANVAS is down, emails/texts should go to all students letting them know if the problem. This simple acknowledgement alone would save much heartache and would serve to show that we are an organization that cares. More FPG opportunities from MCLI.
101	Adequate funding for advisement at our colleges. Some colleges are grocery underfunded.
102	Lab loading
102	The vast disparities in how various ICs developed their HLC qualifications document. People on the ICs are not human resource staff.

	<p>Probably not a Meet and Confer Issue- but getting the district to respect shared governance. District IT and District Legal are out of control and impact the campuses negatively. And I think this is a shared interest by faculty and administration. Three examples from a faculty perspective:</p> <p>1. Say we are required to use Google drive now and I have everything I've created over the years on Dropbox. Now I'm not allowed to use it because district IT said so? Give me a break! I'm not moving all those files over, and two, I don't trust your ability to protect it. Your track record isn't stellar, and if district IT is down, guess what, I now don't have access to these files. Let's just say Dropbox is more reliable, because it is.</p> <p>2. Let's say now I have my files on Google drive and I separate from the District. Whose intellectual property is it, if I lose access because I longer have access via an MEID? Also think retirees, or adjunct who don't teach every semester. The district is very efficient at inactivating your access to email after more than a semester of inactivity (or throwing out your transcripts a few month after many years of service), and Google drive is accessed through email, right? So while Google drive is convenient for files for sharing, files that I actually care about and do share will not be put on Google drive. I don't appreciate the district telling me what I can and cannot do when I share files. They may say Google drive is more secure, yeah right. This is the same district that said Google hangout is not secure?</p> <p>3. Example of District Legal: Ever try to get a electronic journal subscription for your discipline through the college library? Good luck with that, District legal makes it so difficult you will wait about six months (I am not exaggerating) to find out if approved. The process is so difficult it makes you want to tear your hair out. I feel sorry for the librarians who have to deal with this nonsense, but it really sucks as a faculty member trying to request an electronic library acquisition when district legal is such a major barrier. We are supposed to be an institution of higher learning, right? Not with district legal involved in the process. It is easier to pay for my own personal subscriptions to electronic journals related to my discipline, and that is what I'm doing now, rather than trying to benefit faculty of my discipline and students in that major as a whole. And that is fundamentally wrong on so many levels!</p> <p>4. I could go on, but I won't. I suggest doing a survey of thoughts of feedback on District IT and District Legal, but I'm not sure to whom to direct this to. I suspect my comments are the tip of iceberg. What are Chancellor's plans to deal with these District entities that don't operate with any principals of Shared governance yet impact our ability as faculty to govern the quality of teaching and learning?</p>
103	Residential Faculty Overload
104	Faculty Supervision and Compensation
105	successor clause
106	<p>Online enrollment caps and loading need to be part of the RFP. It has caused major issues at my college. The RFP needs to be updated and get current with how teaching is delivered. I often hear my colleagues say that teaching is teaching regardless of modality. I only teach face to face but I get paid less per student than my colleagues who teach smaller enrollments online. I understand the modality may be different, but it does not mean I work any less. I take pride in my teaching and helping my students succeed, but it disgusts me that faculty who simply push the publisher provided canned course get paid more for their online load than I do. Please bring equity to this issue and review enrollment limits and caps for online, hybrid, and face to face courses.</p>

	Always looking to have a dependable salary increase, at least COLA. Permit residential overload
107	Restructure asst. chair position - no need for both pay and release time
	Doing away with the first day of accountability for spring semester. Coming back on the Friday is not conducive to what it was intended for. We no longer have a district wide day of learning.
108	Summer supervision pay would be nice as we have expanded the number of offerings significantly.
109	The summer load - currently MCC only allows for one summer so we do not have a summer 1 & 2. Because of this, the load level available to MCC faculty is 9 credits for the whole summer. For those of us that teach with a lab load like those in the CIS area, we are now restricted on only teaching two classes for the summer with a 7.4 load value (a 3.7 class load times 2). With our classes, we cannot even teach at the load level of a first summer of 9 credits due to the labs requirements. This needs to be corrected so our time will count as summer 1 & 2 so that we are to teach our 8 week classes with lab load.
110	Lab loading
111	Equal loading for lab and classroom teaching
112	Eliminating PAR
	Making PAR a three-year process,
113	Moving "extra" Friday of spring accountability to fall for new faculty orientations
114	none
115	245
116	Lab Loading
117	The issues I am most concerned with are already on the above Meet and Confer list.
	Decrease days of accountability by one (1) so that the first Friday of accountability in the Spring semester is no longer a day of accountability. Days of accountability would change from 170/195 to 169/195. The rationale for having faculty work on this day is based on the long abandoned faculty convocation. Develop a reassigned time policy for occupational program directors.
118	Address concerns regarding faculty who are hired as an occupational program director.
119	Eliminate inequity of reassign time allocated for Faculty Senate President (6 hours) and FPG Rep (9 hours).
120	Nothing comes to mind.
121	I think we should look at the compensation structure for athletic coaches. There seem to be differences in how coaches are compensated based on the sport they coach and I am wondering if there is a formula for how those decisions are made, and if there is gender equity in how those decisions are made (wrestling head coach paid more than volleyball head coach, for example).
122	Lab loading

123	M.F.A. Salary
	<p>Related to Salary Placement and Advancement (including the MFA) - the yearly negotiations for steps needs to be removed from the language of the RFP. COLA should be negotiated when necessary. Steps should be hard wired and compulsory for qualified faculty. The current mechanism simply distracts faculty and administration from negotiating real issues that can improve faculty performance, student success, and graduation rates. Lets move to a era of a defined salary system that does rely on politics, unfair and unpredictable steps.</p> <p>Appointed faculty should be part of the PAR/PARC process. Perhaps in 3-5 increments. This will be fair to probationary faculty and also students. Professional growth and peer evaluation and student evaluation should be continuous throughout a faculty members career. Not just the first 5 years.</p>
124	FPG credit for those who have already obtained their PhD
125	vision coverage in health plan
126	Dept chair term limits
127	Lower insurance cost
128	Continue work on lab loading.
129	Undecided at present,
130	None at this time.
131	Lab Loading vs lecture loading unfairness.
132	Consistent COLA
	<p>Please commit to seeing the (5) aforementioned issues through to completion before starting on any substantive new issues.</p> <p>As you continue with Salary Placement and Advancement, please consider the value of all education as it relates to initial placement and advancement on the salary schedule regardless of the faculty member's "teaching discipline." I know many faculty with multiple degrees, some considered terminal in the respective field, yet because they are not in that faculty member's "teaching discipline," there is no acknowledgment of those degrees in terms of salary. Either we value education or we don't. By not including all earned degrees when looking at salary placement and advancement, I believe that we are actually devaluing the education of our faculty.</p> <p>Section 2.12.1: Expand this section. For fairness sake, each increment of 50 FRP faculty should be assigned 3 hrs per year. To say that the Faculty Senate President at a college with less than 100 faculty should be afforded the same amount of reassigned time as another Faculty Senate President at another college with 199 faculty is ludicrous. Half the faculty should equal half the reassigned time.</p> <p>Why are Service Faculty paid at \$47.50 per hour and Teaching Faculty paid at less than \$30 per hour for work outside their contracts? This is wrong, and it needs to be fixed.</p>
133	

	<p>Hello Esteemed Colleagues, Thank you for all your hard work in negotiating for the faculty. I would strongly suggest that the term "academic advising" be removed from the RFP in the sample job description/duties for faculty. Academic advising is a critical, end-to-end student service that entails financial aid, residency requirements, maximum time frames, placement testing, developmental education, program planning, graduation application check sheets, transfer planning, credit assessment and more. In order to do it well and provide completely up-to-date and accurate advising information, academic advising staff must participate in numerous training sessions and spend considerable time ensuring that they are current on rules and regulations. It is not realistic to expect faculty to maintain the level of skills and knowledge needed to provide top-quality and consistent academic advising. It does a tremendous disservice to our students when faculty are required to provide academic advising, because faculty can not possibly know all the rules and requirements that this entails. Unfortunately, because of the very broad language in the RFP ("academic advising")some administrators and Department Chairs have decided that faculty are required to provide end-to-end full service academic advising. In our college, this has allowed them to avoid providing appropriate dedicated advising staff and to simply referring students on directly to faculty without any other student services support. I believe that faculty can and should be available to help students select discipline-specific courses and help with any course sequencing that requires pre-requisites. Advice that is specific to the faculty member's teaching prefix is appropriate. Can you please advocate to eliminate the term "academic advising" in our job responsibilities? If not, then re-word it to only address discipline or program specific course selection or other much more specific language?</p> <p>Please add specific language to the RFP about compensation for OPDs. Right now, at our college, OPDs have a two page job description, which matches the Department Chair list of responsibilities almost one-to-one. However, while Chairs may get up to 12-15 credits of reassigned time, OPDs only get three credits. OPD compensation should, at least, match the same structure of compensation as a Department Chair, if being asked to do the same things.</p>
134	An actual cost of living increase to make up for the past 10 years. Perhaps it could be guaranteed such as 3% this year, and 3% next year, etc. I realize that those at the top of the salary scale make good money. However, we have lost significant ground in terms of the cost of living. I haven't had a meaningful raise in 14 years. Coupled with the 25 load limit, if you are the top, you have no means to augment your salary beyond.
135	Increase sick leave buyback amounts for residential faculty.
136	Continued pay increases. Ending the "rainy day fund" or whatever the District is calling it.
137	Post-tenure review; we need it.
138	Review of the PAR process, especially how the implementations differ from college to college.
139	An addendum to the 60/40 agreement that takes into account severe enrollment decline and allows colleges to readjust the plan.
140	#1 is still the most important.
141	Continue to do the good work you do! Any issue that focuses on improving the perception of the faculty "brand" is an important issue to me. I am concerned that those that abuse their role as faculty and "coast" by using online learning packages solely (and therefore not making any teaching/learning decisions) or even slacking in challenging students to learn in a face to face environment is damaging the faculty brand.
142	Lab loading
143	Salary

144	HLC quals please.
145	Accountability for the Friday in January.
146	Do we have a say in our benefits package? This would benefit us greatly if there is not yet a mechanism in place.
147	Again if you are going to look at the MFA issue please know that Master of Counseling and Social Work degrees require the completion of 60 credits. Do not take my word for it, do the research and you will see that this is the case. I have about 80 graduate credits and I only get credit for having a Masters Degree.
148	Faculty Buy Out Retirement plan
149	Negotiate a decent cost of living increase that is not a "one-year only" deal. The adjunct faculty pay needs to increase, too, in accordance with their immense value as higher education instructors.
150	None. Continue on salary, faculty supervision & lab loading.
151	additional discussion regarding release time or \$ compensation for additional duties above and beyond already designated contracts. (currently at the mercy of the deans/VP's for approval and that can be subjective or a hit or miss in compensation) Community work for the college etc..above and beyond.
152	None
153	<p>Please finish this work on the MFA. The evidence has been presented to you that it is widely accepted as a terminal degree. And we already have made allowances over the years in other areas e.g the JD.</p> <p>Predictable salary advancement.</p> <p>Get rid of triage now.</p>
154	Would like to see procedures thrust upon us by district, vetted through faculty before they are implemented.
155	Faculty absence policy.
156	6-hour per day/30-hour per week faculty accountability.
157	Salary Placement and Advancement
158	No new issues, just continue with existing ones.
159	I see that it is listed but the MFA issue has been worked on for years, so my hope is that it can be resolved in this next cycle.
160	Lab loading
161	Predictable salary advancement for faculty at the top of the scale who have received no increase in salary since 2005? 07?
162	Pay and steps! I want the steps that I am owed from the last two years for which steps were not granted. I also want COLAs to offset the cost-of-living increases over the last three years. In summary, I want two steps (from 2014-15 and 2015-16) and 9.6% COLA. If not, we should strike or work the minimum!

	<p>1-create meaningful post-tenure peer review process (before performance based pay is chosen for us all!)</p> <p>2-prescribe definitive minimum responsibilities in RFP- mitigates inconsistencies in all 10 College Plans- and prescribed 2-year term limits (provide opportunity for others to step up-if none does, then person may run again)</p> <p>3-- reconcile the 30 hour work week that is sprinkled throughout RFP--maybe it's 30 hours academic and 10 hours of 5.4 responsibilities.</p>
161	There's enough faculty siting 30 hours and leaving the job to make this a priority.
162	MFA pay discrepancy
163	Please bring some closure to the lab loading issues as it has been an area of contention for many many years.
164	Consistent steps
165	PAR for all faculty.
166	N/A
167	These issues are fairly all-encompassing and cover many areas in the RFP that have flaws. I look forward the resolution of each issue.