

## 2014 – 2015 Consolidated Faculty and Administration Meet and Confer Issues List

### *Issue Identified by Both Faculty and Administration*

#### **1. Issue: Conflict Resolution Policy (Section 6 of RFP)**

*Description:* Section 6 of the RFP covers grievances, resolutions of controversy, informal resolution and mediation, administrative evaluation, conflicts between students and faculty members, and internal investigations. Although there are elements in each of these policies that protect faculty rights, the lack of a fully integrated, comprehensive policy has created confusion regarding which conflict resolution method is appropriate in a given situation. Additionally, the lack of a statute of limitations clause in some of the policies has permitted complaints to surface years after the event in question. Inclusion of progressive corrective actions within the policy will help to clarify to all parties appropriate measures to be taken in resolving performance concerns.

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

### *Issues Identified by Faculty*

#### **2. Issue: Steps - Predictable Salary Advancement**

*Description:* MCCCCD was once known nationally for its commitment to salary progression for employees. Between 1991-1992 and 2006-2007, steps were approved in 15\* of 16 years. This national reputation allowed MCCCCD to attract top faculty talent from across the country. In recent years, MCCCCD has not made employee salary progression a priority. Between 2006-2007 and 2014-2015, steps were approved in 2 of 8 years. The lack of predictable salary advancement is impairing the ability of MCCCCD to attract and retain top faculty talent from across the country.

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

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

#### **3. Issue: Lab Loading**

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

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

#### **4. Issue: Residential Faculty Overload Pay Rate**

*Description:* Adjunct faculty currently teach more than 50% of the instructional load districtwide and are critical to the success of the academic program at the colleges. Adjunct faculty are limited to teaching nine (9) load hours per semester. A faculty member who teaches nine (9) load hours each semester/term in Fall, Spring, and Summer makes \$23,301 in a year at the current pay rate of \$863 per load hour. The low pay rate contributes to the high turnover in adjunct faculty. In some disciplines, not enough adjuncts can be recruited to meet student demand. The adjunct faculty pay rate is the same as the residential faculty overload pay rate. Although the residential faculty overload pay rate is in the RFP, the adjunct pay rate is not. Because of this, this issue is being brought forward as the residential faculty overload pay rate.

What changes, if any, should be made to the residential faculty overload pay rate?

#### **5. Issue: Permissible Overload for Residential Faculty**

*Description:* Under current policy, residential faculty may teach up to 22.5 load hours per semester (150% of the 15-load hour contractual load). Because of the variation in how classes are loaded, not all faculty can attain the maximum overload permitted by policy. For example, a faculty member teaching seven 3-credit lecture classes can only attain 21 load hours. Adding an eighth class would exceed the 22.5 load hour limit. For a faculty member teaching the two lab sections that are associated with a lecture section, getting close to the maximum permissible load is even more challenging. For example, a science faculty member receives 15.6 load hours for teaching two 3-credit lecture section and four 1-credit lab sections. Adding another lecture section plus two lab sections would result in 7.8 load hours and 23.4 load hours, which exceeds the 22.5 load cap. Some faculty believe there should not be an overload cap or that the overload cap should be higher than 25 load hours.

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

#### **6. Issue: Horizontal Pay Advancement for PhD Faculty**

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

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

## ***Issues Identified by Administration***

### **7. Issue: Faculty Responsibilities Outside of Teaching**

*Description:* The work that residential faculty do inside and outside of the classroom is critical to student success. In order to achieve district and college goals, it is essential to have a highly engaged faculty body. Yet levels of engagement vary dramatically between individual faculty. Some faculty make significant contributions in achieving college and district goals while others are minimally engaged. Research conducted by Gallup has shown that one key component of employee engagement is making sure employees know what is expected of them at work.

What changes, if any, should be made to policy language to clarify expectations regarding out-of-class contributions of residential faculty?

### **8. Issue: Compensation for Work Performed Outside of the 30 Hours of Accountability**

*Description:* Section 5.4. of the RFP identifies professional responsibilities that are to be performed within the 30 hours of accountability as well as defining the additional work required for each hour of reassigned time. (Each load hour of reassigned time equates to two hours of weekly work.) It is the practice within MCCCDC to provide reassigned time or special services contracts to faculty who participate in additional work activities that benefit the institution. It is sometimes unclear whether a particular activity falls within the scope of the 30 hours of accountability or if additional compensation (i.e. reassigned time and/or pay) is warranted.

What changes, if any, should be made to the policy language so that faculty and administrators can determine which activities are within the scope of the 30 hours of accountability and which activities warrant additional compensation?

### **9. Issue: Day/Evening Distinction**

*Description:* Section 1.2 of the RFP defines the day program as 6:00 a.m. through 3:55 p.m. Monday through Friday during the 195 days of accountability (and includes courses that start before 3:55 p.m.). The evening program is all other hours during the 195 days of accountability. Faculty professional responsibilities/hours of accountability are to be met within the hours of the day program (RFP 5.4.1.). Some members of the administration and some faculty find this restriction to be problematic in fulfilling the mission of the college and would like to remove the day/evening distinction from the RFP.

What changes, if any, should be made to policy language related to day/evening programs?

### **10. Issue: Chair Compensation**

*Description:* Section D.1.3. of the RFP indicates that Division/Department Chairs are to be paid “one-half percent (1/2%) of the schedule base salary for each Adjunct Faculty member teaching within the Department/Division.” In practice, some colleges have been paying Chairs only for adjuncts teaching in the day program and not for adjuncts teaching in the evening program. Other colleges have been paying Chairs for all adjuncts in both day and evening programs.

What changes, if any, should be made to the policy language to clarify how Department/Division Chairs are to be compensated for adjunct faculty supervision?

## **11. Appointive Faculty Evaluation Process**

*Description:* Students benefit when appointive faculty are actively engaged in effective instruction, professional development, and service to the college and district. Levels of engagement in these core areas vary dramatically between residential faculty. A more robust appointive faculty evaluation process could inspire greater levels of faculty engagement.

What changes, if any, should be made to the appointive faculty evaluation process?