

## Meet and Confer Minute – January 2015

The following message will update you on the status of the issues being worked by the Meet and Confer Team this year. The process for addressing issues involves the following steps:

1. Identify the history and interests for the issue (i.e. scoping)
2. Identify data needed and analyze data
3. Brainstorm options
4. Determine which options appropriately address the interests
5. Identify a preferred option or options
6. Gather constituent feedback on the preferred option(s)
7. Draft policy language (as appropriate)

### 2014 - 2015 Issues

- **Lab Loading**

We recently briefed the Academic Affairs Council (which includes the college VPAAAs) and the Faculty Executive Council on a preferred option identified by the Meet and Confer Team. Adapted from Gateway Technical College in Wisconsin, the option proposes that, with the exception of drop in labs (see below), instructor load equals periods. Under current policy, a 3-credit lecture class meets for the equivalent of three 50-minute periods weekly and the instructor load is 3.0 load hours. However, a 1-credit lab class that meets for the equivalent of three 50-minute periods weekly has instructor load of 2.4 load hours. Under the proposed policy, both the lecture and the lab would have instructor load of 3.0 load hours.

If the students enrolled in a lab course and the instructor teaching the lab course are not assigned to a designated lab time with a regular meeting pattern, the course is classified as a drop-in lab. Drop-in labs are proposed to have an instructor load of 0.75 times the number of periods. For example, a 1-credit drop-in lab in which the instructor works for 1 period weekly would have load of 0.75 load hours. The rationale for the load reduction is that the faculty workload is less when students are not required to meet with the same instructor in regular meeting pattern. For example, a student might drop-in to the lab at 9 a.m. on Tuesday one week, at 4 p.m. Wednesday the next week, and on Friday at 1 p.m. the third week, and skip the lab altogether on the fourth week. The instructor assigned to work the lab on Tuesdays from 9:00 – 9:50 a.m. would interact with this student in the lab only once in four weeks with no ability to predict when or if the student would return to the lab during the 9:00 – 9:50 a.m. Tuesday timeframe.

At present, the constituents who have been briefed on the proposal have indicated philosophical support of the proposed option. The cost of implementing the option has not yet been determined. Feedback from faculty at large will be gathered during the Meet and Confer Forums held at each college in April 2015. Work on this issue will continue into the 2015 – 2016 negotiation year.  
(Step 6)

- **Residential Faculty Overload**

This issue is a combination of three issues brought forward through the issue generation and prioritization process: Permissible Overload, Compensation Outside of Accountability, and Faculty Overload Pay. The focus of this issue is to:

- Clarify which responsibilities are part of hours of accountability and which work activities warrant additional compensation
- Establish an overload pay rate that is perceived as commensurate with the work performed
- Establish reasonable guidelines related to faculty workload limits

This history and interests of the issue were scoped in the November 10, 2014, Meet and Confer Team meeting (Step 1) and data needs were identified. We will continue our discussion on this issue in the February 9, 2015, all-day Meet and Confer meeting (Step 2).

- **Conflict Resolution Policy**

Flow charts for complaints and grievances have been crafted and policy language is being drafted for constituent consideration. A *complaint* is defined as an allegation of conduct or performance of a Faculty Member that violates MCCC'D's rules for expected conduct and/or performance as contained in the RFP that, if proven true, could result in progressive corrective action up to and including dismissal, using a process detailed in the RFP. A *grievance* is defined as an alleged misapplication, misinterpretation or violation of a specific provision of the RFP, Governing Board policy or Administrative Regulation by MCCC'D or an individual in their official capacity on behalf of MCCC'D, which affects the faculty member.

Much of the policy language related to complaints and grievances already exists in the RFP, in administrative regulations, or in other policy. The current policy revision effort is focused on increasing clarity and improving the conflict resolution process (Step5 - 7).

- **Masters of Fine Arts Salary Placement**

In light of constituent feedback, the Meet and Confer Team agreed to look at MFA salary placement and salary placement as whole within the broader context of the salary system discussion in the 2015 – 2016 negotiation year (Step 6).

- **Classification and Compensation Study: Faculty Salary Placement and Advancement**

Based on the updated timeline for the Classification and Compensation Study, this issue will be worked by the Meet and Confer Team in Fall 2015. The faculty on the Meet and Confer Team made a formal request for a step and a 2.3% COLA in the September 29, 2014 meeting. However, due to current, multiple priorities in the Maricopa district, it is unlikely that resources will be made for additional salary (COLA and steps) in the current year. While we will continue to work on the salary system issue over the next couple of years, the implementation of any solution will align with the Classification and Compensation Study implementation timeline (Step 2 – 3).

- **A New Issue: Faculty Supervision and Supervision Pay**

In November 2014, the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources responded to a request from Faculty Association leadership to interpret D.1.3. of the RFP which details how Department/Division Chairs are to be compensated. Faculty from multiple colleges had expressed concern over a period of years that some colleges were not correctly

compensating Chairs. In her ruling, the VCHR indicated that the policy requires Chairs to be compensated for all adjunct faculty not just adjunct faculty teaching during the day. Colleges are required to compensate Department/Division Chairs consistent with this interpretation retroactive to July 1, 2014. Because this investment in supervision was not built into some college budgets, it may take some time to identify the required resources; however, all Chairs will be paid appropriately no later than the end of Spring 2015.

Of the 11 issues prioritized by the Meet and Confer Team this year, Chair Compensation and Day/Evening (which included faculty supervision) were two issues that were not planned to be worked this year. In response to VCHR's ruling regarding chair compensation, the Administration on the Meet and Confer Team requested that the issue of Chair Compensation be revisited during the current negotiation year. Recognizing that reprioritizing issues mid-year was inconsistent with past practice, the faculty on the Meet and Confer Team consulted with the Faculty Association leadership and the Faculty Executive Council in regards to this request. It was determined that focusing solely on chair compensation would not be in the interest of faculty; however, a broad discussion of faculty supervision roles and supervision compensation could be of benefit to faculty. In its January 27, 2015, meeting, the Faculty Executive Council voted in favor of having the Meet and Confer Team dialogue about supervision roles and supervision compensation during the current negotiation year.

Recognizing that there are myriad interests surrounding this issue, the Meet and Confer Team will hold two centrally-located faculty forums in February. These forums will provide Department/Division Chairs, Occupational Program Directors, Evening Supervisors, and other interested faculty the opportunity to articulate their interests. Any options generated through the Meet and Confer process will be vetted through FEC and college Meet and Confer forums (Step 1).

Frank Wilson  
Faculty Meet and Confer Team Chair