



Patty Finkenstadt <patpt03961@phoenixcollege.edu>

Meet and Confer Update

Patty Finkenstadt <patricia.finkenstadt@phoenixcollege.edu>
Reply-To: patricia.finkenstadt@phoenixcollege.edu
To: Patricia Finkenstadt <patricia.finkenstadt@phoenixcollege.edu>
Bcc: DL-FAC-ALL <dl-fac-all@memo.maricopa.edu>

Fri, Oct 2, 2015 at 2:42 PM

Meet and Confer Update – September 2015

Faculty Colleagues,

The following message will update you on the work of the Meet and Confer Team.

Issue Generation and Prioritization

For the last several years, the faculty representatives of the Meet and Confer Team have solicited new issues from the faculty during Spring ratification and early in the Fall semester. These new issues were prioritized by each college Faculty Senate and then the Faculty Executive Council (FEC). The top ranked issues were then forwarded to the Meet and Confer Team for prioritization of which issues would be worked during that negotiation cycle.

Recognizing the complexity of the issues identified in Fall 2014 (and the addition of Faculty Supervision and Compensation in Spring 2015), we informed faculty that we anticipated many of these issues would be multiple-year issues. At end of the 2014-2015 negotiation year, the Team was still working the issues and agreed that the work would continue into the 2015-2016 negotiation cycle.

This Fall, the Team was faced with the challenge of how best to respect the prioritization of issues last year by continuing negotiations on the prioritized issues while balancing identifying possible new issues for this year. FEC discussed this topic on August 25, 2015 without resolution. Several possibilities were discussed and Faculty Senate Presidents requested time to consult the faculty at their college to discuss the possible options. At FEC on September 8, all 10 Senate President agreed that the issues prioritized during Fall 2014 should continue to be negotiated by the Team and that new issues to be prioritized for the next negotiation cycle would be solicited in Spring 2016. FEC unanimously agreed to “authorize the Meet and Confer Team to continue to work the unresolved issues from negotiation year 2014-2015 and delay new issue generation and prioritization until Spring 2016.”

The issues solicited during Spring 2015 ratification (and other items of interest) are available on the Faculty Association's website at www.mccfa.org. Information related to Meet and Confer specifically can be found [here](#). It is worth noting that an informal analysis of the issues submitted during Spring 2015 ratification identify many of the current unresolved issues as priorities for faculty. The responses received closely align to the issues prioritized for negotiation last year that we are committed to continue working this negotiation cycle.

Issue Status

The Joint Meet and Confer Team met last Friday and we reaffirmed our commitment to working the prioritized issues to completion. A description of these issues is provided below.

1. Issue: Predictable Salary Advancement

Description: MCCCDC 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 MCCCDC to attract top faculty talent from across the country. In recent years, MCCCDC has not made employee salary progression a priority. Between 2006-2007 and 2015-2016, steps were approved in 2 of 9 years. The lack of predictable salary advancement is impairing the ability of MCCCDC to attract top faculty talent from across the country and to retain currently employed, highly qualified faculty.

*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.)

This issue includes three major interrelated issues.

1. The inclusion of a vertical step for all eligible faculty and appropriate COLA in the budget presented to the Governing Board.
2. Faculty Salary Placement and Advancement is aligned with the Classification and Compensation Study currently underway by District Human Resources. For faculty, the study focused on compensation only. In Spring 2013, a Task Force was formed composed of faculty and administrators and co-chaired by a faculty and administrator from the Meet and Confer Team. The Task Force was charged with identifying options for consideration of the Classification and Compensation Advisory Committee, and ultimately, the Meet and Confer Team. A draft version of a possible salary structure was shared with the Meet and Confer Team on April 1, 2013 and then shared with the Classification and Compensation Advisory Committee.

The focus of the discussion will include a review of current policy related to initial salary placement and predictable salary advancement throughout the course of a faculty member's career. The delays in the Classification and Compensation Study have resulted in deferral of this issue over the past several years. Based on the updated timeline for the Classification and Compensation Study, this issue is planned to be worked by the Meet and Confer Team in Fall 2015.

3. Masters of Fine Arts Salary Placement focused on evaluating how to appropriately place faculty members with a Masters of Fine Arts degree. While a potential solution was negotiated by the Meet and Confer Team, in light of constituent feedback, the Team agreed to look at MFA salary placement and salary placement as a whole within the broader context of the salary system discussion. Although the Team recognized the argument for treating the MFA as more than a Master's degree, the Team also acknowledged that there are salary placement issues that affect faculty with other degrees and occupational experience that need to be considered as well.

What changes, if any, should be made to MCCCDC's salary placement and advancement practices?

2. 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.

Last year, the Meet and Confer team negotiated a solution that proposed that instructional load assigned to lab courses (with the exception of drop-in labs) be equal to the periods that the lab meets. This option is currently being costed out by the Vice Chancellor of Business Services' office.

To resolve this problem, two key issues need to be addressed:

- a. 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?
- b. What changes, if any, need to be made to ensure that lab classes are fiscally viable?

3. Issue: Conflict Resolution Policy (Section 6 of the 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 and provide guidance to administrators, 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 (RFP§6)?

4. Issue: Residential Faculty Overload

Description: This issue is a combination of three interrelated issues.

1. Permissible Overload seeks to establish reasonable guidelines related to faculty workload limits. 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 instructional 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 instructional load cap.
2. Compensation Outside of Accountability is focused on clarifying which responsibilities are part of hours of accountability and which work activities warrant additional compensation. RFP§5.4. identifies professional responsibilities that are to be performed within the 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 MCCC 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 accountability

or if additional compensation (i.e. reassigned time and/or pay) is warranted. 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. 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.

3. Faculty Overload Pay seeks to establish an overload pay rate that is perceived as commensurate with the work performed.

To resolve this issue, three key issues need to be addressed:

- a. What changes, if any, should be made to the overload policy?
- b. 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 hours of accountability and which activities warrant additional compensation?
- c. What changes, if any, should be made to the residential faculty overload pay rate?

5. Issue: Faculty Supervision and Compensation

Description: The RFP makes clear the role of faculty chairs in §D.1.3. by articulating the oversight of adjuncts be supervised. Until the present time, colleges have interpreted §D.1.3. differently across the 10 colleges with inequity in compensation as a result. Last fall, an interpretation of the RFP by District Human Resources mandated that all chairs be compensated for all adjunct faculty. To some colleges this caused a financial hardship and drastic change of process.

The focus of the discussion should contemplate additional models of Faculty Supervision and Compensation and meet the interests of the parties involved.

To resolve this issue, two key issues need to be addressed:

- a. What changes, if any, should be made to the policy language to provide Faculty Supervision models that meets the varied needs of the individual Colleges and Divisions/Departments?
- b. What changes, if any, should be made to the policy language to provide appropriate compensation to faculty serving in supervisory roles?

Team Composition

There has been one change to the composition of the Administrative group: Steven Gonzalez (GWCC) has replaced Maria Harper-Marinick.

We appreciate your continued support of the Meet and Confer Team as we seek to negotiate solutions that positively impact faculty. Thank you!

Patty Finkenstadt

Meet and Confer Team Co-Chair

Patricia Finkenstadt, Ph.D.

Biosciences Faculty

1202 W Thomas Road, Phoenix, AZ 85013
phone | [602.285.7108](tel:602.285.7108) • fax | [602.285.7349](tel:602.285.7349)
email | patricia.finkenstadt@phoenixcollege.edu
website | www.phoenixcollege.edu