

2014 – 2015 Priority Issues Identified by FEC and Affirmed by Meet and Confer Team Faculty

1. Issue: Steps - Predictable Salary Advancement

Description: MCCCCD was once known nationally for its commitment to salary progression for employees. Between 1994-1995 and 2005-2006, 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?

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. 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?

3. 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.

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

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?