Meet and Confer  
Management and PCCEA  
Friday, February 13, 2015

**Present:** Nan Schmidt, Lisa Anne Smith, Dan Berryman (ex-officio), Matej Boguszak, Scott Collins, Alison Colter-Mack, Dr. Ann Parker, Irma Federico (ex-officio), Julia Fiello, Makyla Hays, Ted Roush, Kate Schmidt, Denise Dudoit (note taker)

**Absent:** Greg Wilson

I. Public Comment
   a. None
   b. Julia announced in Faculty Senate and at All Faculty Day that the Meet and Confer meetings have begun.
   c. It was noted if PCCEA should receive emails from their constituents; those emails could be read during the public comment portion of the meeting.

II. Introductions –
   a. This was Dan Berryman’s first meeting and introductions were made.

III. Review and approve Meeting Notes
   a. 1.9.2015 – no discussion, approved with suggested changes.
   b. 1.23.2015 –
      i. The group took a moment to review the notes
      ii. A large amount of work was done by Nan and Lisa Anne to revise the notes.
   iii. Section V – Topic Exchange
      1. At PCCEA’s request, a clarifying statement was added to this section “e. Items that appear to have been resolved prior to meet and confer and require formalization:“
      2. Section e. ii – as part of the attendance task force, Julia clarified there are 3 items from task force that are topics for Meet and Confer (she will talk about them later)
      3. Added “briefly” to section V f. because the idea was to revisit this topic at the February 13 meeting.
   iv. No further discussion; approved with suggested changes.
      1. Requested the note taker send final versions of the notes to all team members and to Louise Glogoff and Ana Jiménez for posting.

IV. Review Board Guidelines for Fiscal Year 2015-16 Meet and Confer Planning
a. A copy of the Board Guidelines for Fiscal Year 2015-16 Meet and Confer Planning, provided by the Board of Governors, was given to team members.

b. PCCEA stated that the issue of whether or not step plans will be held in abeyance remains unclear, i.e., what will be done with step plans in progress.

c. PCCEA understood the Board to say there would be a fixed amount of money available that could not be exceeded and offered ways to accomplish that; this was not referenced in the printed guidelines.

d. The Chief Spokesperson for the Management team asked if it would help to have greater clarity regarding what will happen with steps that have been submitted and the budget and PCCEA requested such clarification

e. PCCEA stated that current policy states if steps are not funded, they are held in abeyance. If the Board decides not to allow this to happen, they will have to override what is in policy.

f. Faculty are happy with the step progression system currently in place for faculty.

g. PCCEA asked when they might be notified about when and how they will be communicating directly with the Board about their proposal/discussion topics.

i. Management Chief Spokesperson will look into this.

V. Review of Management priorities and HLC report – impact on faculty

a. The list Management presented during the January 23 meeting is a list of areas that should be looked at in light of the current budget situation and HLC issues.

b. Some of the listed articles align with issues PCCEA has brought forward and those Articles can be reviewed as the PCCEA proposals in those areas are reviewed. There are four articles identified by Management that are not identified in the PCCEA proposals. For those, the Management Team proposes that both teams review those sections for possible changes to address budget and/or HLC issues. Those four Articles are:

i. Article XI – Retrenchment of Faculty

1. Nic Richmond presenting information at the next meeting related to Faculty Hiring; might also be useful for this topic

ii. Article I – General Information

1. Does this reflect what the HLC is looking for? The College’s best interests?
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2. Is the information within this section relevant and current?

iii. Article II – Conditions of Work

1. Cross campus assignments is a budgetary issue in terms of making sure that needs are being met and employees are used efficiently.

2. 12-month accountability was a pilot quickly developed last year with the understanding it would be brought back this year for review.

iv. Article III – Faculty Employment

1. Faculty Hiring Task Force has not been reconvened

2. Only filling mission critical positions

c. If after review of the policies, it is determined revision is unnecessary and the teams are comfortable with what is already in place, the policy will be left as is.

VI. Proposal Topics - PCCEA

a. Article V.I Pay Period Adjustment and Restructure (e.g. Payroll Creep)

i. Guest: Leslie Weng, APM, Employee Processing

ii. Making sure the language changes reflect practice

iii. Background – each year faculty are effectively paid one day earlier in comparison to when they began work and gradually accumulates to the first pay date two weeks prior to the start date; periodically faculty skip a pay period in the summer to “catch back up.”

iv. By changing the language to “20-21 pay periods” this problem is avoided.

v. PCCEA feels it would make sense to add language that says changes in salary elections must be made by a certain date; the default is the academic year.

vi. Flex Year

1. ESF are always on a fiscal year contract but Instructional Faculty can be on an academic year pay schedule, a flex schedule, or a deferred pay schedule.

2. PCCEA offers two options for Instructional faculty to make things more standardized and easier to move between different types of contracts:
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a. The flex schedule can begin July 1, the start of the new fiscal year, or;
b. the first day of accountability (in August).

3. The issue of payroll creep already addressed in agreed upon changes is not impacted by this flex year contract issue but they are both in the same section so this MOU will be revisited so both issues can be addressed together.

4. A discussion followed about aligning not only flex year and deferred pay contracts for instructional faculty, but also ESF contracts so they all have the same start date. Various issues were discussed.

5. Both teams will get feedback on the possibility of having ESF and all instructional faculty contracts start at the beginning of the academic year.

b. Appendix B, Unit Guideline: Flex year issues
   i. Both sides agreed that faculty should be able to request a flex schedule for his/her second year.
   ii. There was a discussion about the possibility of a more comprehensive contract that applies to all faculty that could be more flexible in the way services are delivered to our customers.

   iii. PCCEA noted the need to maintain allowance for 169-day faculty to work outside of the College when not accountable to the College (e.g., typically in the summer).

c. Holidays and Recesses
   i. A MOU was presented by the Management team to PCCEA for review
   ii. The proposal was reviewed and dates adjusted as needed
   iii. A question regarding Independence Day, which falls on a Saturday, was raised. This item will be revisited during the February 20 meeting.

d. Article V, Appendix A, Appendix Q: Horizontal Movement
   i. The task force was initially intended primarily to address needs related to occupational faculty
ii. PCCEA expressed an interest in adding to post Ph.D. movement to the schedule, based on faculty survey feedback

iii. The task force has never met and is unable to provide recommendations to put into policy at this time; both sides agree the task force should be continued to next year but the question is whether the scope should be broadened as suggested by PCCEA.

iv. PCCEA would like the charge to refrain from being so specific; the only recommendation is changing the salary schedule.

v. Management feels it is necessary to go back and get feedback; there is support for moving the task force forward a year but we need to obtain feedback regarding expanding the scope of the language and the benefit to the College by adding education above the doctorate level.

vi. PCCEA requested the administrative lead come from HR because PCCEA experienced difficulties when attempting to convene the task force and would like to replace “management” in the charge with a specific office.

e. Article IX, Complaints Involving Faculty

i. Policy should be updated to sync with Grievance & Complaint policy

ii. PCCEA would like to meet with Lori Cox to discuss.

iii. PCCEA provided a brief review of the grievance and complaint policies which are referenced in Common Policy as well as the Code of Conduct.

iv. Complaints against faculty can come in a variety of ways: faculty against faculty; student against faculty; staff against faculty; etc. Several scenarios are not covered by a single policy and there are different ways each can play out.

v. There is agreement there are gaps in the policy and no clear guidelines for how to file a complaint or what constitutes a complaint.

vi. The question was posed if it would make sense to develop a general policy that does not specify faculty, although there are specific issues related to students and faculty that need to be addressed.

vii. Clarity from the College is needed before it can be determined how best to move forward.

f. Article I, Superseding Pima Policy
i. PCCEA will propose a MOU regarding this policy although they do not expect Management to sign it without legal review but would like their feedback.

ii. Last year, after Meet and Confer ended, PCCEA was asked to sign a proposal approving a change in policy without having the chance to fully think about what was signed.

iii. This year, PCCEA would like to amend that language to allow for discussion if other options might be available before our policies are set aside.

iv. Proposed language reads “if a conflict occurs, the College will work with the faculty representative group to collaboratively problem-solve”

g. Attendance Task Force Recommendations

i. Ted and Julia were unable to meet to begin work on drafting language but Ted did send Julia the section where it was thought changes were needed.

ii. This discussion was tabled in light of Ted needing to leave the meeting early.

iii. The basic issues to be addressed are:

1. Accountability has increased in terms of the work that must be done and some faculty responsibilities are not clear in policy;
2. There are specific new obligations regarding syllabi and taking attendance that may need to be reflected in FPPS

VII. Agenda items – 2.20.2015

a. Public Comment

b. Review Meeting Notes

i. 2.13.15

c. Proposal Discussion Topics

i. Appendix B, Unit Guidelines, Flex Year – Update

ii. Holidays/Recesses

iii. Horizontal Movement

iv. Attendance Task Force

v. Article I. Superseding Pima Policy
d. Agenda Items – 2.27.2015