Meet and Confer
Management and PCCEA
Friday, April 24, 2015

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

Absent: Alison Colter-Mack, Makyla Hays

I. Public Comment
 II. Review and approve Meeting Notes
   a. 4.10.15
      i. Approved with changes

III. Discussion Topics
   a. Article VI. Leaves, Section D. Holidays and Recesses
      i. Ed Support Faculty (ESF) did not have strong feelings regarding removing the dates from policy however it was noted the Academic Calendar Committee refers to the FPPS when developing the academic calendar.
         1. The academic calendar has been set for the next two years
      ii. There is some concern employees will be unprotected if specific dates are not listed in policy should the College determine a change is necessary.
         1. This same calendar has been used for the past eight years.
      iii. PCCEA is concerned there may be an unintended consequence for ESF and would like the option to revisit this issue in the future.
         iv. No further discussion; proposal signed.
   b. Article VII. Faculty Professional Development Program and Appendix L (Sabbaticals)
      i. The members of the Management team are comfortable allowing Faculty who have an approved sabbatical to continue with supplemental work if it will not negatively impact their objectives while on sabbatical and with supervisor input.
      ii. Language was added that would allow a faculty member with an approved sabbatical to perform additional work this year.
         1. Faculty Chair, Tineke Van Zandt, will email faculty with an approved sabbatical to inform them of this change in policy.
      iii. Other clerical updates were made to existing language and forms.
      iv. Changes were made to who should receive the Sabbatical Proposal Cover form for approval
      v. No further discussion; proposal signed.
   c. Provisional Faculty
      i. Joint proposal between PCCEA and Management
      ii. All references to “Administrative Appointments” will be revised to say “Provisional Faculty”.
      iii. A note was added to the proposal recommending Common Policy language also be updated to reflect this change.
      iv. No further discussion; proposal signed
d. Performance Evaluation / Step Plan Task Force
   i. In a recent meeting with the Chancellor, Dan Berryman, and Jeff Silvyn, Matej and Julia shared that they envision the job of the task force will be to look at systems to determine the appropriate avenue for changes, if any.
   ii. PCCEA prefers to keep the task force open with a lot of options until they are able to obtain feedback from faculty members.
   iii. The task force will look at what is necessary for performance and how compensation adjustments are determined.
   iv. In the past, if the Board determined money would be available to fund raises, it was important for the employee groups to decide how the money would be applied: a lift to the salary schedule or steps.
   v. The Chancellor has spoken about compensation in general terms: step progression plans vs. merit based vs. cost of living and what Dan describes as an affinity towards a system based on longevity. In addition, Chancellor Lambert has also emphasized the need for a more robust method of assessing faculty that is not captured with the current Collegial Conference and step progression package.
   vi. There is agreement work should be done over the summer to determine an evaluation process for next year.
   vii. In light of time, it was agreed the proposal would be reviewed for substance and final wording would occur at an additional meeting between the Chief Spokespersons.
   viii. PCCEA feel strongly they should have the ability to select who participates on the task force; all Faculty whether they are members of PCCEA or not, will be invited to participate on the task force.
      1. There has been some concern not all employees are represented by the employee groups; PCCEA has data to support this is not accurate for PCCEA and faculty.
      2. It should be clear PCCEA did not fight the composition of the task force for the review of Board Policy 4001 because PCCEA perceived that the Chancellor understood that PCCEA has the support of virtually all faculty, even non-members.
      3. Language was added to be more inclusive of all faculty
      4. Management will seek guidance from the Chancellor regarding this issue.
   ix. No further discussion; Chief Spokesperson will discuss next week.

e. Appendix P: Task Force to Review Full-Time, Regular Faculty Hiring
   i. Management reviewed the changes suggested during the last meeting (4.10.15).
   ii. No further discussion; proposal signed

f. Article X., E. Retirement
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i. Management informed PCCEA the Chancellor and EVC of Finance are not convinced the proposed program is a way for the College to save money at this time and therefore, the Management team cannot sign an MOU re: retirement.

ii. PCCEA anticipated this might happen and because a lot of ground work has already been done and to honor their constituents who do support this type of program, PCCEA will bring an MOU forward to the Board with the understanding there is no support on the administrative side.

iii. Past practice has been to include a rationale as to why one side or the other did not sign the proposal; Management will consider doing so if they feel it is appropriate before it goes to the Board.

iv. No further discussion; proposal signed *only* by PCCEA.

g. Article XI. Retrenchment

i. The retrenchment policy was replaced with all new language including a change to the section title

ii. Discussion regarding the best individuals to consult when eliminating a program or discipline; PCCEA encouraged Management to consider the sub disciplines taught when considering which faculty to keep; changes made capture each team’s interests as well as the students’ best interests.

iii. Changes were made to the language regarding disciplinary action; it is important to note someone who has had corrective action is not on their way to dismissal.

iv. Management Chief Spokesperson thanked PCCEA for their work and willingness to compromise on certain areas of this policy revision.

v. No further discussion; the proposal is not in the proper format and will be edited for punctuation and grammar when the Chief Spokespersons meet next week.

h. Article II. Extended and Reduced Contracts

i. PCCEA attempted to increase flexibility for administrators to extend contracts that may not have increased teaching duties.

ii. Throughout the proposal, months was changed to days to reinforce days of accountability as the proper term.

iii. Management expressed concern about the quality and economic impact of extended contracts

iv. Language will be added regarding the ability to take unpaid leave as a reduced contract; important to be careful not to fall below a certain level so benefits are not affected.

v. No further discussion; proposal will be finalized next week.

i. Pima Online / Cross Campus Assignments

i. Withdrawn because of lack of time to explore; both teams agree this should be revisited next year.

j. Article IV. Professional Status, D. Campus Faculty Enrichment Funds
Meet and Confer  
Management and PCCEA  
Friday, April 24, 2015

i. Language referring to a one time distribution was never removed; this proposal removes the paragraph.

ii. Includes the change to Article I allowing provisional faculty the use of campus enrichment funds.

iii. Campuses have different methods of requesting funds; DC is developing a plan and criteria to apply for those funds.

iv. May be a mutual interest next year to review how faculty receives these funds.

v. No further discussion; proposal signed.

k. Appendix A. Guidelines for Salary Adjustment, B. Vertical Movement

i. Management suggested deleting items one and two; PCCEA expressed concern over deleting language before it is replaced.

ii. Agreed to refrain from striking out this language and added new language to appear before the bulleted items.

iii. PCCEA will not sign at this time because there is nothing in place to replace the current language and because of the elimination of steps held in abeyance, which negates the work that faculty have done in good faith over the past year.

iv. No further discussion; proposal signed only by Management.

IV. Updates

   a. Proposal Numbers

      i. Chief Spokespersons will meet next week to finalize proposal numbers; a list will be provided to the note taker.

This was the final scheduled meeting between the PCCEA and Management teams as a whole.