

AAUP NEWSLETTER

Volume 6, Issue 1

Montgomery College Chapter

October, 2008

American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Montgomery College Chapter Scholarship Renamed to Honor Professor James Thomas O'Brien, Ph.D.



For many years, our AAUP Chapter has supported student excellence by providing an annual scholarship of \$2,000. This year, the Executive Committee has renamed this scholarship to honor Jim O'Brien for the many years that he has honored us with his dedication and many contributions to the institution and to students, his activism and devotion to the Chapter and to College governance, his

unrivaled, in-depth analysis of any given subject, his academic activities and affiliations, and his unwavering adherence to ethical standards.

Dr. James T. O'Brien, on leave from the College this semester, holds a B.S. degree from Siena College and a M.S. and Ph.D. from Catholic University. Jim has been a Professor of Physics and Engineering at Montgomery College, Rockville Campus, since 1971. His contributions to Montgomery College are far too many to list and with impact far too significant to adequately describe. Jim began his tenure at MC as the principal developer for Technical Physics courses. In addition to teaching and developing curricula, Jim has served as Chair of the department and been a major contributor to the development of instructional materials, technology, and programming. Montgomery College's engineering transfer program, which is the largest and one of the most successful in the nation, is largely a product of Jim's pioneering leadership efforts.

In addition to Jim's contribution to his discipline, many College programs that have proved to be critical to student success, such as the Advising Cadre, the Reading and Math Centers, formal assessment testing, and honors sections of existing courses, were initiated by the Rockville Environment Committee during Jim's term as Chair. Jim has been a member of countless committees and served as Chair of the College-wide Advisory Committee on Academic Computing, Chair of the Rockville Department Chairs, and Chair of the Web Maintenance Team (WMT). Jim was, in fact, the first designer and developer of the College's website.

Jim has been an influence of singular magnitude on defining the rights, responsibilities, status, and stature of the faculty, through governance channels, through his work on our AAUP Chapter, and through combining the two. Jim has been involved in our Chapter since its inception and served twice as AAUP President. For many years, he has been on the Executive Committee as our Governance Liaison to the Academic Assembly, a position he essentially created and defined. Jim has provided opportunities for meaningful communication between faculty and administration and between faculty and the Board of Trustees by establishing and coordinating regular meeting of faculty leaders with senior administrators, as well as dinners with the Board.

In This Issue

AAUP Chapter Scholarship renamed to honor Dr. James O'Brien	Page 1
Open Enrollment for Montgomery College Benefits	Page 2
Who's Who in the Chapter 2008-2009	Page 2
President's Corner	Page 3
Formulas for Calculating ESH for Chairs and Coordinators	Page 7
Chair and Coordinator Academic Year Equivalent Semester Hours	Page 8

See Scholarship, p. 2

Beyond his many and varied activities and contributions to Montgomery College, Jim holds the rank of Research Professor at Catholic University in the Department of Physics; he has been active in the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility in Newport News, VA, where he served as Archivist of the CLAS collaboration. Jim also served as a Visiting Scientist at MIT Lab for Nuclear Science and as a Visiting Foreign Expert at Institute for Nuclear Physics Research, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Those of us who have worked with Jim, in his discipline, in governance, as AAUP officers, on the WMT, on the many, many committees, councils, and assemblies over the years, have been dazzled by the brilliance of his mind. Jim is, in every role at the College, a formidable presence: the ultimate resource for information related to and in-depth analysis of most every aspect of Montgomery College. For so many of us in so many and varied positions at the College, Jim has been the unwitting mentor. He has taught us to analyze and predict, to see all sides of a question and all possible solutions, and to apply ethical considerations to every request and decision. Even when we are not the students and even when it has not been his intention, Jim is the consummate teacher.

Leadership is not defined by title or power; leadership is defined by how one influences the course of history. In the eyes of the Executive Committee of the Chapter, Jim O'Brien, perhaps more than any other individual, faculty, staff, administrator at Montgomery College, has influenced the course of our history and contributed to every aspect of the institution of which we are proud. With this scholarship we have tried to give Jim a gift that demonstrates our appreciation for the gift he has given us and that reflects his strong commitment to students and to education. ♣

Open Enrollment for Montgomery College Benefits

By Bill Talbot, AAUP Treasurer (R)

In November, you will receive a packet through campus mail for open enrollment. As the faculty representative of The Benefits Review Committee, I would like to encourage you to look through the information so you can take advantage of each and every benefit you are entitled to receive. In the packet is a multi-page explanation of these benefits. Please read this

information in your packet.

For example, did you know that your FSA increased the Health Care contribution from \$3,000 to \$4,000 in 2008? Probably not, because only 26% of the employees participate in the FSA. This is a tax-free benefit. If you buy prescription glasses, you can take advantage of this benefit. I would like to see at least 50% of the employees participate. You must enroll in the FSA on an annual basis.

Life insurance has a new vendor for 2008. There are lower premiums for regular life and AD&D.

Vision and group legal is voluntary with no college contributions.

The dental vendor will change to Cigna Dental effective 1/1/2009 with no change in premium and no change in benefits.

These are just a few of the highlights of Open Enrollment, November 7th through December 5th, 2008. Do you have questions about your benefits? Participate in the Benefits Fairs in November. An HR specialist is ready to help. Or email me at bill.talbot@montgomerycollege.edu ♣

Who's Who in the Chapter 2008-2009

President	Rose Sachs (R)	5077
Secretary	Stephanie Pepin (R)	5207
Treasurer	Bill Talbot (R)	5014
VP—Germantown	Bryant Davis	7747
VP—Rockville	Rick Penn	5182
VP—TP/SS	Jason Fuller	1348
Past President	Harry Zarin (G)	7767
Governance Liaison	Harry Zarin (G)	7767
Grievance Officer	Tim Kirkner (R)	5049
At-large Members	Dan Wilson (R)	7846

President's Corner

By Rose Sachs (R)

COLLABORATIVE DECISION MAKING

Despite the never-ending rhetoric about shared governance and collaborative decision making, the faculty has been concerned, for quite some time, about our exclusion from those processes. Moreover, in instances when we have been part of a process, such as joint committee work, with a fair amount of consistency, in the end, our input has all but evaporated. We have generously attributed this phenomenon to poor communication, miscommunication, and/or lack of communication. Perhaps, this is not about communication at all but rather about intent, action, and a departure from a good faith effort to establish and adhere to a collaborative process. The following is a rather detailed history of the work of two joint committees, the members of which worked with the utmost attention to every possible detail and produced recommendations that were deemed fair and equitable by both faculty and management representatives, only to have their findings ignored and their proposals altered essentially and substantively.

Sadly, the first example, the Pay/Progression System, was entirely obliterated and is beyond resuscitation. The Chair/Coordinator ESH formula, on the other hand, we believe is still salvageable. Compensation for work done by faculty, including chairs and coordinators, is a legitimate concern of the Chapter. Neither the Joint Committee nor faculty has agreed to the Chair and Coordinator ESH formula that has been implemented; neither the Joint Committee nor faculty has been afforded an opportunity to respond.

We have sent a memo to the administration requesting that, rather than using a formula for chair ESH that has not been agreed to by the faculty, we return to the chair ESH formula that was approved in 1998 and make every attempt to reconvene the Joint Committee to work towards a more equitable solution to chair/coordinator ESH allocation. Keep in mind that the original charge was to examine and develop a formula for coordinator ESH; chairs were receiving ESH but many coordinators were not. If agreement cannot be reached between faculty and management, we then recommend developing formulas for compensating both chairs and coordinators during the next round of contract negotiations.

Pay/Progression: A Chronology of Frustration and Loss

At the turn of the century, this century, during the

FY2000/2001 round of negotiations, management expressed an interest in establishing a merit system for faculty salary increases, and faculty expressed an interest in establishing a step system. To satisfy both of these interests, it was agreed upon and actually specified in the Agreement between the Board of Trustees of Montgomery College and the Montgomery College Chapter, American Association of University Professors (August 2001), that: *A Chapter/Management committee shall be established to develop a salary progression system that (1) permits a faculty member to reach maximum salary under defined conditions, and (2) incorporates performance factors in the progression. The Performance/Progression Committee was charged with developing a system by July 1, 2002, to be implemented in academic fiscal year 2005.*

During the fall of 2001, a joint committee was formed. The management team included Judy Ackerman (Dean-R), Dale Johnson (Dean-G), Marshall Moore (Chief Business Officer), and Lynda von Bargen (Deputy Chief Human Resources Officer); the faculty team included Rick Penn (R), Rose Sachs (R), Sandi Schuler (TP), Ellen Terry (G), and Mike Weichbrod (R). Over the course of the ensuing years, the membership of the committee dwindled due to reappointments, retirements, diminishing interest, and death; a small core group, however, remained steadfast to the bitter end.

The committee met throughout the fall of 2001 and the spring and summer of 2002. After identifying the issues, defining the interests, developing the options, examining systems at "peer" institutions, discussing and analyzing each aspect in depth and detail, establishing rationales for decisions, reviewing the system in terms of the standards developed during the prior negotiations, and researching possible consultation for review, on June 30, 2002, the Chapter/Management committee arrived at a tentative agreement, which included all of the essential components of the proposed Pay/Progression system: salary structure, relationship between salary and performance, performance criteria, timelines, and the number of years from bottom to top of scale. Only a very few details were identified as work yet to complete.

By July 1, 2002, meeting the scheduled (and contractually mandated) timeline, the Performance/Progression Committee, faculty and administrators, had developed a salary progression system that (1) permits a faculty member to reach maximum salary under defined conditions, and (2) incorporates performance factors in the progression. Yes, this story might have ended here, but it did not, and why, one may query, six years later, has the proposal entirely evaporated?

On July 10th, ten days later, the firm of William L. Mitchell & Associates was retained to conduct a critical review of the

system developed by the Chapter/Management committee at a cost of \$14,400, which was shared by management and the Chapter. We forwarded the recommendations of the committee to the consultant, along with the charge of the committee, the negotiated Agreement, and the issues, interests, and acceptable standards we had developed and provided the following directives: To (1) *compare the system to “best practices” of other institutions*; (2) *provide recommendations for fair implementation*, and (3) *develop strategies for gaining stakeholder acceptance*. In addition, the consultant was asked to consider the following questions:

- Will the system satisfy the issues and interests?
- Are there other issues not considered?
- Are there potential consequences not foreseen?

The review was scheduled for completion in eight weeks; in fact, the review took months longer as the consultant canvassed ten peer organizations. During this time, the joint committee continued to meet to refine the details of the system.

In late March 2003, the committee discussed creating faculty focus groups to meet during professional week in May so that final adjustments could be made, if and as needed. The goal was to have the system ready for the administration to present to the BOT in fall of 2003.

At the end of April, having received the *Review and Analysis of the Proposed Faculty System for Montgomery College* prepared by William L. Mitchell, the committee met with Mr. Mitchell to discuss the few minor issues raised. No substantive changes to the document resulted. Mr. Mitchell suggested that faculty and management “get the details to the principals, and then develop a strategy on presentation to the full constituency.” The faculty assured him that the Executive Committee was being kept current on the progress of the committee; management stated that the BOT was aware of the committee’s work to establish a progression system with a performance component and that the Executive Vice Presidents were aware of the details. On May 12th, the committee made minor adjustments to the Agreement; the essential structure and conditions put forth in the June of 2002 version of the document remained unchanged.

On September 4, 2003, the management team met with the Executive Vice Presidents, the Director of Employee Relations, and the Director of Human Resources; although presumably both faculty and management teams had been receiving guidance and feedback from their respective leaders, for the first time, and much to our surprise, eleven points of “concern” were expressed by senior administration. Some of the points were editorial and/or language-based; some, however, were conceptual and, in fact, mitigated the essential structure and

philosophy of our jointly constructed document. As the system had not essentially changed since June 30, 2002, it is unclear why these concerns had not been voiced before. By the end of September, when the Joint Committee met to discuss the eleven **points**, the composition of the management team had changed: Dale Johnson had died suddenly and unexpectedly, Judy Ackerman had become acting Provost, and one of the faculty members had bowed out. The joint committee met to discuss the eleven concerns voiced by senior administration. All issues were resolved at the committee level; the committee, faculty and management, agreed to only one non-substantive change.

Several days later, the management team met again with senior management and presented the committee’s resolutions of the eleven points, which were accepted. However, from that meeting evolved five additional concerns, concerns that were different from the eleven previous concerns—concerns that had not been identified one month earlier. Although the current tentative agreement was a document created jointly by faculty and management, senior management had now clearly entered into the negotiations as a third voice; thus, we found ourselves negotiating with individuals who were not at the table and who were wholly inaccessible to us for the purpose of discussion. The primary concern and only major area of disagreement between senior management and the joint committee at this time appeared to be whether to cap the number of or percent of faculty who could be issued a rating of outstanding during a given year. All other essential components of the Agreement had been accepted. Several weeks later, faculty requested a meeting with management to try to negotiate this final point of controversy; management refused to meet with us and suspended all work on the Performance/Progression System. We had gone from teetering on the brink of a mutually respectful dialogue to a wall of silence erected by the administration that continued for the remainder of the academic year. Little did we know that down the road silence would have been welcomed.

In July of 2004, what was left of the Joint Committee met again, followed by a meeting with the Executive Vice President for Administrative and Fiscal Services. At that meeting, we were able to reach a resolution on the one remaining, and singularly controversial, point: how to cap the number of outstanding faculty in a way that would protect both the faculty and the institution. Having made only two changes, both having to do with numbers, to the July 1, 2002 document, two years later, the committee again discussed sharing the fruits of our labor with our constituents, the faculty, and the BOT. The goal was to implement the system in academic year 2007, a goal that, needless to say, was never attained.

Once again, the process (a term I use loosely) came to a screeching halt. Between 2004 and 2006, the document was

passed around to seemingly every administrator, dean, acting dean, interim dean, associate dean, and, we suspect, any living or dead relative of any current or past administrator. Because not one of these individuals was privy to the committee's years of thoughtful discussion or to the rationales upon which the system was built, the comments/suggestions generated were mostly useless. The remnants of the committee continued to touch base periodically to review our frustration, now bordering on anger at the stunning lack of progress.

In February of 2006, the Joint Committee came together for yet another attempt to resurrect our system. We were all, management and faculty, hopeful, once again, to present the document to the faculty for ratification at the May meeting and to the BOT for approval; the 2007 implementation date was still a possibility. Unfortunately, the Executive Vice Presidents wanted to run the document by the deans again; as no changes had been made to the document, this activity seemed a bit curious, and we missed the close of the academic year.

On July 8, 2006, the remaining four committee members met; a brand new set of recommendations had emerged from a meeting between the Executive Vice President of Academic and Student Services and the deans. From this meeting emerged the usual suggestions for editorial/language changes. In addition, a condition was put forth that not only undermined the process of joint-committee work in general but essentially destroyed any opportunity for fair and equitable treatment that had been clearly established in the proposal. To guard against favoritism and/or retaliation, our proposal established a combined committee of deans and faculty to provide certain determinations. That structure had been (four years after the system had been proposed) rejected in favor of the faculty member's dean having the final say over the committee. And what, then, is the point of having a committee, one might ask. And yet, we remained cautiously and moronically optimistic that we could still go back to the table and that our hard work had not been in vain.

The proverbial nail in the coffin, however, that snuffed out our optimism and ended our work with a resounding thud (or was that the sound of the faculty's head hitting yet another wall?) was the suggestion/condition/proclamation (it is rarely clear which) that the Executive Vice President has the authority to unilaterally evaluate the performance of a faculty member and determine his/her salary improvement, entirely outside of the prescribed structure of the Pay/Progression System. Clearly, the notion that any administrator would have that right demonstrates a lack of understanding and/or respect for our Contract. In fact, such a provision would be a blatant contractual violation. And thus—the many years

and enormous outlay of salaried time were rendered useless and the Pay/Progression System forever lost.

I present this chronology not only as a somewhat interesting bit of history of the demise of a program that we believe would have benefited both the faculty and the institution but as a backdrop for the current decisions made regarding chair/coordinator ESH and the similar process, or lack thereof, followed as it relates to the recommendations put forth by a joint committee. The exploration of chair/coordinator ESH, although not contractually mandated at this time, is perhaps more compelling than the Pay/Progression system because in addition to being another example of the administration's dismissal of the work and recommendations of a joint committee, the action taken directly relates to fair and equitable pay for work done and hours spent, as defined in the Contract, and thus, to our conditions of employment.

Chair/Coordinator ESH: A Troubled Journey

The Chair/Coordinator Joint Committee began its work in the fall of 2005. The management team included Tony Hawkins (Dean-G), Dehlylly Porras (Dean-TP/SS), Ed Roberts (Dean-R), and Kathleen Wessman (Acting Chief Policy and Planning Officer), with Ron Liss from the office of the Executive Vice President of Academic and Student Services in the role of convener. The faculty team included Bette Daudu (TP/SS), Muhammad Kehnemouyi (R), Margaret Latimer (G), May Owens (R), and Debra Poesse (R). The task of the committee was to establish a fair and equitable formula for coordinator ESH. After trying various ways of addressing coordinator ESH, the committee turned to the Chair ESH formula that had been in effect (or so we thought) since 1998—a formula that was established with information collected by and from chairs and deans, but by a committee composed entirely of management. Although the original charge of the joint committee was to devise a formula for coordinator ESH, it became apparent that the two, chair work and coordinator work, were intertwined and, thus, could not be examined separately. Keep in mind that chair/coordinator ESH is based on a point system and that the maximum number of ESH that a chair can receive is 24, the reason being that the remaining 6 ESH is earmarked for teaching and/or performing other teaching-related activities. The 1998 College-wide Chair ESH System, which had been accepted by the administration, awarded the maximum 24 ESH to those chairs with a total of 70 points or above. The joint committee agreed to increase the threshold by three points, 70 to 73. Clearly, all negotiations, formal or otherwise, are based on compromise, giving in on one point to obtain something else; the loss of three points in the formula is not necessarily an issue unto itself. The issue is rather the loss of three points as part of a series of compounded losses, as adjustments were made to chair ESH in the course of establishing coordinator ESH—and subsequently, that the total loss of points was neither brought back to the committee for discussion nor vetted

through the faculty.

I digress from this particular saga momentarily to bring to your attention a curious occurrence that emerged from the data collection late in the Joint Committee's deliberations. The 1998 document calculated the factor definition of *Students* as total contact hour enrollment. Unbeknownst to faculty, in a 2002 document the calculation had been changed from contact hours to billable hours. For some departments the two are the same; for other departments, particularly in the arts and sciences, the two figures are quite different. While we believe that optimally, communication is defined as an interactive process, under certain circumstances, we are grateful for the one-way flow of accurate information. Moreover, we do accept, grudgingly perhaps, but accept nonetheless, the notion of management's prerogative to make certain decisions. We do not accept, however, that management has the right to change the formula upon which we are paid and fail to communicate that information. It is difficult to believe that neglecting to inform us has been a simple oversight—a recurring, simple oversight—a recurring, simple oversight—for six years.

In addition to the involuntary and unknown change in the definition of *Students*, during the course of their work on coordinator ESH, the Joint Committee made several adjustments to the chair formula as well. The chair point system was composed of five factors: *Faculty and Staff* (total number FT/PT); *Students* (total contact hour enrollment—as aforementioned); *Academic Program* (number of disciplines, degrees, certificates); *Space* (dedicated teaching spaces); and *Expenses* (department's operating budget). The committee agreed to remove *Budget* as a point indicator from the 1998 formula; those points, however, were reallocated for space consideration; thus, the calculation for both chair and coordinator ESH would be done using four factors. Allocation of chair ESH, which had been at increments of three, went to single increments. And the committee also increased the top values for faculty/staff and numbers of programs; the student factor remained unchanged. It is important to note that the recommendations for calculating chair and coordinator ESH that the Joint Committee presented to various College bodies—chairs, deans, faculty councils, AAUP—was (1) based on student contact hours and (2) included *Space* as a point indicator. As far as I know, not one of those groups, certainly not chairs, faculty councils, or AAUP, accepted the proposal based on billable hours and missing the 15 points that had been allotted to *Space*. No faculty group has accepted the changes established by the administration in which the 15 points allotted to *Space* has entirely disappeared. Those points are not available in any of the other factors; moreover, the points in the formula have not been adjusted to account for these 18 points, 15 + 3 lost in lowering the point threshold. The current proposal

that has been implemented has not been vetted through faculty.

On November 26, 2007, *Recommendations for a College-wide Chair and Coordinator ESH System*, an extremely thoughtful and comprehensive 17-page document, was submitted to the Executive Vice Presidents by the Joint Committee. The factors upon which accumulated points for both chair ESH and coordinator ESH were calculated included (1) *Faculty and Staff*, (2) *Students*, (3) *Academic Programs*, and (4) *Space* (which you will remember included the reallocated points from *Expenses*). It was also at around this time that the members of the Joint Committee discovered the 2002 switch from contact hours to billable hours in calculations within the *Student* factor. A compromise was proposed. The committee was assured the availability of pertinent data by early 2008; in fact, the data was not provided to the committee until their next meeting the following March.

Also presented at the March of 2008 meeting was the Executive Vice President of Academic and Student Services' response to the Joint Committee's recommendation, including several points of disagreement, the most notable being *Space* as a point factor. In a memorandum, dated March 28, 2008, the entire Joint Committee, faculty and management, responded to the Vice President's proposal to eliminate the *Space* factor and recalculate the formula by unanimously affirming their position to retain *Space* in the formula. Recognizing the current economic situation, the committee further suggested that the Chair and Coordinator ESH be implemented and phased in over time, beginning with approximately 50 ESH in fall of 2008. Two and a half years of data collection, painstaking examination, discussion, and deliberation had yielded a combined chair/coordinator increase of 217.5 ESH, College-wide; thus, the initial 50 ESH represented about 25% of the committee's recommendation. On June 25, 2008, the Executive Vice President of Academic and Student Services met with faculty representatives from governance and AAUP, immediately followed by the members of the Joint Committee; we were informed that the committee's proposal had been essentially accepted, excluding the consideration of *Space*, which, of course, had included the consideration of *Budget*, and the total increase in ESH had gone from the Joint Committee's recommended 217.5 ESH to 51.5 ESH.

Please note that the administration's acceptance of the Joint Committee's recommendation would have not changed the ESH awarded this fall, nor would it have obligated the College to phase in the additional ESH using any timeline that was not fiscally responsible. Accepting the Joint Committee's recommendation or some facsimile, however, would have supported the monetary interests of management while, at the same time, recognized the work we do and demonstrated a willingness to compensate us in a manner that is fair and equitable. We wonder why, particularly at a time when we need to be uniting as one

communal force, the administration continues to make choices that create ill will and that foster distrust. Thus, even more troubling, if possible, than the aggregate loss of more than 150 ESH to faculty from the Joint Committee's recommendation, is the administration's continued adherence to a process of decision making that either excludes the faculty or solicits their input, only to dismiss it. In the administration's consideration of the Joint Committee's position on the *Space* factor, discussion was neither solicited nor included from chairs and/or coordinators, those of us who actually perform the work. We are all well aware of the economy and of the prognosis for the economy. Whether or not the budget will support the committee's recommendation dictates only implementation; the calculation of fair and equitable compensation for work done is not tied to economics.

Recommendations from a joint committee represent an enormous outlay of time and energy as well as compromise from both teams. A recommendation is a package. If the package is not accepted by the administrations and/or BOT, as appropriate, or, in the case of formal negotiations, not ratified by the faculty, the proposal goes back to the table. To think that accepting part of a recommendation represents a good faith effort on the part of the administration is one more indication of the disconnect between management and faculty as well as a blatant lack of respect for our time and expertise. Ignoring the recommendation of a joint committee and presenting, not a counter proposal to go back to the committee, but rather a pronouncement, subject faculty to a further layer of compromise, essentially eliminate faculty priorities, and ultimately make a mockery of the collaborative process.

Last summer, the Appeals Process concerning Summer ESH entailed an enormous amount of time for very little, if any, benefit to either faculty or the College. A similar process has been established for chair and coordinator ESH. We believe this increasingly used practice of substituting sound policies with an appeal system, particularly one that uses the same jury that or individual who made the initial determination, simply steals time from our students by engaging us in protracted exercises in futility. Perhaps it would be more time and energy efficient and more financially responsible to establish effective and equitable policies and procedures rather than to continue to create systems that demand elaborate justifications for exceptions. We are six weeks into the new academic year, and already the faculty is battle-weary. ♣

Formulas for Calculating ESH for Chairs and Coordinators

Chair Point/ESH Calculation 1998

	<u>Points</u>
Faculty/Staff	2 – 8
Students (contact hrs)	10 – 60
Academic Programs	3 – 12
Space	1 - 4
Expenses	3 – 9

70 (+) points = 24 ESH (maximum chair ESH)

Recommendations for Chair and Coordinator Point/ESH Calculation 2007

	<u>Chair Points</u>	<u>Coordinator(s) Points</u>
Faculty/Staff	2 – 12	2 +
Students (contact hrs)	10 – 60	10 +
Academic Programs	3 – 15	3 +
Space	3 – 15	3 +

73 (+) points = 24 ESH (maximum chair ESH)

Chair and Coordinator Point/ESH Calculation Implemented Fall 2008

	<u>Chair Points</u>	<u>Coordinator(s) Points</u>
Faculty/Staff	2 – 12	2 +
Students (billable hrs)	10 – 60	10 +
Academic Programs	3 – 15	3 +

73 (+) points = 24 ESH (maximum chair ESH)

Chair and Coordinator Academic Year Equivalent Semester Hours

	Dn	Code	Department	Current Allocation Combined ESH	Joint Committee Recommendation Combined ESH
Germantown					
G	Mic	G130	AC, BA, LA, MG	22	22
G	Mic	G131	CA, CS, NW (was MT)	13	20
G	Mic	G133	AS, BI, BT, CH, ES, LN, PC, PH, GL	41	49
G	Mic	G134	Mathematics-G	22	22
G	Haw	G312	GE, HS, PS, SO	11	11
G	Haw	G313	Art, Comp Graphics	11	15
G	Haw	G314	AN, EC, ED, PL, PY, WS	25	25
G	Haw	G315	English Lang, Reading	20	20
G	Haw	G317	English	22	22
G	Haw	G318	Health, Phys Ed	6	13
Rockville					
R	Rai	R105	Biology	27	35
R	Rai	R111	Chemistry	17	27
R	Rai	R144	Mathematics-R	55	58
R	Rai	R165	AS, EE, ES, GL, ME, PC, PH	31	45
R	Pre	R202	Art	30	44
R	Pre	R250	Music	13	28
R	Pre	R283	Speech, Dance, Theatre	20	28
R	Pre	R286	GD, CG, PG, TR	30	50
R	Ter	R327	Reading, ESL, FL, Philosophy	76	76
R	Ter	R329	English Comp, Lit, Prof Writ	54	54
R	Bar	R408	BA/EC/MGT	35	38
R	Bar	R441	FM, HM	11	11
R	Bar	R475	Computer Applications	13	13
R	Bar	R476	Computer Science	6	6
R	Rob	R601*	AT, BU, PR		
R	Rob	R623	CT, GE, ID	28	35
R	Mon	R735	History, Political Sci	17	17
R	Mon	R759	Hlth Enh, Ex Sci, Phys Ed	20	27
R	Mon	R771	Psychology	17	17
R	Mon	R772	Education	15	17
R	Mon	R780	Sociology, Anthro, Crim Jus	22	27
Takoma Park/Silver Spring					
T	Pic	T167*	Health Sciences	63	63
T	Pic	T168	Fire Science	6	6
T	Pic	T169*	Nursing	18	18
T	Mat	T261	English, FL, Philosophy	48	48
T	Mat	T262	AN, EC, HS, PS, SO	13	13
T	Mat	T262B	ED, MH, PL, PY	19	19
T	Mat	T263	DN, FL, MU, SP, TH	6	11
T	Mat	T264	AR, IS	9	15
T	Por	T360	Bus, Mgmt, Info Sci	25	25
T	Por	T362	BI	22	27
T	Por	T364	AS, CH, GE, GL, PH, PC	19	25
T	Por	T365	Mathematics-T	18	20
TOTAL				996	1162

*Department excluded from calculation due to accreditation or other external certification requirement.