



A Union of Professionals

ALTERNATIVES TO THE FACE PROTOTYPE

The FACE prototype legislation is just that—a prototype which illustrates how the different pieces of the FACE concept can be fully implemented. It is up to you—state and local elected leaders and staff—to craft a FACE bill that works for your state and serves your interests.

In real life, dozens of factors can “interfere” with the feasibility of the prototype. For one thing, state law, or the nature of existing bargaining agreements, or the percentage of contingent faculty in the state (as well as where and what they teach) can be critical in determining what makes a FACE bill “right” for a particular state at a particular time. Likewise, the mix of different kinds of institutions in the state, the state’s political makeup, the legislature’s history of working with its public institutions, the state budget situation—all of these will also shape the legislative proposal.

In that spirit, after a year of working with AFT affiliates on FACE legislation, as well as consultations with each higher education constituency, we now have some alternative options to offer. We hope you find these helpful. As always, the national AFT Higher Education staff will be happy to help you—including in person if necessary—anytime during the process.

Options

1. The “Full FACE” prototype legislation can be broken down into easier-to-swallow pieces. The FACE model encompasses a wide variety of steps to be taken over a five year period to fully reverse the academic staffing crisis. This has the virtue of being comprehensive—and is the type of bill introduced most often in 2007. However, a five year bill also carries a five year price tag which, in some cases, may be too large for the legislature to swallow.

A different option would be to break down the Full FACE bill into year-by-year legislation. For example, instead of asking the legislature to pass a five year bill to achieve a 75% percent ratio of classes taught by full-time tenure or tenure-track faculty, you could ask the legislature to enact a one year bill—a FACE 2008 bill—that only calls on colleges to reach whatever staffing percentage makes sense to you as a one-year goal. You might, if you choose, set different ratios for two-year and four-year institutions. Another option would be to set an institution-wide staffing goal rather than the department-by-department goal in the Full FACE bill.

The five-year goal of compensation parity for contingent faculty and instructors can also be broken into one-year pieces of legislation. For example, you might ask the legislature to enact a FACE 2008 bill that brought you 20% toward the goal of full equity or whatever percentage you consider feasible. Alternatively, you could choose to focus your 2008 FACE bill on a particular aspect of contingent inequity—such as pro rata pay, healthcare, pensions, or consideration for tenure-track positions—rather than trying to attack everything at once. ***However, it is important to remember that, no matter how broadly or narrowly you choose to focus your FACE bill, the bill should include a provision of***

the bill for contingent equity and a provision for restoring full-time tenured lines in order to keep all elements of the faculty united behind the measure.

2. The period of time for achieving Full FACE goals could be altered to any period that you believe would make it more palatable. For example, the Full FACE prototype calls for the achievement of all program goals within five years. Lengthening that time is one way to make the bill less expensive, if you so wish.

3. The growth of full-time tenured faculty in the Full FACE bill can be altered. The model calls for 75% of classes in each department to be taught by full-time tenured faculty by the end of a five year period. You could, for example, set another goal—65% or 70% over whatever period of years works for you. As noted earlier, you could set different staffing goals for two-year and four-year institutions. The increase in classes taught by full-time tenured faculty could be reflected in an absolute number of new positions rather than a percentage.

4. The definition of pay equity for contingent instructors could be altered to reflect your perspective of what is feasible and the best definition of equity in your particular circumstances. (The Full FACE bill leaves the definition of equity up to the institution.) As noted earlier, if you chose to develop a one-year bill rather than a multi-year Full FACE bill, you might choose to pursue one aspect of equity rather than another in any given year—for example, pay equity or pension equity or health benefit equity.

5. The funding mechanism in the Full FACE bill can be altered. The Full FACE bill calls for the creation of a fund to support equity and job restoration. *We strongly recommend that this be part of whatever bill you put forward.* However, the trigger could be altered. One possibility would be to activate the funding mechanism only when a particular appropriation level or staffing level has been reached which helps protect current employees.