

CFA E-board Retreat Minutes
1-24-23

Present: Jaimy, Mark, James, Brad, Larry, Mira, Sue, Teresa, David, Craig, Tendai, Althea
Laurene, Kurt, Ann

Assignment of tasks:

Minutes: Ann

Facilitator: Brad

Stack: Larry

Time: Tendai and Mark

AB 1460 AND THE MONEY (Mark)

Mark reported that at the Council on Racial and Social Justice the topic came up about funding for the implementation of AB 1460. The money was supposed to go to Ethnic Studies departments that were not fully developed. There was at least one campus that did not receive any funding even though it should have received some. So it is important to find out what happened to the money.

David said that they will raise this question at the next labor-management meeting here at SFSU.

POLITICAL ACTION (Sue)

Sue reported that it is important to organize both within and beyond electoral priorities. We need a membership committee on the Political Action committee. Defending unions and educating should be our priorities. For example, AFT 2121 at SF City College needs defending. Some of our emails have dealt with CSU locals and what they are doing, which is a good idea. There will be a bus to Sacramento to take folks to lobby over the budget. It is important not to over-commit people.

CRAIG FLANNERY'S INTRODUCTION (Craig)

[Craig will be temporarily replacing David, whose last day is February 10 and who will resume his position on July 1.]

Craig is a CFA staff representative at the Maritime Academy and San Luis Obispo. Before he was a lecturer faculty member at CSULA and CSU East Bay. He has been on staff for 7 years.

Craig also mentioned that Christine Randolph wants to be a delegate to the SF Labor Council and that Catherine Powell no longer wants to be a delegate.

Ann volunteered to report on the SF Labor Council at the next meeting.

CONTRACT DEVELOPMENT AND BARGAINING STRATEGIES REPORT (Mark)

Mark reported that they met on January 10 and 11. There was a huge amount of time devoted to open bargaining in relation to the reopener. The discussion was very positive. There will be another meeting coming up soon. The importance of supporting the Bargaining Team was emphasized.

Larry asked what they were discussing in terms of salary raises for the reopener. Mark responded that no specific number was established but some talked of 30% and some about 8% plus.

Teresa asked if Mark was warmly received and Mark responded "yes," and that everyone there was open to open bargaining but wanted more details.

James asked if there was a real sea change in relation to open bargaining since it was voted down in the past at the Assembly.

David responded that what was voted down in the past contained more than open bargaining.

Brad reported that last week he had a really good meeting with Meghan O., who is on the Bargaining Team and is one of the leaders of the statewide Lecturers Council. She supported open bargaining. Meghan also talked about what to ask for in relation to Lecturer Faculty and mentioned range elevation reform and the elimination of Range A, so Brad is hopeful.

Larry cautioned that a sea change is welcome but we should be cautious.

Craig reported that in May we will have sunshine proposals. The real bargaining will start after that and that CSU must agree to open bargaining but they will look bad if they reject it.

ELF REPORT (Brad and Ann)

Brad reported that we turned our Statement of Principles into a shorter document and that we want to get endorsements of it and use it as an organizing tool. When we recently conducted a survey of lecturer faculty we got a 30% response rate, which is huge. We want to get at least 350 signers. If we succeed, we will go ahead and organize an informational picket line to put public pressure on the administration to meet our demands that are contained in the Statement of Principles.

Ann moved to endorse the new Statement of Principles and James seconded. It passed unanimously.

Craig said it was important to conduct conversations with key people on campus to get their buy-in because they can influence others.

Brad said he will raise it at the university retreat that is taking place soon and will invite everyone there to endorse it.

Ann moved to endorse the Pomona resolution [it is included at the end of the minutes]. James seconded and it passed unanimously.

Ann moved to endorse the San Luis Obispo statement [it is included at the end of the minutes].

James seconded and it passed unanimously.

Craig urged that we notify these campuses that we endorsed their statements.

JEWISH CLIMATE (Sue)

Sue reported that there was an October 28 letter by President Mahoney about a Jewish climate initiative. A resolution was passed in 2019 which was about safeguarding the campus community and about being free from discrimination, including Zionism. In other words, they made Zionism into a religious identity rather than a geopolitical view and wanted it protected even though the UN says Zionism is a racist ideology and it is a slap at the Palestinians.

Teresa said she would ask the US Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel if we could use their statement.

David mentioned there is an AAUP statement.

DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVE ELECTIONS (Kurt)

Kurt reported that the e-board needed to approve the election of new department representatives. They are:

Alexis Martinez – TF – Sociology

Ryan Moore – LF – Sociology

Michael Schweikardt - TF – Theater and Dance

Larry Salomon – LF – Race and Resistance Studies

Anthony Pahnke – TF – International Relations

Kurt moved to approve all the candidates; Larry seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

MEMBERSHIP AND DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVE MEETINGS (James)

James said we need someone to run the dept. rep. meetings since Blanca is on sabbatical.

Teresa reported we have an Organizing Committee that can take charge and she will help lead the effort

ANTI-RACISM AND SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE (Mark)

Mark reported that at the past Assembly he had great conversations with Charles and Mo and suggested we might consider organizing a symposium on AB 1460 and AMED to repair and heal after Covid. We could have it in the spring or fall and address various topics like how to build up our Anti-Racism and Social Justice work. It could be a one or two-day event.

James said that bringing Charles and Mo to campus was a great idea and he would help organize the event. We could devote a future meeting to this.

Craig reported that there is a CFA Equity Conference coming up in March and is on zoom.

SPRING CHAPTER CFA LEADERSHIP ELECTIONS (James)

James reported that these elections will take place in March or April. He talked to Brad about running for president and Brad agreed. James said Larry is retiring so he could run for Larry's position and that we should form a slate and he will draft a platform for the slate.

Larry said he would be willing to continue on the e-board as a retiree representative. Brad pointed out that if he runs for president, we will need someone to fill the position of lecturer faculty vice president.

Tendai suggested we reach out to the department reps to see if anyone wants to join the e-board.

James said he agreed with Tendai about reaching out to the department reps and also that we need a rep for Health and Social Science. He also reported that Dean Alvarez of HSS was fired because the chairs did not like him.

MEETING WITH THE STAFF UNIONS (James)

James reported that the next meeting will be on February 6 at noon. There was a bad feeling among staff over the 3/3 teaching load for tenured/tenure track faculty because they thought it was costly and that they [the staff] had to suffer layoffs as a result. The administration has started using an algorithm called Ad Astra that is supposed to be able to predict course enrollments but it is cutting courses that are necessary for majors.

Most of the time was spent discussing the plight of lecturer faculty.

Ann requested that James send out an email before the next meeting that included a list of the staff unions involved.

FACULTY RIGHTS (Kurt)

Kurt reported that the Faculty Rights Panel has been engaged in enforcing the Weingarten rights of some of the faculty. Weingarten rights refer to our right to have a union representative present at a meeting if we think it might result in disciplinary measures being taken against us.

Kurt reported that there are four regular chapter grievances.

Article 12.29 is a regular chapter grievance. The administration will not give us a list of who is qualified to teach specific courses in a department and who the courses were offered to. They say it is too much work.

There are grievances over sabbaticals because it is a broken system.

Last Friday there was a Level 1 meeting (the first step in the grievance process) about workload. Specifically, it was about the transition from ilearn to Canvas and the fact that it is involving a lot of unpaid work.

There is also work on health and safety issues. There has been a collapse of mental health on campus. Some faculty have been terrorized by students who have exhibited threatening and hostile behavior. The university has not been addressing this problem adequately and it needs fixing.

Brad reported that Article 12.29 needs to be enforced.

Larry said that given Dean Alvarez was leaving, we are going to be in a state of volatility and more violations will occur.

David reported that some safety issues have been successfully resolved.

Ann reported that some department chairs do not care if they violate Article 12.29 and consequently engage in repeated violations.

BUDGET (James)

James reported that Teresa has volunteered to attend alternate budget meetings. Sep, our treasurer, is on sabbatical so the statewide CFA folks have been helping out.

WHERE WE ARE AND WHERE WE WANT TO GO

Teresa noted that in our previous retreat we prioritized ELF and Racial Justice where we were hoping to engage in data collection. We also have an enrollment crisis.

Tendai pointed out that racial justice work places a heavy burden on faculty of color. We need to broaden participation in this work and augment our grassroots capacity. We need to let folks know that they are not alone. The department rep system is a good step. We need to bring a larger community to statewide events and influence policy. Perhaps we should have a faculty rights newsletter.

James said it was a good time to be involved with the statewide folks. He mentioned that he and Ann talked about members of the e-board attending department meetings. We should also encourage department reps to meet with their departments.

Larry said that the newsletter was a good idea. Unfortunately, faculty must go to many meetings. We should think about our narrative. Mahoney was brought here to downsize us.

Craig mentioned that back in 2002-4 CFA raised the idea about a People's University. This was a precursor to our ARSJ (Anti-racism and Social Justice) work. This engaged students. There were rallies, presentations and panel discussions. The point was to project a different vision of the university. He also mentioned we could invite Joe Berry and Helena Worthen to campus. They wrote the book on CFA titled Power Despite Precarity.

Ann endorsed the idea of a newsletter and the importance of dept. rep meetings and visiting department meetings, pointing out that labor organizing groups all emphasize how important it is to listen to our members and what they say is important to them. Recent strikes in higher education have shown that if we organize effectively, we can win substantial gains.

Sue endorsed the idea of bringing Joe Berry and Helena Worthen to campus. She also mentioned CFA could again hire Pat Winn to go around and get folks to join the union. Teresa said that a newsletter on faculty rights would be good but it was a question of who would put the letter together.

Brad agreed that we have a capacity problem. He could participate in some department meetings. Membership is an issue. It is hard for lecturer faculty to ask tenured/tenure track faculty to join CFA. He supports the idea of a democratic egalitarian university.

Teresa said we should organize a townhall general meeting of our membership early in the semester, e.g., in February.

Larry said we should have more union socials.

Laurene reported that the counsellors are going through a lot. An evaluation took place. It seems as if the university wants to do a huge shift around mental health. The evaluators decimated the counselling program at San Jose State. The counsellors here at SFSU have been meeting on a weekly basis without their director, who is not supportive. Jamillah has been meeting with them. There is less and less support for a growing program. The administration wants lots of case managers but few therapists. But that is a problem because the students lack health insurance.

Brad listed the ideas that were raised in the meeting:

- Organize a townhall meeting

- Create a faculty rights newsletter

- Work with department reps and have more presentations

- We need a communication team

- We need a paid organizer

- We need to organize another union social.

- Indicate to departments that e-board members, depending on availability, are will meet with departments to hear their concerns and let them know what we are doing.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Resolution of CFA Pomona on campuswide unit 3 employees workload (November 2022)

Whereas the Contract of the California Faculty Association (Contract) of the California Faculty Association unit 3 employees (instructional faculty) by and between the Trustees of The California State University, hereinafter referred to as the "CSU" or "Employer," and the

California Faculty Association, hereinafter referred to as the “CFA,” or the “exclusive representative,” was ratified February 3, 2022 in effect until June 30, 2024;

Whereas the parties recognize the importance of the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) Section 3561(b) of HEERA, which states:

“The Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this act to both preserve and encourage that process . . .”;

Whereas Article 20.1 a. of the Contract states:

“The primary professional responsibilities of instructional faculty members are: teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service to the University, profession and to the community;”

Whereas Article 20.1 b. of the Contract states:

“Faculty members have additional professional responsibilities such as: advising students, participation in campus and systemwide committees, maintaining office hours, and/or opportunities for student consultation connected to online teaching, working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions;”

Whereas Article 20.1 c. of the Contract states:

“The performance of instructional responsibilities extends beyond duties in the classroom and includes such activities as: preparation for class, evaluation of student performance, syllabus preparation and revision, and review of current literature and research in the subject area, including instructional methodology. Research, scholarship and creative activity in the faculty member’s field of expertise are essential to effective teaching. Mentoring students and colleagues is another responsibility that faculty members are frequently expected to perform. Just as faculty members may teach online, they may perform other duties online, pursuant to campus policies;”

Whereas Article 20.1 d. of the Contract states:

“The professional responsibilities of faculty members include research, scholarship and creative activity, which contribute to their currency, and the contributions made within the classroom and to their professions. The professional responsibilities of faculty members are fulfilled by participation in conferences and seminars, through academic leaves and sabbaticals that provide additional opportunities for scholarship and preparation, and through a variety of other professional development activities;”

Whereas Article 20.3. a. of the Contract states:

“Members of the bargaining unit shall not be required to teach an excessive number of contact hours, assume an excessive student load, or be assigned an unreasonable workload or schedule;”

Whereas lecturer instructional faculty campuswide workload or schedule is out of line with Article 20.1. a of the Contract which explicitly states:

“The primary professional responsibilities of instructional faculty members are: teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service to the University, profession and to the community” and under current workload arrangement is out of compliance with the Contract as lecturer faculty in general have no WTUs allocated for research, scholarship, creative activity and/or service to the University, profession and to the community;

Whereas lecturer instructional faculty campuswide have been assigned an unreasonable workload or schedule resulting from the following workload factors:

Under the current workload arrangement, lecturer faculty are not compensated for their non-teaching WTUs (research, scholarship, creative activity, service) described explicitly in Article 20.1 d. of the Contract as part of all instructional faculty’s professional responsibilities;

Whereas campuswide, instructional faculty have been assigned an unreasonable workload or schedule under the current workload arrangement, and are unable to conduct all their job duties explicitly stated in CBA Article 20.1 d.: teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service to the University, profession and to the community due to the following evidence of excessive workload or schedule:

- institutional over-enrollment of FTES which places extraordinary and cascading workload demands on unit 3 faculty inclusive of counselors, advisors, coaches, librarians, and instructors,
 - escalating service demands that threaten the sanctity of teaching wherein instructional faculty are forced to conduct service meetings which interfere with teaching, mentoring, advising, office hours, and/or prep,
 - escalating and cascading student needs due to the covid-19 pandemic,
 - escalating student needs and instructional demands due to transformation of higher-ed, such as increased load on faculty prep due to unplanned migration to online/hybrid learning management systems,
 - escalating demands to deliver time and labor-intensive computer-based instruction due to the covid-19 pandemic which has become instructional delivery norm without consultation and/or compensation,
- escalating time and labor-intensive computer technological service-related demands due to campuswide roll out of novel technological platforms, without consultation and/or compensation,

- escalating student mental health crises along with CPP 2,900:1 student to counselor ratio, out of compliance with industry recommendations,
- campuswide mission, vision, and values of learn through discovery (LTD) polytechnic pedagogy require labor and time intensive high-impact practices such as intensive mentoring, dissemination of student work beyond the classroom, service-learning, and experiential learning, which exceed the capacity of faculty within the current WTU assignment arrangements, and service demands,
- lecturer faculty are almost 2/3 of campuswide instructional faculty yet face job insecurity and are forced to travel between the CSU and community colleges campuses across the region to earn a decent living and are forced to engage in unpaid service, professional development, and/or research work to support students and maintain currency of teaching,
- historically marginalized faculty including disabled, LGBTQ+, BIPOC, women, and first-gen faculty experience rising and continued cultural taxation in teaching, mentoring, advising, and service due to disproportionate student and institutional reliance on their knowledge and expertise,
- campuswide payroll failures in which faculty are unpaid and/or paid untimely for excessive workload or schedule labor;

Whereas, CFA EP&R 76-36, Faculty Workload: Policies and Procedures, explicitly states:

“Variations in campus curricula require variations in the use of instructional faculty positions allocated to each campus;”

Whereas campuswide, instructional lecturer faculty assert that their ability to deliver high-quality, time and labor intensive LTD instruction and/or to obtain consideration for tenure-line positions in the current system is foreclosed under the current lecturer instructional faculty model due to the following factors:

- lack of compensation for research and publication assigned time which limits currency in the classroom and/or forces unpaid labor,
- lack of compensation for service assigned time which limits campuswide representation and collaboration and/or forces unpaid labor,
- lack of compensation for professional development which limits currency in the classroom, collaboration, and/or forces unpaid labor;

Whereas campuswide, tenure-line instructional faculty assert that their ability to deliver high-quality, time and labor-intensive LTD instruction is foreclosed under the current 12 WTU teaching, 3 WTU service, 3 WTU research tenure-line instructional faculty model due to the following factors:

- exponentially increased service demands which frequently require more than forty hours per week in department, college, and university committee meetings, preparing reports, and transmitting e communications, which requires unpaid labor and excessive workload and forecloses effective teaching, mentoring, and advising,

- inability to supervise undergraduate research due to exponential service demands which limits currency in the classroom,
- inability to adequately mentor and advise students due to exponential service demands which limits currency in the classroom,
- inability to conduct and publish research due to exponential service demands and increasing student needs, which limits currency in the classroom;

Whereas campuswide, due to the current workload and representation arrangement, part-time instructional lecturer faculty are excluded from joint decision-making and consultation which HEERA explicitly states is to include all instructional faculty, a contradiction which is addressed in the active campus senate referral, *AS EP-002-223 Academic Senate Representation for Part Time Lecturer Faculty*;

Whereas, peer institutions including CSU San Jose maintain a 9WTU/3-3 teaching load, among others;

Resolved, that the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona Academic Senate:

1. Recognizes that Article 20.3. a. of the Contract states *“Members of the bargaining unit shall not be required to teach an excessive number of contact hours, assume an excessive student load, or be assigned an unreasonable workload or schedule”* and the current campuswide conditions reflect campuswide unreasonable workload or schedule.
2. Adopts a campuswide lecturer 75 percent teaching WTU / 25 percent service, professional development, and/or research WTU workload arrangement.
3. Adopts a campuswide tenure-track 9WTU teaching load / 3WTU service / 3WTU research workload arrangement.
4. That this resolution be distributed to the President of Cal Poly Pomona, the Provost of Cal Poly Pomona, VPs of Cal Poly Pomona, AVPs of Cal Poly Pomona, Deans of Cal Poly Pomona, Department Chairs of Cal Poly Pomona, Unit 3 Employees of Cal Poly Pomona, Cal Poly Pomona Poly Post, CSU Chancellor’s Office (CO), CSU Board of Trustees, Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU), CSU Campus Senate Chairs, California Faculty Association (CFA) Statewide President, CFA Chapter Presidents, CFA Cal Poly Pomona Chapter President, California State Student Association, ASI President of Cal Poly Pomona, and California State legislators.

References

Collective Bargaining Agreement of the California Faculty Association, Unit 3 Employees, 2022-2024. The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), 1979.
 CSU San Jose, Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) Assigned Time Program, 2019. CFA EP&R 76-36, Faculty Workload: Policies and Procedures.
 AS EP-00

CFA-SLO Statement on Workload and Semester Conversion

As Cal Poly SLO transitions to semesters, we are committed to maintaining a quality education for our students. Thus, CFA-SLO endorses the following:

1. A standard semester workload of 9-3-3 for tenure-line faculty: 9 weighted teaching units (WTU) designated for teaching and instructional activities; 3 units for service; and 3 units for research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA), commensurate with established standards for retention and promotion.
2. **Fulfillment of all lecturer entitlements, with no lecturer required to teach more than 12 units per semester to meet their entitlement. At least 3 WTU/semester shall be assigned to eligible lecturers who maintain currency in their field and/or perform service, consistent with established standards for re-appointment and range elevation.**
3. Senate Resolution [AS-944-22](#), reaffirming that each Academic Program shall set the unit values of its own courses.

CFA-SLO's proposal provides tenure-line faculty with WTU in recognition of RSCA work and lecturers with WTU in recognition of service and the maintenance of currency in their fields. Reassigning WTU in this way corrects a longstanding discrepancy in our compensation.

Our *current* workload allocates WTU only for teaching and service, but not RSCA. After their first two probationary years, for example, tenure-line faculty are still required to engage in RSCA for retention and tenure/promotion, but receive no WTU to complete this work. CFA-SLO

believes WTU distributions should be updated to reflect the reality of faculty workloads.

Our proposal also implicitly challenges the assumption that teaching four 3-unit classes is equivalent to teaching three 4-unit classes. It is not. It is an increase in workload. A workload of four 3-unit classes represents an increase in simultaneous students, an increase in the total number of assignments that must be graded concurrently, an increase in the total number of course preparations per term, and an increase in the total number of class session preparations per teaching day. Such a schedule would degrade our ability to provide individualized attention to students, undermining the quality of a Cal Poly education and student success. (For a more detailed analysis, see this [2016 report](#) on semester conversion and workload by Cal State San Bernardino's Faculty Affairs Committee.)

Finally, CFA-SLO strongly endorses the related resolutions of our own Academic Senate, including the Senate's [reaffirmation](#) of faculty control over curriculum and the assignment of course units. Our proposal is also similar in spirit to the [recommendation of the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Semester Conversion](#), which last spring proposed the establishment of an opt-in 9-3-3 WTU distribution system, similar to the opt-in system established at [San Jose State](#). Like the Senate, we believe strongly in both the Teacher-Scholar Model and increasing tenure density.

FAQs:

Is this plausible?

Yes. Other campuses, including San Jose State and CSU San Marcos, have created and funded opt-in systems through which research-active faculty can continually receive WTU for RSCA work, though faculty must periodically reapply. Last spring, the Cal Poly Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Semester Conversion [recommended](#) exactly this kind of opt-in system, with a similar 9-3-3 distribution for tenure-line faculty. While CFA-SLO's proposal is for a default redistribution of WTU (rather than an opt-in system), our model shares much in common with existing programs established within the CSU and with the recommendations of our own Senate.

Is this consistent with the contract?

Yes. Our contract does not specify how WTUs are to be apportioned. Our current workload and WTU distribution patterns are instead mostly matters of tradition, with origins in "common guides" set out nearly a half-century ago in [EP&R 76-36 Faculty Workload: Policies and Procedures](#). EP&R 76-36 is an archaic document that was never intended as ironclad universal policy. Our contract has not explicitly referenced EP&R 76-36 since 1995, instead referring only generically to "past practice" regarding WTU assignments, without further clarification. Most significantly, EP&R 76-36 does not assign WTU for research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA), while our [current contract](#) clearly lists RSCA as among our "primary professional duties." CFA-SLO's workload proposal addresses this omission by proposing a reasonable revision and clarification of WTU apportionment.

Useful Resources

Useful Resources

General Resources:

[Current Contract \(2022-2024\)](#) and [Cal Poly Employee Salary Memo \(July 29, 2022\)](#)

[Chapter By-Laws \(2014\)](#)

[Faculty Rights Resources](#)

[Retirement Resources from the CFA Retired Faculty Committee](#)

Chapter meeting agendas and minutes are also available to members upon request.

Covid-19 Links:

[Cal Poly Covid-19 Updates & FAQs](#)

Semester Conversion Resources:

[CFA-SLO Statement on Workload and Semester Conversion \(see above\)](#)

[Schedule for Curriculum & Program Proposal Review \(Academic Senate\)](#)

Resources for Lecturers:

[Lecturers' Handbook \(2019-2020\)](#)

[Council of Lecturers](#)

Grievances

