



CPFA JOURNAL

ADVOCATE · EDUCATE · LEGISLATE

FALL 2017 · VOL XIX · NO. III

ADVOCATE · EDUCATE · LEGISLATE

Formerly CPFA News • Published by the California Part-time Faculty Association

IN THIS ISSUE

AGAINST TENURISM
[PAGE 1](#)

PART-TIME FACULTY:
THE PERSISTENT
PARADOX
[PAGE 1](#)

TENURE FOR THE
COMMON GOOD
[PAGE 2](#)

THE HEALTHY
CALIFORNIA ACT
[PAGE 2](#)

IMHO: CPFA CHAIR
REPORT
[PAGE 3](#)

BILL TO STENGTHEN
DUE-PROCESS FOR
FACULTY
[PAGE 3](#)

NEW ONLINE CPFA
MEMBERSHIP FORM:
JOIN TODAY!
[PAGE 4](#)

AGAINST TENURISM BY KEITH HOELLER



In my book, *Equality for Contingent Faculty: Overcoming the Two-Tier System* (Vanderbilt University Press, 2014), I contributed an article entitled “The Academic Labor System of Faculty Apartheid.” While the term “apartheid” originally referred to racial disparities in South Africa, it can refer to “any system or practice that separates people according to color, ethnicity, caste, etc.”

The two-tiered system, enshrined in virtually every [faculty] union contract in America, creates a system of privileged “haves” and unprivileged “have-nots,” whereby the tenure-track faculty form a minority, now less than 25% of all college professors, who rule over the majority of faculty with little to no job security, low wages, few benefits, and virtually no way out of this academic ghetto.

Worse, the have-nots, often called adjuncts or contingents, are often represented by the same unions who represent the tenured faculty who serve as their immediate supervisors. In 1980, the National Labor Relations Board ruled that tenure-track faculty were “managers” and not entitled to unions at all at private colleges and universities (NLRB v. Yeshiva University). The NLRB has since made it

clear that tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty cannot be placed in the same bargaining units. (See Seattle University v. Service Employees International Union, Local 925, NLRB Region 19 decision, April 17, 2014).

But public colleges are governed by state laws, often drafted and supported by unions. While some states have outlawed “mixed units,” some have allowed them, and a few have mandated them. It is

“I think we can now give a name to the treatment of non-tenured faculty by their tenured colleagues: tenurism. Like racism, which categorizes people by their race, and sexism, which categorizes people by their sex, tenurism categorizes people by their tenure status and makes the false assumption that tenure (or the lack of it) somehow defines the quality of the professor.” —Keith Hoeller, 2014

not fair to force adjuncts, who have no job security, into the same bargaining unit with tenured faculty, especially when these tenured faculty function as supervisors, hiring, evaluating, and re-hiring and/or firing the adjuncts.

Contingent professors have lacked a name for their exploitation. I invented the term “tenurism,” a form of “rankism,”

as defined by Robert Fuller in his book, *Somebodies and Nobodies: Overcoming the Abuse of Rank*. I wrote, “I think we can now give a name to the treatment of non-tenured faculty by their tenured colleagues: tenurism. Like racism, which categorizes people by their race, and sexism, which categorizes people by their sex, tenurism categorizes people by their tenure status and makes the false assumption that tenure (or the lack of it) somehow defines the quality of the professor.”

Like all divisive “isms,” tenurism must try and defend itself as natural. So throughout academe there is a common myth that the tenured faculty are inherently better and superior to those who teach off the tenure track. This is underscored by the fact that nationwide it is the tenured faculty who are chosen to observe, evaluate, and hire the contingent faculty; virtually nowhere are the contingent faculty assigned to evaluate those on the tenure-track and they have no role in the granting of tenure, even though

some colleges place students on tenure committees.

When research suggested that contingent professors were in fact better teachers than tenured professors, a firestorm of criticism ensued. (See my New York Times dialogue “[Academia's Two Tracks](#)”).

Continued on page 4

Part-time Faculty: The Persistent Paradox

BY DEIRDRE FRONTZAK, DEBBIE KLEIN, AND LOUISE MACKENZIE

Part-time faculty are the consummate paradox of the California Community Colleges. Although the Education Code deems part-time faculty “temporary,” they are a permanent part of the landscape. Adding insult to injury, the state law does not require this 40,000 corps of faculty professionals to be paid for anything beyond the classroom hour (collective bargaining agreements can add more), and they are limited to teaching 67% of an equivalent full-time load in a single district.

Moreover, this exploited underpaid and under-supported strata of the faculty often teach the most vulnerable students in our state, creating a dynamic that no one would call a recipe for success.

While the origins of the current two-tier system between full- and part-time faculty date back to the 1960s, it was not too long afterward that the system began proposing partial solutions. Dating back to the 1970s, the system recognized that this two-tier structure had a corrosive effect on students but never exercised leadership to eliminate it altogether.

In 1978, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors (CCCBG) approved the principle of limiting to 25% credit instruction taught by part-time faculty. A decade later, the state enshrined the system’s goal of 75% credit instruction taught by full-time faculty into the Education Code. Over the subsequent 10 years, the Legislature approved measures establishing state funds to incentivize districts to offer paid office hours and health benefits to part-timers, which was followed in the early 2000s by a line-item in the state budget (meant to be the first of five) to achieve pay equity between full- and part-timers.

These efforts continued in more recent history, including a 2012 legislative affirmation in the Student Success Act linking the principle of student success with access to faculty, along with a call for more full-time faculty and increased support of part-time faculty. Last year, AB 1690 (Medina) and SB 1379 (Mendoza) successfully connected negotiation for part-time faculty seniority to student success, and this year, FACCC-sponsored ACR 32 (Medina) calls upon the community college system to prioritize achievement of both 75/25 and part-time equity.

Despite these legislative efforts, the basic inequities between the two classes of faculty have intensified with the system claiming powerlessness under the guise of the Legislature’s failing to direct specific money for this purpose. Over the past 10 years, there has been no real progress in the percent of instruction taught by full-time faculty, which today hovers at just over 56.

Part-time faculty, as academically qualified and talented as their full-time colleagues, are hired to prepare, teach, and assess their classes. Most part-time faculty offer office hours even though many colleges do not provide compensation or appropriate office space. Limited to teaching 67% of a full-time load at any one institution and paid at a rate much less than the full-time equivalent, and provided with little or no health care benefits and professional development, many part-time faculty are forced into a frenetic work life traveling from one college to another, often hundreds of miles each week, leaving minimal time and energy for consultation with students, which is critical to their success.

FACCC, faculty unions (CFT, CTA, and CCCI), and the Academic Senate (ASCCC) have a long history of advocating for part-time faculty rights, and continue to push for compensation parity (equal pay for equal work), job security, and medical and other benefits. Faculty groups are also

Continued on page 4



Please consider attending
the 13th conference of
**COCAL: the Coalition of
Contingent Academic Labor**

- Meet fellow non-tenure track faculty from across the U.S., Canada, and Mexico.
- Learn about shared struggles and solutions.

2018 COCAL Conference
8/3/18 - 8/5/18
San Jose State University

Registration and lodging details
will be forthcoming at:

www.cocalinternational.org

Tenure for the Common Good

By
CAROLYN BETENSKY



Activists have been fighting for years for decent working conditions and pay for adjuncts and graduate student instructors. The majority of these activists are adjuncts and graduate students themselves. They have formed collective bargaining units under the auspices of the AAUP and other unions, and they have created organizations such as the New Faculty Majority and Faculty Forward (which grew out of the SEIU). While some tenured and tenure-stream faculty have supported their adjunct colleagues and graduate students in their attempts to unionize and to secure a living wage and benefits—and I’ll single out the University of Illinois Chicago and Portland State University here—many have not. The AAUP has certainly been out in front of this problem, and individual tenured scholars such as Michael Bérubé, Jennifer Ruth, and Marc Bousquet, to name a few, have written extensively and passionately about adjunctification. But until now, tenured faculty have not come together as a group, as tenured faculty, to pool our ideas and strategies. Those with the least job security in our institutions have shown the most bravery in facing a phenomenon that has for

quite some time been a threat to all of us—while those of us with the most job security have, as a group, been the least courageous.

What I want to consider here is not why that is but what can be done about it. Here’s my modest proposal: let’s transform our notion of tenure from being one associated principally with the professional achievements and privileges of the individual scholar into a concept associated, in addition, with the common good. Tenured faculty need to come together, as tenured faculty, locally and nationally, to make more assertive and community-minded use of the power we still have. If tenured faculty, with the protections many of us still have, organize ourselves to advocate for labor justice in our own midst with a fraction of the energy and courage of our contingent colleagues, we might be able to make some real and desperately needed changes on our campuses.

When I propose that tenured faculty come together, I mean either under the umbrella of the AAUP or outside of it. As I mentioned above, the AAUP has been in the vanguard in addressing adjunctification, but the AAUP fights many different kinds of battles and represents all ranks of university professors. I acknowledge that the notion of an advocacy group that militates from a particular rank, especially from a rank that is rapidly coming to look like the academic version of the infamous one percent, might smell bad. Yet it’s important for tenured faculty to identify themselves and each other as tenured

faculty—not for the prestige tenure confers but for the cover it provides. There are things tenured faculty can do that non-tenure-track and untenured faculty simply cannot.

Tenured allies need to rally ourselves together nationally and locally, on public and private campuses, at institutions with or without faculty unions and with or without existing models of shared governance. Each campus has its own culture and poses its own challenges to any attempt to change the status quo.

I would love to say that unions are the answer here, but there are too many institutions that don’t or can’t have full-time faculty unions. Not to get lost in the weeds here, but there are also real structural problems at campuses where the same collective bargaining unit represents tenure-stream and contingent faculty, and other structural problems when different collective bargaining units represent them. Not every institution can implement the ultimate strategy of solidarity that the full-time faculty at the University of Illinois Chicago did when they went on strike with and on behalf of their adjunct colleagues—not right away, at any rate. But there are other strategies that can be adopted and shared in the near term to awaken and embolden the most powerful and secure members of our profession.

The first and most obvious strategy is to get people talking about the problem on a regular basis instead of treating it as if the disappearance of tenure lines were just God’s will. As I explain in my

Continued on page 4

The Healthy California Act

By DAVID WELCH AND TOM REED

As a Republican Congress continues its assault on the Affordable Care Act, the State of California prepares to join the Worlds other developed countries in guaranteeing access to health care for all its people.

Senate Bill 562, “The Healthy California Act,” introduced by Democratic Senators Ricardo Lara (Huntington Beach) and Toni Atkins (San Diego) will develop a single payer system of universal health care, guaranteeing comprehensive services for all Californians. All medically necessary services will be covered, including: routine medical diagnosis and treatment, emergency services, surgery, hospital stays, mental health services including chemical dependency treatment, home health care, vision and dental care - and will authorize the utilization of alternative health care modalities of proven effectiveness. Patients will have a free choice of provider.

The most frequent attack on single payer systems can be summed up in two words: “higher taxes”. But the truth is that we are already paying the cost of covering everyone, without getting our money’s worth. Total spending on health care in California is more than enough to finance SB 562 if redirected in that way. Today, we spend that money through numerous channels: taxes and subsidies, premiums, co-pays, and deductibles. But much of that money is wasted through inefficiency and duplication, and even more goes to insurance company overhead that helps no one’s health.

Countries the World over provide comprehensive health care for all their people—usually at less than half our per capita expenditures—and often with better outcomes.

Much of the cost of SB 562 would come from money we are already spending to

finance Medicare, Medical, and government subsidies to private insurers. The rest would come from a modest and progressive tax based on ability to pay.

Yes, there will be a tax increase, but it will replace all current premiums, co-payments, deductibles and out of pocket expenses. A clear majority of Californians’ will pay less for health care than we do today.

Health care costs will be controlled and stabilized. First, by eliminating private insurers from our health care system, and establishing a transparent and democratically controlled single payer system for financing and administration. This will save tens of billions of dollars in wasteful and unnecessary administrative costs, corporate profits, and exorbitant executive salaries that contribute nothing to the health of California’s people. Billions of dollars of additional savings will be realized through negotiation of equitable reimbursement rates for health care providers, hospitals, pharmaceutical companies, and other providers of medical equipment and supplies. Finally, a single payer system will allow us to plan the rational allocation of resources and delivery of health care services, minimizing duplication of services and maximizing the likelihood that services will be available where they are needed.

SB562 has passed the California Senate and is currently in the State Assembly. It has the enthusiastic support of rank and file Democrats as well as much of the Party leadership. Additionally, polls indicate that a universal, single payer health care system, like that of SB 562 has significant—maybe majority—support of independents and rank and file Republicans. The time has come.◊

David Welch, BSN, RN serves on the Executive Board of National Nurses United/ California Nurses Association.

Tom Reed M.A., MPA., is founder of the Butte County Health Care Coalition.

For more information about SB 562, go to www.healthycaliforniaact.org.

SBCC Faculty Association

The collective bargaining agent for faculty at Santa Barbara City College

The FA is a member of the California Community College Independents (CCCI)

Adjunct faculty Representatives

Lynne Stark
lestark@pipeline.sbcc.edu

Jeffrey Gray
jpgray@pipeline.sbcc.edu

Geordie Armstrong
bgarmstrong@pipeline.sbcc.edu

<http://fa.sbcc.edu>

CPFA JOURNAL

ADVOCATE · EDUCATE · LEGISLATE

CPFA EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

CHAIR
John Martin, MA
jmartin@cpfa.org
[1-916-572-CPFA](tel:1-916-572-CPFA)

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
Raymond Brennan, PhD
rbrennan@cpfa.org

FINANCE
Dijana Fazlic, MA
dfazlic@cpfa.org

MEMBERSHIP
Kathleen Brantley-Gutierrez, MLIS
kbrantley@cpfa.org

SOCIAL MEDIA
Carol Whaley, M.A., M.F.A.
cwhaley@cpfa.org

BAY AREA REGION
Sue Broxholm
vbroxholm@cpfa.org

EX OFFICIO
Robert Yoshioka, PhD
ryoshioka@cpfa.org

CPFA Journal
(previously published as *CPFA News*, *CPFA Free Press*, and as *Community College Journal*) is published twice yearly by the California Part-time Faculty Association.

Circulation: 45,000.

Distributed to legislators, faculty, administrators, and boards throughout the California community college system.

SEND ADDRESS CHANGES, MANUSCRIPTS, AND CORRESPONDENCE TO*:

editor@cpfa.org, or

Editor, *CPFA Journal*
c/o CPFA
Post Office Box 1836
Sacramento, CA 95812

*Email submissions preferred.

CORRESPONDENCE AND ARTICLES may be edited or condensed due to space limitations. Letters are limited to 500 words and articles to 1000 words unless otherwise specified. Letters may be published. Op-ed pieces, news briefs on union organizing or contract negotiations particularly welcome. Human interest articles and opportunities to reprint items about the contingent faculty condition are encouraged. Unsolicited manuscripts submitted by mail should be accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Signed articles express their authors’ opinions and do not necessarily reflect the views of CPFA.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES BY MAIL:
\$12 per year. Outside U.S. add \$6/year for surface, \$20 for airmail. *CPFA Journal* is copyright © 2015 by the California Part-time Faculty Association.

POSTMASTER:
editor@cpfa.org
CPFA Journal
c/o CPFA
Post Office Box 1836
Sacramento, CA 95812

TO ADVERTISE:
Contact John Martin, jmartin@cpfa.org

TO DISTRIBUTE:
To distribute the CPFA Journal on your campus contact David Milroy, dmilroy53@gmail.com

TO JOIN:
Contact Kathleen Brantley-Gutierrez, kbrantley@cpfa.org

TO TELEPHONE:
CPFA Headquarters: [916.572.2732](tel:916.572.2732)
CPFA Editorial Offices: [916.572.7732](tel:916.572.7732)

IMHO: CPFA CHAIR REPORT



BY
JOHN MARTIN,
CPFA CHAIR

Since July of this year, many of California's community college districts and local bargaining units around the state have been compelled to return to the negotiating table, so they may, at long last, honor the spirit and intention of Senate Bill 1379 (Medina) and honor the human dignity of thousands of part-time faculty. Unfortunately, it has been business as usual for most of the negotiating teams, with too few exceptions. Meanwhile, a new academic year has started and the majority of part-time faculty continue to face precarious working conditions with the promise of real job security hanging in the balance.

With many contracts still being ironed out, there is only anecdotal evidence to go off of for now. Rest-assured, CPFA will be monitoring all new contracts and there will be more updates by our next spring edition. Based on what we have learned so far, the failure of many of the recent negotiations are a reflection of the still skewed power dynamics of local bargaining units, which only purport to represent the interests of both full-time and part-time faculty while actually favoring administrators and the already privileged full-time (i.e. tenured) faculty. Needless to say, this imbalanced system continues to undermine the integrity of the entire bargaining process, and demonstrates once again the consequences of too much reliance on so-called "local control"—a naive presumption that the majority is best

served with minimal legislative directives, which ultimately cedes unchecked power to the privileged few at the local level.

Along with other statewide groups, CPFA had warned that SB 1379 might not go far enough in safeguarding job security rights of part-timers, and that this partial legislative step would still allow too much leeway for local negotiating teams to potentially make very harmful decisions for the underprivileged majority—part-time faculty. Already some negotiating teams have agreed to a seniority list defined by an arbitrary year, such as, 2015; which would mean that part-time faculty who have worked just four to six terms would suddenly obtain the same seniority status as part-timers who have been with their districts more than 5, 10, 15 and 20 years (or more)! I invite you to imagine for a minute what the reaction would be from full-time faculty if this kind of contract language was being applied to them? Their response would be all too predictable (and we would all agree with them!) this is an absurd notion of a seniority list, and it's a far cry from real job security for those who have already dedicated years of their professional careers to these districts.

Since a seniority list is part of the foundation of real job security, let's take a closer look at what that actually entails. Seniority means that instructors in good standing are ranked each term according to their date of hire, and this ranking is what ought to determine who gets offered the maximum course load (67%) first. Seniority does not infringe upon the right of the district to assign classes as they see fit; it simply means that instructors who have taught the most number of

courses at a district will be given priority in awarding courses and maximum workloads. As we have established here at Butte College, it may be reasonable to require new hires to complete an initial probationary period of one semester, so long as instructors who remain in good standing after routine evaluations may start to accumulate seniority after completing their first semester.

Below is specific language from Butte's Contract that other districts would be wise to incorporate into their local contracts in order to create a more fair and balanced seniority list system and a solid foundation for real job security going forward.

SECTION 18.1.3 "LOAD"

- Unit members have re-hire rights based on seniority for Fall, Spring and Summer semesters. Starting with the most senior member, unit members will be given the first right of refusal of assignments for the maximum load allowed by the District providing the District is scheduling enough assignments to make this possible. . . .

- New associate faculty hires are considered "probationary" until the unit member receives a positive evaluation and is recommended for reemployment. Seniority rights are not in effect until such time. . . . If the unit member's performance is deemed unsatisfactory, the unit member may enter into a probationary third term with an improvement plan outlined by the unit member's supervisor or designee. Seniority for previous semesters will be awarded after the unit member successfully completes the conditions of the improvement plan.

- The District will send to the PFA/UPTE Association office updated seniority lists within forty-five (45) days of the completion of each semester, including summer.

- ...Whenever feasible, those unit members possessing seniority shall have their preferences taken into consideration before assignments are made to those who possess less seniority...

As you can see, Butte's contract language regarding seniority manages to both protect part-time faculty and provide reasonable powers to the district; and as one of the strongest contracts in the state, other districts should be using similar language as their starting point. So far I have been informed that at least one local chapter is on the right track by establishing seniority based on the date of first hire. This is good news, but why have others not done the same?

It took statewide legislation to compel districts to finally address the issue of job security for part-time faculty, but it's going to take a lot more at the statewide level to secure the right of real job security for the majority of faculty in the CCC system. That's why it's important that you join CPFA, who is working hard on behalf of all part-time faculty across the state to achieve quality education and boost student success, which can only be accomplished by way of fair working conditions for all faculty. ♦

To read more about SB 1379, go to www.cdfa.org, [CPFA Journal](http://www.cdfa.org), Spring 2017.

To view [Butte-Glen Community College District's contract with UPTE & CWA](http://www.cdfa.org) online, visit www.upte.org.

Bill Seeks To Strengthen Due-Process Rights For Faculty

BY JEFFERY
MICHELS



AB 1651 (Reyes), cosponsored by the California Community College Independents (CCCCI) and

the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), with support from many California labor and faculty organizations, including CPFA, has passed the Assembly and Senate and now waits for the Governor's signature to become law. Aimed at strengthening due-process protections for faculty members accused of misconduct, the scope of the bill was narrowed during the amendment process, particularly in dialog with the Governor's office.

Originally, AB 1651 sought to require that faculty be provided a copy of any misconduct-complaint a college district intended to investigate formally. As amended, the bill now deals exclusively with cases where a faculty member is placed on involuntary paid administrative leave. In such situations, if the Governor signs the bill, districts will be required to notify faculty in writing of the general nature of the allegations upon which the decision to place the employee on administrative leave are based, and they will be expected to complete their investigations within 90 days.

Even in its amended form, the bill makes valuable progress in protecting

faculty, since for the first time in law, it defines involuntary paid administrative leave, and it establishes some due-process rights for faculty who are placed on this sort of leave. The fact that faculty on involuntary administrative leave are paid has allowed districts in the past to claim that they are not being "disciplined" (even while faculty are barred from contacting their students or coming onto campus), and so districts have denied faculty even minimal due-process rights while on leave. AB 1651 takes a small but important step by clarifying that even on paid leave, faculty have rights to information and expeditious process. ♦

Jeffrey Michels is President of the California Community Colleges Independents, incoming President of the Bay Faculty Association and Executive Director of United Faculty of Contra Costa Community College District. He can be reached at ufjeffmichels@gmail.com.

DO YOU KNOW A PT
ACTIVIST WHO SHOULD
BE RECOGNIZED IN THE
NEXT EDITION OF THE
CPFA JOURNAL?

Contact John Martin
[916.572.2732](tel:916.572.2732)
jmartin@cpfa.org

Real representation
for part-time faculty



UPTE-CWA – over 15,000 members strong – represents part-time faculty at these community colleges:

Butte College

Part-Time Faculty Association (PFA-UPTE)
Contact: Stacey Burks, burksst@butte.edu

College of the Sequoias

Contact: cos@upte-cwa.org

Mt. San Jacinto

Contact: Thom Milazzo, tmilazzo1@yahoo.com



UPTE fights for
part-time faculty
rights

University Professional & Technical Employees
Communications Workers of America, Local 9119
510-704-UPTE ♦ www.upte.org/local/cc

CCCI

California Community College Independents

**We fight for
part-time faculty:
PT salaries (parity),
paid office hours,
job security,
full-time opportunities,
and
fair working conditions!**


CCCI represents faculty from
Allan Hancock, Chabot-Las Positas,
Contra Costa, Foothill-De Anza,
MiraCosta, Ohlone, Pasadena,
Rancho Santiago, Redwoods,
Santa Barbara, Santa Monica,
Santa Rosa, Yosemite, Yuba

REACH OUT TO THE
CPFA COMMUNITY

YOUR AD HERE

FOR MORE DETAILS REGARDING SIZES
AND PRICES OF ADVERTS IN THE CPFA
JOURNAL CONTACT: JMARTIN@CPFA.ORG

JOIN OR RENEW YOUR ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP WITH CPFA ONLINE IN MINUTES!



Just go to the CPFA Forum and Blog, at www.cpfa.org, to fill out your membership form and pay dues online.

It's never been more simple and reliable to join CPFA and fight for quality higher education in the community colleges system.

*You can still fill out our paper membership form provided below and mail it with your personal check to:
Post Office Box 1836
Sacramento, CA 95812

TENURISM, Continued from page 1

This is the argument in favor of the privileging of the tenure-track faculty: The tenure-track deserves its superior treatment because they have won a competitive national search process and passed the tenure-review process and awarded the prestigious status of tenure. Contingent faculty, however, are often hired on the spur of the moment, and are not put through the rigorous tenure process.

Given the large number of well-qualified applicants and the scarce number of tenure-track positions, it seems reasonable to conclude that many of those who did not secure a tenure-track job were equally, or perhaps even better, qualified than the one who was chosen for the position. As for teaching competence, it has been argued that the major factor in receiving tenure is research, not teaching, at least at research universities. Contingent faculty are not supported in their research and must often conduct it in their own time and at their own expense.

But what about the tenure process? Academia's major mantra is that tenure exists to protect "academic freedom." Does it in fact do so? While it appears to grant lifetime job security, colleges and universities have not hesitated to get rid of even tenured faculty who speak out if the colleges feel they are threatened.

I would argue, however, that if anything, contingent faculty are even more heavily evaluated and for longer periods of time, according to entirely arbitrary criteria, than tenure-track faculty. Lacking job security, most contingent faculty are

subjected to far more observations and evaluations than tenured faculty undergo even in their post-tenure reviews. And contingent faculty must continually pass muster or they can be summarily dismissed for any reason or no reason at all.

I hasten to add that just as opposing racism does not mean opposing white people, or opposing sexism does not mean opposing males, opposing tenurism does not mean opposing either "tenure" or people who are tenured.

In opposing tenurism, I am calling for the abolition of the two-track system and full equality for all professors. I am in effect arguing for the one-track system as it exists in the Vancouver Community College system in British Columbia.

More than six decades have passed since the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously struck down public education based on race: "We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" (May 17, 1954). It has been more than five decades since the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 striking down this nation's discriminatory system of laws based on race, color, religion sex, or national origin. Since tenurism is the ideology offered to support the denial of equal treatment to contingent faculty, it is necessary for us to oppose it and to seek its abolition. ♦

Keith Hoeller is co-founder of the Washington Part-Time Faculty Association and Editor of [Equality for Contingent Faculty: Overcoming the Two-Tier System](#) (Vanderbilt University Press).

PARADOX, Continued from page 1

leading the conversations about creating a state-wide system and culture that fosters respect, inclusion, collegiality, and professionalism among all faculty.

How can the system remain complacent under this permanent two-tier structure? While studies affirm the negative impact on our students, the corporatized model of education finds it too convenient to eliminate a non-benefitted underpaid workforce.

Community college faculty and their representative organizations are re-envisioning community college education through the lens of equity and social justice. As the system implements best practices for student learning, engagement, growth, and success, it should also lead the way in implementing best practices for part-time faculty inclusion and equity.

If we want to move the needle on part-time faculty equity while also better serving students, the California Community College system will need to:

- Fully integrate all faculty on aspects of community college policy, including student success, equity, workforce education, and Guided Pathways.

- Make progress on part-time faculty workplace equity—compensation parity, seniority, paid health benefits and office hours, personal leave, and access to full workload if desired.

- Meaningfully address this two-tiered system in which the majority of faculty must function under unjust and physically exhausting conditions.

- Support the elimination of practices that marginalize part-time faculty so that student outcomes improve and our colleges become more equitable learning environments. ♦

Deirdre Frontczak and Louise Mackenzie are part-time faculty members, teaching philosophy at Santa Rosa Junior College and English at Santa Barbara City College, respectively. Debbie Klein is a full-time faculty member in anthropology at Gavilan College. [FACCCTS, Special Edition 2017](#), reprinted with permission.

[Editor's Note: CPFA has been working on the above issues since 1998 and is responsible for AB 591, raising the workload cap on part-time faculty from 60% to 67%. CPFA hopes that other unions and statewide faculty institutions will work with CPFA on future legislation.]

THE COMMON GOOD,

Continued from page 2

article in the September/October issue of *Academe*, "[Tenured Allies' and the Normalization of Contingent Labor](#)," tenured allies must talk about the erosion of tenure lines as if it were a problem of the gravest urgency—because it is one. And the only way we can do this is to talk to each other, privately and in public forums, about what has happened, what is happening, and what is yet to happen to labor conditions under which many of our colleagues struggle on our own campuses. It's not that merely talking about the casualization of academic labor will eliminate the problem, but talking about it frequently is a precondition for the organized efforts that will.

I'm well aware how quixotic and unsexy it sounds to try to get tenured professors

together to fight for the common good, but this is an approach that to my knowledge has not been tried. And we just don't have time to waste feeling powerless when we haven't exercised the power we have.

Folks interested in joining me to strategize, lead, or participate in any fashion should email me at carojabete@gmail.com, or visit the Facebook page and group I've started ([Tenure for the Common Good](#)). A website is pending. ♦

Carolyn Betensky is a Professor of English at the University of Rhode Island.

Reprinted with permission of the author. Original blog post was retrieved from, *ACADEME BLOG*, produced by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). <https://academeblog.org/2017/09/14/tenure-for-the-common-good/>.

CPFA - California Part-time Faculty Association

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION OR RENEWAL

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY

NAME	(first)	(middle)	(last)	()	Home Phone	()	()
ADDRESS	(street)	(city)	(zip code)				
EMAIL ADDRESS				Renewal? Y N	Application Date:	/	/
COLLEGE / DISTRICT				DEPARTMENT			

Select either **OPTION ONE (Payroll deduction)** or **OPTION TWO (Payment by check)**

NOTE—Districts with CPFA payroll deduction are:

• Butte	• Hartnell	• Palomar	• Solano
• Cabrillo	• Glendale	• Riverside	• Southwestern
• Contra Costa	• Grossmont-Cuyamaca	• Santa Monica	• West Kern
• Foothill-DeAnza	• MiraCosta	• Shasta	

Contact CPFA or your college's payroll department to set up payroll deduction.

OPTION ONE: PAYROLL DEDUCTION AUTHORIZATION:

To _____ Community College District:

You are hereby authorized to deduct from each of my regular salary warrants the amount below for professional organization dues and transmit these deductions to the California Part-Time Faculty Association, without further liability to the above named district. This authorization shall remain in effect until modified or revoked in writing by the California Part-time Faculty Association or me.

SIGNATURE (for payroll deduction)	LAST FOUR (4) DIGITS OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER or EMPLOYEE ID NO.
_____	_____

Please check one: ☐ Regular Memberships \$4.00 per Month (10 Months)
☐ Sustaining Membership \$10.00 per Month (10 Months)

OPTION TWO: PAYMENT BY CHECK: Please make check payable to "CPFA"

Please check one: Annual Membership ☐ Regular \$40 ☐ Sustaining \$100
Annual Institutional Membership ☐ Institutional \$500

Business Organizational Status IRS 501 (c) (6)

Visit our website at www.cpfa.org Questions? Contact Director of Membership at membership@cpfa.org

With either payment option, mail the entire application to:

CPFA Membership
PO Box 1836
Sacramento, CA 95812