



JOURNAL

FALL 2022 • VOL XXVI • NO. II

FORMERLY CPFA NEWS • PUBLISHED BY THE CALIFORNIA PART-TIME FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Don't Forget Kashara Moore

By Kristie Iwamoto, CPFA Northern Regional Representative

Long Beach City College part-time union President Dr. Kashara Moore was fired for allegedly “elbowing” a student after the student took issue with her name being mispronounced during LBCC’s graduation ceremony on June 9th of this year (there is a YouTube video of the graduation – the alleged incident happens at the three hour and twenty-six minute mark). A Long Beach City College Board of Trustee member reportedly got involved as well. Moore was put on administrative leave, an investigation ensued, and in the end, the Board of Trustees upheld the district’s proposal of dismissal 3-2 at their September 14th meeting. One of the yes votes was cast by the very Board Member that some

witnesses say contributed to and escalated the conflict.

According to an article in the Long Beach Post News, the college’s rationale for firing Dr. Moore was detailed as such: “Despite several witnesses on and around the stage saying they did not see physical contact, the report concluded it was intentional, but then went on to say that intent didn’t matter” (“LBCC professor fired over alleged elbow incident during graduation ceremony”).

By firing Moore, LBCC has effectively “beheaded” their part-time union.

The actual legal documents prepared by the LBCC Human Resources Department, published in the Long Beach City College Viking News, state, “it is impossible to tell if direct physical contact was made,” even though the entire graduation is on video, and a camera is on Moore and the student during the time of the alleged incident (“Read the documents to the Kashara Moore case”).

Dr. Moore made a statement at the LBCC Board **Continued on page 4...**

Sue Broxholm, Skyline Math Professor, advocates for the end of the “Two-Tier System” that divides full & part-time faculty

Interview by Marianne Kaletzky, AFT 1493 Executive Secretary

Sue Broxholm has been teaching Math as a part-time instructor at Skyline College for over 20 years. In addition to teaching, Sue has been a long-time advocate and organizer for equitable pay, benefits and working conditions for part-time faculty. In the interview below, Sue explains what the “Two-Tier system” is and why she has worked against it, as well as sharing a little bit about herself, including a surprise personal connection to Albert Einstein.

You’ve done a lot of advocacy to draw attention to the inequity of something called the “Two-Tier system” in higher education. What is the two-tier system? And what are some of the problems with it?

The two-tier labor system creates two different pay and benefit structures (or lack thereof) for existing and future employees. Workers oppose the policy for several reasons, including that **Continued on page 6...**

IN THIS ISSUE

Sue Broxholm Interview.....	1
Don't Forget Kashara Moore.....	1
Should Contingents Support More Tenure-Track Jobs?.....	2
COCAL Resolution.....	2
Chair's Report.....	3
Part-Time Faculty Face Indignities.....	7

Should Contingents Support More Tenure-Track Jobs?



When hearing about proposals to fund new tenure-track jobs, adjuncts might think to themselves:

"If I could only get a tenure-track job, I could say 'Good riddance' to this dead-end adjunct gig with its discounted, poverty-level pay; limited hours; lack of job security; lack of health insurance and retirement; and the rest of its substandard working conditions, so you bet I'll support legislation for more tenure."

Over the last half century, the primary response of U.S. faculty unions to the rise of adjunctification and the decline of tenure has been to call for funding of more new tenure-track positions. But adding tenure-track positions does nothing to improve the substandard working conditions of contingent instructors. For that reason, a resolution opposing more tenure-track jobs was presented at the COCAL conference in Queretaro, Mexico, in August 2022. Improving the working conditions of contingents is, or should be, the chief goal of the California Part-time Faculty Association, COCAL, and faculty unions who represent contingents.

While contingent instructors can't be blamed for wanting tenure, it is delusional to believe that legislation funding new tenure-track jobs will make their dreams come true when non-tenured instructors outnumber the tenured by at least 2 to 1. In California Colleges, for example, if every one of the 18,000 tenured instructors were to suddenly resign, the resulting job openings could not come close to accommodating the 37,000 part-timers. Apart from the numbers, the variables of the hiring process make clear that contingents are not guaranteed a tenure-track job: nationwide competition, preference for more recent graduates and/or a bias against current

adjuncts, personal shortcomings that may have prevented being hired into a tenure-track position in the past, etc.

Further, newly funded tenure-track jobs convert positions, not people. Current adjuncts would not become tenured in place. Quite the reverse: at least some contingents would lose their jobs since new tenure-track jobs are created by eliminating non-tenured ones.

As long as faculty unions, institutions, and some frantic contingents call for more tenure-track jobs, the chances of meaningful reform of the substandard working conditions of contingents are very slim. Especially detrimental to improving contingent faculty working conditions are those who claim that more tenure-track positions is actually the solution, as HELU's pledge explicitly declares, "Expand Tenure to End the Adjunct Crisis." It is an absolute falsehood to suggest that more tenure "will end" the adjunct crisis.

Inevitably, some will say: "Why not push for both, more tenure-track positions and improved working conditions for contingent faculty? That way, everybody wins!" But that posture sustains the false notion that more tenure positions would help current contingents and provides the option to ignore their unfair and exploitative working conditions.

The California Community College Chancellor has recognized this fact. In 2021, Vice Chancellor David O'Brien opposed AB 1269, which called for the Chancellor to develop a state plan for "pay equity for part-time faculty." But such a plan, he explained, would conflict with collective bargaining that established the current working conditions. He proposed the alternative of "additional investments in full-time faculty hiring *Continued on page 5...*

COCAL RESOLUTION:

CHOOSING EQUALITY FOR ALL CONTINGENTS OVER TENURE FOR A FEW

Whereas over the last half century in the United States, the number of tenured and tenure-track appointments has declined while the number of non-tenured appointments has increased; generally, the non-tenured outnumber the tenured by at least a 2 to 1 ratio;

Whereas the primary legislative and collective bargaining response to the decline of tenure-track positions has been initiatives for new tenure-track positions, such as California's 1988 AB 1725; the AFT's 2006 FACE campaign; and the Sanders-Jayapal H.R. 2730, the College for All Act of 2021;

Whereas such initiatives do not improve the substandard pay and working conditions of non-tenured instructors;

Whereas such initiatives convert positions, not individuals; are created by eliminating the jobs of non-tenure-track instructors; and cannot possibly offer tenure to the majority of non-tenured instructors;

Whereas the resulting two-tiered faculty workplace stands in defiance of equality, creating the morally reprehensible circumstances of two instructors with similar or identical professional *Continued on page 7...*

Dear Readers,

In the past, I have always provided my "Report" on CPFA's efforts in the fight for part-time faculty rights in California. However, this time I feel compelled to use my platform to share some of the poignant reactions of other part-timers in response to the Governor's veto of AB 1856 and the widely circulated article about the veto by Thomas Peele for EdSource. If you have not done so already, be sure to go to CPFA.org to read Peele's full article and Governor Newsom's official veto message, as well as the Letter of Support that I wrote back in September to the Governor urging him to pass AB 1856 on behalf of the thousands of part-time faculty in the California Community Colleges System continuing to struggle to piece together a full-time salary.

Yours sincerely,

John Martin, CPFA Chair

+++

In response to Thomas Peele's EdSource piece "Newsom rejects second effort to make more community college adjunct faculty eligible for health care":

There is a major misconception perpetrated by this piece that has been present in the Governor's vetoes of both this year's AB 1856 and last year's AB 375.

Peele writes: "Assembly Bill 1856, sponsored by Assembly member Jose Medina, D-Riverside, would have allowed adjuncts to teach as much as 85% of a full-time teaching load, or roughly four classes a term, a level that would qualify them for health care coverage."

Teaching at 85% would not necessarily

qualify part-time instructors for health care coverage. Here's why: The threshold for Affordable Care Act (ACA) eligibility is 30 hours per week assuming a 40-hour work week. Assuming teaching 15 credit hours as a 100-percent full-time weekly teaching load, 85 percent of that full-time teaching load would be 12.75 hours weekly (15 x 85% = 12.75). The 12.75 classroom hours, with the IRS multiplier of 2.25 (to convert classroom hours to hours per week) results in 28.7 hours, which is less than the 30-hour per week ACA threshold. If this calculation is faulty, I and others who have articulated it for some time, would hope that it might be corrected, not ignored.

Also, it is patently absurd to suppose that all 38,000 California part-time instructors would somehow qualify for health insurance with the passage of AB 1856 and encumber the state with up to \$440 million as the Chancellor's office asserted last year as a scare tactic. To a cynic, the Governor's \$200 million might seem like hush money, as if to say, "Hey, here's \$200 million, so stop your bellyaching about not being able to work more than 67 percent in a given college district." Both AB 1856 and last year's AB 375 are about workload, not health insurance. ~JL

+++

This headline [EdSource article] reflects a slight oversimplification of what this bill is really about. While allowing contingent faculty to teach more hours at one district would probably result in more folks qualifying for health benefits that is not the primary reason for the bill.

...Advocates for lifting this cap on

teaching loads can list many reasons for doing so, in addition to making it easier to qualify for benefits: spending more time teaching and less time in traffic; being more invested in a single campus rather than spreading energy too thinly; and, importantly, being more available to students rather than having to run off to teach elsewhere.

There is really no reason for any cap. Many tenured faculty routinely teach much more than a standard full-time load. The current 67% cap on contingent faculty is just plain stupid. ~JG

+++

"The California Federation of Teachers (CFT) pushed hard for the bill as part of an initiative on adjunct health care." If that's true, the CFT has big time missed the mark. An 85% workload for adjunct instructors does not put them over the 30 hours per week threshold that would cause the ACA to kick in! A full-time teaching workload is not 40 hrs. per week! These are not time card punching laborers. Based on IRS rules, an 85% workload for an adjunct instructor translates into about 28.7 hours per week. Healthcare is a moot issue here! Bringing up healthcare and the ACH is either an act of ignorance or subterfuge. ~RB

+++

Last night I got a text from Gavin Newsom that started out, "Gavin Newsom here, writing to ask if ANYTHING I can say to convince you to make a contribution to my re-election campaign before our September fundraising deadline ends." Then a bunch of blather about fundraising goals, blah, blah, blah, etc. I responded, "Sign ABI856!" ~SB

Protecting, advocating, and fighting for the rights of part time faculty since 2015

UPTE-CWA

Over 15,000 members strong - representing part-time faculty at these community colleges:

Butte College – College of the Sequoias – Mt. San Jacinto

Part-Time Faculty Association (PFA-UPTE) Contact:

College of Sequoias Adjunct Faculty Association (COSAFA) Contact:

Mt. San Jacinto Contact:

Stacey Burks, burksst@butte.edu

Celeste Solis, celeste_at_sdsu@hotmail.com

Sandra Blackman, smflowers2000@yahoo.com

510.704.UPTE

www.upte.org/local/cc/

UPTE
CWA 9119 AFL-CIO

Part-time Faculty Face Indignities

A Letter to AFT1512 Leadership & California Federation of Teachers
President Jeff Freitas

By Rick Baum

I wrote the letter that is below to the leadership of AFT1512 and to the California Federation of Teachers President Jeff Freitas as a response to the indignities we part-time faculty must constantly put up with. They are dished out by administrators and even our colleagues. Additionally, our own labor union leaders impose indignities on us by continuously negotiating and supporting two tier contracts that keep us in an inferior position—a position in which we have no job security, are paid significantly less for doing the same work as our full-time colleagues and are provided with few, if any, of the benefits received by full-time faculty.

The letter focuses on the situation concerning part-time instructor Dr. Khalid Hussain based on information posted on the elchorro googlegroup. Khalid was kicked off his union's executive board by union leaders for having, from what I understand to be, the audacity of trying to organize part-time instructors for the purpose of moving in the direction of equality by improving their and his working conditions, pay and benefits.

I am a strong supporter of unions. At some schools at which I have taught, soon after being hired, I would seek out the people in charge so I could sign up to be a member and pay dues.

Like many of you reading this, I have experienced numerous indignities coming from the leadership of my own union. Recent examples: During the last three years at City College of San Francisco, some 400 part-time faculty members have lost their jobs—most of these cuts

were planned for before the pandemic. In the spring of 2021 when 161 full-time faculty were threatened with the loss of their jobs and, again, last spring, when some 60 faced job losses, the leaders of my union called emergency meetings. The meetings did not accomplish much, but no such meetings were ever called to talk about protecting the jobs of part-time instructors.

On June 8, 2022, my union's Executive Director and lead negotiator who is paid a six figure income wrote a statement for a bargaining session. It began (click then go to click here to read in full)

"We are here today because the decision has been made by the new chancellor to erode the full-time workforce at City College no matter the cost to the institution or the community she serves.... As a union representing educators, we know all too well that eroding full-time jobs is bad for students, bad for enrollment, bad for programs, bad for institutions, bad for workers, bad for accreditation, and bad for communities."

What is striking is that no mention is made in her statement about the loss of the jobs of part-time faculty—Are we nobodies whose work makes no difference?

The previous year, a one-year deal involving major pay cuts was reached, in part, to supposedly save the jobs of the 161 threatened full-time faculty. You can read more about it here.

We were told that the agreement resulted in "progressive" cuts in our salaries because those with the lowest pay would be absorbing smaller cuts than more highly paid faculty. However, while the salary cuts averaged around 10%, some part-time faculty endured "progressive" cuts of 100% because they lost their jobs even though a union bulletin had assured us that the agreement would "preserve part-time jobs" two days before the quickly held ratification vote.

Please read my letter below. It is based on second-hand information. I requested a response **Continued on page 5...**

CCCI

California Community College Independents

**We fight for
part-time faculty!**

**Higher Salaries,
Paid Office Hours,
Job Security,
Full-Time Opportunities
Fair Working Conditions!**

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

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

Margarita Martin DelCampo
mmartindelc@pipeline.sbcc.edu

Sally Saenger
sasaenger@pipeline.sbcc.edu

Lynne Stark
lestark@pipeline.sbcc.edu

<http://fa.sbcc.edu>

from the union president to learn about his side. As I write this, two weeks have gone by and he has not responded.

October 22, 2022

Dear James,

I am writing to you in part because we are about to enter campus equity week which in CFT literature is described as “a time of education and activism that draws attention to the working conditions of faculty working on temporary, low-paid contracts, who now constitute the majority of college instructors.”

I have read the letter dated October 13, 2022 from union lawyer Lawrence Rosenzweig and yourself (which I assume is written on behalf of the leadership of your local and presumably paid for out of union dues) to Khaled Hussain (copy attached). I have since learned that Mr. Hussain has been suspended from the executive board of AFT Local 1512.

I am reaching out to hear your side of the story so you can provide proof showing why I am wrong in the conclusions I have reached that are spelled out below.

I am a longtime dues paying member of AFT 2121 which is the union representing faculty at City College of San Francisco. I believe strongly in the importance of unions.

From what I have read, I am extremely disturbed by the developments concerning Mr. Hussain.

In the letter cited above is the claim that “the Guild has been fighting for adjuncts for many years” though what has been achieved is not specified. Yet, hasn’t the Guild, for years, accepted two tier contracts in which adjuncts, teaching a class for which they are as equally qualified as a full-timer teaching the same class, receive lower rates of pay and, based on a load factor, proportionately fewer, if any, benefits provided the full-time faculty member?

The point about fighting is followed by three points seeing all the problems facing adjuncts regarding their employment, their pay, and the obstacles they face for

achieving justice as the sole responsibility of the district. However, haven’t the contracts negotiated that keep adjuncts in a position of continually having to face these problems been approved by union leaders like yourself?

The last two points are about how low enrollment results in “limited opportunities for adjuncts” and that “adjuncts are vulnerable to loss of class assignments because of low enrollment and other factors” that are not specified. This comes across as a statement I would expect from management.

In the letter, you go on to write that “The Guild will continue to fight for adjuncts,” but what you are seeking to achieve is not specified. I would have hoped that you would have spelled out what is probably a most critical purpose and principle for union leaders, which is to fight more on behalf of its most vulnerable and most poorly paid members than for any other group they represent.

Instead, what is inferred in the letter is that adjuncts should expect to remain in their second-class status. That attitude is found in your Wednesday Wins October 19 message to union members (attached) in which you specify wins that include “Full-time faculty will benefit from a secure retirement that will be payable for the rest of their lives and can be shared with beneficiaries.” How could this be called a win when so many of the dues paying people you supposedly represent are excluded from this win, many of whom, while still working and who cannot afford to retire, are presumably enduring housing insecurity and on public assistance?

Had Mr. Hussain been working to organize women or people of color instead of adjuncts to achieve what I understand to be equality both as workers and as members within the union, would he have been treated the same way?

Some who are familiar with what has happened to Mr. Khaled have concluded that he is a victim of bullying, perhaps, as one means to keep part-time faculty in an

inferior position.

Please clarify why I should not reach the conclusion that by suspending Mr. Hussain and not supporting his efforts, you, as president and the other responsible leaders of AFT 1521, have done a disservice to the part-time members you supposedly represent. Why should you and others responsible for Mr. Hussain’s treatment not be expected to immediately resign from your positions?

Thank you

Sincerely,

Rick Baum

Member of AFT 2121

Member of CPFA

Ed. Note: Signed articles express their authors’ opinions and do not necessarily reflect the views of CPFA.



**Should Contingents Support Tenure...
Continued from page 2**

to lower the abundance of part-time faculty.”

The contingent faculty movement needs to put an emphatic stop to the idea that more tenured instructors help contingent faculty and confront and reform the substandard working conditions.

Tenure is not the only option for a livable wage, job security, and professional dignity. The Vancouver Model offers regularization with tenure-like job protection awarded upon completion of a probationary period and promotes the individual, not the position. The Vancouver Model is a single tier with equal pay, equal work, and job security protected by seniority.

It is time that U.S. faculty unions act like real unions and end the bifurcated and elitist two-tier faculty labor system, instead of strengthening it, and promote the equality of a single tier. In doing so, they would be honoring their duty of fair representation (DFR), which may also be their best move to save tenure.

it creates disparities among workers for essentially doing the same job which can hurt morale and create animosity. At the community college level, two-tier refers to the division between full-time/tenure and part-time/adjunct faculty labor.

In all sorts of workplaces, from Nabisco and Kellogg to John Deere and Kaiser Permanente, employees have been united in their opposition to a two-tier benefit and wage system. It's time for community colleges to join the rest of the country in achieving normal equity for their workers.

Additionally, at California community colleges there is no real pathway to the upper tier. Sadly, in our district there is not a strong record of promoting from within. According to San Mateo District's Human Resources department, only about 60% of full-time positions are filled internally. Thus,

we have many people of proven worth who have been stuck in lower positions for years. After a while many adjuncts don't even bother applying for full-time positions anymore. In fact, there is no guarantee of an interview for someone who has been working in the district for years with good reviews when a full-time position opens up. It's unfair, terrible for morale, and a waste of human capital.

Tell us about some of the work you've done to achieve equity for part-timers, either in our union or elsewhere.

I have been involved in union meetings in which part-time issues were at the forefront. I've also talked to administrators about the problems with the two-tier system and how important it is to get rid of it. I've also gone to conferences put on by other faculty organizations such as Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) and California Federation of Teachers (CFT). Additionally, I have been serving on the Executive Committee of California Part-time Faculty Association (CPFA).

I have made several trips to Sacramento with colleagues and friends or by myself, to hand out fliers to people who work in the Capitol,



Sue (at left above) joins other AFT 1493 members (l. to r., Marianne Kaletzky, Monica Malamud, Jessica Silver-Sharp and Timothy Rottenberg) at a CFT Lobby Day in Sacramento, during which they met with legislators to advocate for part-time issues—including asking them to support the \$200 million for part-time healthcare—which was eventually passed!

legislators, and to the public about abolishing the two-tier labor system for community college faculty. I have been heartened by how the public enthusiastically agrees with this goal!

According to a report by the American Academy of University Professors, as of Fall 2019, 63% percent of faculty members in higher ed across the country were contingent faculty (adjuncts and/or part-timers), compared to just 37% tenured or on the tenure track. In our District, more than half of faculty are part-timers. Colleges and universities have become so

dependent on adjuncts who have unstable, low-paying appointments, and the two-tier system has become so deeply entrenched. Is there really a way out? Are there any good models of institutions that have abolished the two-tier system?

Yes, there is a way out which would require a conversion process towards the Vancouver model.

The union contract at Vancouver Community College (VCC) in Vancouver, British Columbia, managed to transform VCC to a fully pro-rata, one-tier system: only one pay scale, not two, with equal access to benefits and entitlements such as vacation, sick leave, pensions

and professional development. In their career, faculty usually go through only one hiring process at the beginning. They are mentored and evaluated for usually about two years before they become "regularized". "Regular" status is a form of job security similar to

tenure. The faculty labor organization exhibited at VCC is commonly referred to as the "Vancouver Model".

One-tier educational systems are not unheard of in this country. In fact, we already have a one-tier system. It is K-12 which has been working well for a very long time.

How did you come to be a community college math teacher? How long have you been at Skyline, and where else have you taught?

I didn't choose this profession; this profession chose me. I couldn't get away from the numbers! When I was a child, I played school with my little

sister, and I was her teacher. She later grew up and became an engineer, so I guess I did OK with her. After high school I worked at various service jobs and office jobs as well as at the post office. At each job, I would somehow find a quantitative aspect to it.

Later I earned a bachelor's degree at Berkeley in Statistics and a master's degree in Mathematics at San Francisco State. A friend of mine got me into tutoring and then I went on to teach at Skyline College. I've been teaching at Skyline as an adjunct over twenty years.

Like many adjuncts, because of the 67% cap on workload, I've become a Freeway Flyer. In addition to teaching at Skyline College, I teach at College of Alameda, and often at Merritt College and Laney College.

What have been your favorite parts of teaching and working at Skyline?

I love working with the students, encouraging them and looking for ways to make the material more accessible to them. I believe the presentation of material and encouragement are both vitally important in teaching.

At Skyline, I really appreciate the Professional Development benefits which are the best I've ever seen in community colleges. I've been able to go to some great conferences, hear some interesting ideas, sharpen my teaching skills, and meet other community college math teachers from all over the US and Canada. I love getting their different perspectives on mathematics education. Additionally, as an extra

bonus my husband also works at Skyline College in the Automotive Department. It's great to have someone to talk to about things we encounter at school.

What would you change about Skyline if you could?

Get rid of the two-tier system and go to the Vancouver model! It would be a perfect way for Skyline to show to faculty, students, and the public its commitment to inclusion and equity. Skyline could be a beacon for the state and the rest of the country, and the "Skyline model" could become America's answer to the Canadian "Vancouver model." I would love that!

Finally, what is something that most of your colleagues might not know about you?

My father knew Albert Einstein! My father went to Princeton to get a Ph.D. in Physics and ended up taking classes from Albert Einstein. My father had a picture of himself attending a lecture given by Einstein. He always kept it on his desk when he was alive and now, I keep it on my desk! In the picture, my father is the one with the black tie pointing to Einstein's head.

Ed. Note: Not many people know that Albert Einstein was a member of the American Federation of Teachers. When he joined AFT Local 552 as a charter member in 1938: Einstein stated:

"I consider it important, indeed urgently necessary, for intellectual workers to get together, both to protect their own economic status and, also generally speaking, to secure their influence in the political field."



COCAL Resolution, Continued from page 2

credentials who teach the same classes, award grades and credits of the same value, and have the same tuition charged for their classes but with grossly different wages and working conditions;

Whereas one-tier faculty workplaces have been collectively bargained in higher education with equality for all instructors (e.g., the Vancouver Model), where all instructors are compensated according to a common multi-stepped salary schedule; perform equal work that is prorated in the case of the part-time instructors; have avenues for job security after completing a probationary period; and are granted job protection through seniority.

Be it Resolved that COCAL declare its opposition to initiatives to create more tenure-track positions which have the effect of sustaining and reinforcing the two-tiered faculty labor system;

Be it Further Resolved that COCAL retract its endorsement of Higher Education Labor United (HELU) and any other organizations that mistakenly claim that more tenure-track positions would "end the Adjunct Crisis" as HELU's pledge does.

Be it Further Resolved that COCAL endorse current and future initiatives that treat all faculty equally: equal pay; equal work; equal benefits; job security which is not necessarily tenure; and job protection through seniority.

Ed. Note: COCAL has yet to make a decision about the resolution.

For inquiries, contact:

David Milroy

dmilroy53@gmail.com

Jack Longmate

jacklongmate@comcast.net

*Don't Forget Kashara Moore
Continued from page 1*

of Trustees meeting that there was no malicious intent in any of her actions. She remains steadfast that any contact between her and the student, if any was in fact made, was accidental, and that she apologized for mispronouncing the student's name. For legal reasons, Dr. Moore could not comment directly in this article.

So why fire Moore instead of just not giving her a teaching assignment, which all districts in the state have freely done to part-time faculty for decades for a multitude of reasons (and non-reasons)? One could argue



Kashara Moore

that the district feared a lawsuit from the student if they did not publicly act. However, AB 1690 established minimum standards for reemployment rights. Could an unintended consequence of this bill be that instead of quietly not rehiring a part-time faculty member, the district must now formally dismiss them, whether warranted or unwarranted? While this added layer of due process is by and large a step in the right direction for all, does a firing on one's job history adversely affect one's chances of being hired at another institution?

Let's not forget that LBCC has already been the subject of a class action suit filed by their part-time faculty alleging minimum wage law violations. Does this action by the district regarding Dr. Moore not hamper the organization efforts of and serve to thoroughly intimidate the very faculty who will benefit from this lawsuit? What about the fact that Dr. Moore was also the principal witness for AB 1752 (Santiago), the Part-Time Parity bill, and testified for it at a hearing in front of the April 5th Assembly Higher Education Committee? She was also quoted in the CTA Educator, a statewide publication, advocating for AB 1752: "The time has come for Cali-

fornia to make equal pay a reality for educators in the largest postsecondary education system in the world. During this climate of unprecedented economic uncertainty, nothing could be more important than ensuring that all workers receive equal pay for equal work" ("CCA Making Strides to Ensure Members are Heard in Sacramento"). Could the firing of Dr. Moore be case of district retaliation for a part-time faculty

lawsuit and/or advocacy for a bill that would directly affect budget bottom lines?

Dr. Moore was the President of Long Beach City College Certificated Hourly Instructors (CHI), the part-time union. By firing Moore, LBCC has effectively "beheaded" their part-time union. The warning is not that if LBCC can do this to their part-time union President, they can do it to any part-time faculty member. We already knew that. The warning is that if LBCC can do this to their part-time union President, they can do this to their NEXT part-time union President, and every part-time union President after that. Maybe ANY community college can do this to their part-time union President, and if that is the case, then why would anyone ever step up to lead a PT-only unit again? What if this is the first of many metaphorical association "beheadings"? Maybe not based on an incident at a graduation, but in a classroom, in a meeting, or in a hallway. If PT-only units are valued, they must be protected, and their leadership must be as well.

Kristie Iwamoto has been teaching English full-time at Napa Valley College since 2012. She is currently President of the Napa Valley College

Faculty Association and serves as CPFA's Northern California Regional Representative.



CPFA JOURNAL

ADVOCATE • EDUCATE • LEGISLATE



CPFA EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

CHAIR

John Martin, MA
jmartin@cpfa.org

DIRECTOR OF MEMBERSHIP

David Donica, MBA
ddonica@cpfa.org

DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL MEDIA

Heather Emerson, MA
hemerson@cpfa.org

BUTTE COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVE

Laurel Hartley, MA
lhartley@cpfa.org

BAY AREA REGION

Sue Broxholm, MA
sbroxholm@cpfa.org

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION

Kristie Iwamoto, MA
kiwamoto@cpfa.org

EX OFFICIO

Robert Yoshioka, PhD
ryoshioka@cpfa.org

POSTMASTER:

editor@cpfa.org, info@cpfa.org

CPFA Journal
c/o CPFA

Post Office Box 1836
Sacramento, CA 95812

TELEPHONE:

CPFA Headquarters: 916-572-CPFA
CPFA Editorial Offices: 916-572-7732

CPFA Journal (previously published as CPFA News, CPFA Free Press, and as Community College Journal) is published twice annually by the California Part-time Faculty Association. Distributed to legislators, faculty, administrators and boards throughout the California Community Colleges system.

CORRESPONDENCE AND ARTICLES may be edited or condensed due to space limitations. Letters may be published. Op-ed pieces, news briefs on union organizing or contract negotiations are particularly welcome. Human interest articles and opportunities to reprint items about the contingent faculty condition are encouraged. Signed articles express their authors' opinions and do not necessarily reflect the views of CPFA.

Copyright 2022 © California Part-time Faculty Association (CPFA)