Article 18: Load and Class Size Overview and Exhibits

Overview:

Article 18 governs a variety of issues having to do with faculty workload. AFT and the District have agreed to some changes already. The major disagreements are around these issues:

I. Current practice
II. Minimum class size
III. Workload
IV. Office hours
V. STRS Reporting
VI. Alternate assignments for full-time faculty when there is not enough work available in their departments
VII. Reopener

Exhibits:

11. AFT's Proposed Language
12. Email Sent to Chairs: Plans for Summer and Fall Class Cuts
13. Excerpts from Mission Campus ESL Equity Plan
14. Curriculum Committee Letter
15. District's Lab Proposal Cost Analysis
16. AFT's Lab Proposal Cost Analysis

Article 18: Load and Class Size Issues in Dispute

I. Current practice (18.A)

Background:
This section is a clarification of the scope of this article. AFT and the District have agreed to some wording changes, and both sides are proposing further changes.

Proposal:
Current contract language includes respect for current practice as reflected in the sentence, “current policies and practices regarding load and class size minimums and maximums not expressly provided for in this Article shall remain in force”. The District proposal removes the word “practices”, and only includes “current written policy”. AFT rejects this change.

Rationale:
The District seeks to remove past practice protections for faculty workload. AFT proposes maintaining current contract language. The parties decided long ago to honor existing practices regarding load and class size rather than attempting to include a myriad of such information in the contract, e.g. the maximum capacity of each CCSF course; load factors for specific courses; etc. Some classes must be small for reasons having to do with safety, limits of facilities, and appropriate pedagogy. Stripping "practices" from the agreement without negotiating over unwritten practices would eliminate any faculty/union voice over workload conditions.

II. Minimum class size (18.B)

Background:
The minimum class size is now officially 20 students, with exceptions for special cases. In practice, the District has generally been enforcing a minimum of 15 students by cancelling smaller classes. Cancellations have occurred before the semester starts in some cases, as well as in the first few weeks of classes.

Proposal:
AFT 2121 proposes to reduce the minimum to 15 and also to allow new classes (or classes offered at new locations) three semesters to grow before subjecting those classes to the minimum class size requirement.

Rationale:

1. Keeping classes open builds enrollment, a goal which enjoys universal agreement. The District claims class cuts are necessary for budgetary reasons. But their planned cuts will further reduce enrollment, and consequently reduce the college's funding. Even Rafael Mandelman, President of the City College Board of Trustees, acknowledges that cuts will reduce enrollment.
2. The District has been, in fact, using 15 as the minimum in most cases. A letter to department chairs with instructions for planning Summer and Fall 2016 explains that "classes with enrollment of 19-15 students will be allowed to continue." Jill Yee, the Deans of Behavioral and Social Sciences sent this letter on April 29, 2016. She included a explanatory notes, where she says that these guidelines "are similar to last semester." (See exhibit 12.) The 15-student minimum is not universal, but has become common practice over the last few years.
3. Small classes are simply good education. This is not controversial. It does no one a service to reduce the quality of education at CCSF. Administration has said they would like larger classes to increase our "productivity". Faculty reject this definition of productivity. We do not view our students as products to be turned out in a factory.
4. A new class, or a class at a new location, needs time to build. CCSF will never expand its offerings if administration cuts new classes before they have a chance to get established. The ability to offer new classes is important not only to increase enrollment, but to protect student equity. This is explained in the Mission Campus ESL Equity Plan, written by Greg Keech, chair of the ESL department, as part of the ESL Program Review in Fall 2015. Greg proposes specific steps to "address the achievement gap among Latino Students at the Mission Campus." He states: "in order for the plan to go forward, NEW SECTIONS MUST BE HELD HARMLESS for a period of three years." [caps in the original]. Selections from this document are attached here (ESL Equity Plan, exhibit 13), and the whole document is available at: https://secure.curricunet.com/ccsf/reports/review_report.cfm?program_reviews_id=78

III. Workload (18.D Load Factors: Type of Assignment)

Background:
For an instructor teaching only credit lecture classes, a full-time load is 15 hours in the classroom, plus all the preparation, grading, committee work, and other responsibilities that go along with teaching. Assignments other than credit lecture classes (labs, non-credit, and non-teaching assignments such as counseling) each have a "load factor", a number used to figure out how many hours are assigned. For instance, the load factor for library work is 0.5, so a full-time librarian is assigned 30 hours per week. The load factor attempts to account for all the preparation and extra work faculty do in addition to the hours in direct contact with students.

Current load factors are as follows:

	Load Factor	Hours per week
Credit		
Lecture & Conference	1.0	15
Lecture/Lab -- "Science"	0.85	17.65
Lecture/Lab -- "Non-Science"	0.75	20
Lab/Performance	0.67	22.5
English Composition	1.25	12
Non-Credit Instruction	0.60	25
Library & Counseling	0.50	30
Non-Instructional	0.43	35

Proposal (18.D.2):
AFT 2121 proposes to change the names of credit labs from "Science" and "Non-Science" to Credit Lab A and Credit Lab B

Rationale:
The labs in the category currently listed as "Science" are not all science courses and some science labs are not in this category. Hence this is just a language change to lessen confusion.

Proposal (18.D.2):
AFT 2121 proposes to add a category called "Conference-Lab" and set its load factor to 1.0

Background:
Recent changes implemented by the CCSF Curriculum Committee have required that all "Conference" classes be re-designated as either "Lecture" or "Lab", depending on the content. Departments are to make the appropriate changes by Fall 2016, and some changes have already gone into effect. In a November 18, 2015 letter, the CCSF Curriculum Committee informed departments that even if course outlines and curriculum had not been changed, class designations, and therefore load and pay associated with those designations would change as of Fall 2016. (Exhibit 14). Although this letter is titled "recommendations" of the Curriculum Committee, the District has chosen to enforce the policy.

Faculty teaching conference classes currently receive the load factor of 1.0. If these classes are re-designated as "Lab", load and pay for instructors will decrease because of the lower load factor for labs. What actually happens in the classroom will not change at all. This is the subject of a current Unfair Labor Practice charge: Administration has assigned faculty to continue doing the same work they have been doing, but has unilaterally cut their pay.

Departments may alternatively choose to designate their conference classes as "Lecture", which would preserve the load factor of 1.0. However, that would have the adverse effect of increasing both units and fees for students. The UC and CSU systems have credit limits for transfer students, and increasing our units actually makes some of our degrees useless for the purpose of transfer. Affected departments include Chemistry, Radiologic Sciences, Computer Science, Physics, and Biology. The Chemistry AS-T degree has already been removed from the catalog, which is a disaster for the department.

The Chemistry department chair contends that re-naming these classes is already causing confusion for Fall 2016. Faculty, students, and even the administrators who schedule classes are having a hard time knowing the nature of the classes, when two different types of classes have the same name.

Rationale:
1. This proposal makes the required changes very simple: All classes currently designated as "Conference" will be re-named as "Conference-Lab."
2. There will be no ambiguity as to what a student is enrolling in.
3. Students will not be adversely affected by an increase in fees or units.
4. Faculty pay will not change.
5. This is a cost-neutral proposal.

Proposal (18.D.2):
AFT 2121 proposes to add a category called "Music-Lab" and set its load factor to 1.0

Background:
Faculty teaching Music courses currently receive the "lecture" load factor of 1.0. Under directive from ACCJC, the College Curriculum Committee has ordered the Music Department to either:

1. Increase student units of its courses to align with lecture hours (one student unit per lecture hour). This would increase units and fees for students, and invalidate the Music major for transfer to UC and CSU. Or;
2. Re-name some of the lecture hours as lab hours. In that case, load and pay for instructors would decrease despite that fact that what actually happens in the classroom would not change at all.

Rationale:

1. This proposal makes the required changes very simple: As appropriate, classes currently designated as "Lecture" in the Music Department will be re-named as "Music-Lab."
2. Students will not be adversely affected by an increase in fees or units.
3. Faculty pay will not change.
4. This is a cost-neutral proposal.
5. This approach was adopted at Bakersfield (Kern Community College District)

Proposal (18.D.2, 3, and 4):
AFT 2121 proposes to raise the load factors for credit labs in stages, over the three years of this contract:

- Year One: Raise all 0.67 labs to 0.75.
- Year Two: Raise all labs by 0.05. All 0.75 labs become 0.8 and 0.85 labs become 0.9.
- Year Three: Raise all labs by 0.05. All 0.8 labs become 0.85 and 0.9 labs become 0.95

Rationale:

1. The District and AFT 2121 have previously agreed to work towards the goal of reaching equity between labs and lectures. Article 20.A.3.1.1 of our contract states:

   > 20.A.3.1.1 The parties acknowledge that, in reference to item 3.1(f) above, considerable discussion has taken place regarding the comparability of load factors between classroom/lecture and laboratory instruction, particularly in the science-related disciplines, that this matter of inequity needs to be addressed incrementally over time, and that it is the intent of the parties to work towards that end.

2. The State of California reimburses the college at the same levels for lecture and lab classes. It is inherently unfair to not pass this funding on to the faculty.

3. This proposal is affordable. The District supplied AFT 2121 with a hand out, “Costing of Lab Factors” prepared by Mickey Branca, as of 2/10/2016, (Exhibit 15) that gave the costs for bringing up all labs to a factor of 1.0. Based on these numbers we calculated the cost to bring the lab factors up to our proposals in each year of the contract. (See Excel Worksheet, Cost of AFT Lab Load Proposal - exhibit 16.)

4. The current multipliers make no sense. Some departments have 0.67 multipliers, some have 0.75 multipliers, and others have 0.85 multipliers. Even within some departments, labs sometimes have mismatched load factors. These numbers do not reflect a real difference in the work load. Faculty across all departments need to be treated equitably. This proposal resumes progress towards equity.

5. Load factors are intended to account for the work faculty do outside the classroom. Labs are given smaller load factors because they are presumed to be less work than lecture. This is erroneous. Labs frequently involve working directly with students, monitoring safety, and complicated set-up. The idea that labs are somehow less work is an artifact of an older university system in which higher-status professors lectured and associate professors and graduate students worked directly with students.

6. The idea that we can clearly name modes of instruction is outdated. Modern pedagogy mixes modes and blurs this distinction. Lecture classes frequently include small group work, discussions, and hands-on activities. Labs often include whole-class “lectures”. Labs often have exams, homework, and outside work, just like "Lecture". It simply doesn’t make sense to say that all labs or all lectures will be taught in one particular way. They both require the same amount of (hard) work.

7. CCSF would not be breaking new ground. All over the country, colleges are moving away from the outdated idea that labs and lecture should be paid or valued differently, and toward an understanding of modern pedagogy and equity. In the 13 two-year colleges in the Wisconsin State Community College system, 100% of them give science labs a multiplier of 1.1, more credit than a lecture. Other California community colleges are improving their load factors, and some have achieved real equity between lecture and lab. LACCD, the largest district in the state, has a load factor of 1.0 for all labs. Likewise Palomar College in San Diego pays all of their labs at the same rate as lecture. And Foothill College also recently moved to 1:1.

8. Professional societies and academic leaders agree that lab and lecture should be weighted equally. CCSF has a reputation for academic excellence – if we want to maintain our high standards we should not discount the professional advice of our peers.

   The American Chemical Society argues that lab and lecture loads should be equal: "When determining faculty teaching assignments, each laboratory contact hour should be equivalent to a classroom contact hour."

   American Chemical Society. (2009, Spring). ACS Guidelines for Chemistry in Two-Year College Programs, Section 3.2. Retrieved May 18, 2016, from http://docplayer.net/394888-Acs-guidelines-for-chemistry-in-two-year-college-programs.html

   The American Association of Physics Teachers agrees: "In computing physics faculty workload, one hour of laboratory supervision should be considered to be at least equivalent to one hour of lecture responsibility."

   American Association of Physics Teachers (2002). Guidelines for Two-Year College Physics Programs, Section L-7. Retrieved May 18, 2016, from http://docplayer.net/1551567-Physics-computers-science-equipment-laboratories-elease-time-education-college-two-year-college-travel-physics-programs-guidelines-for-aapt.html

   The California Academic Senate passed the following resolution about CTE programs in Spring of 2016: "Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the state-level leadership of faculty unions toward a joint effort to eliminate the differential between lecture and laboratory hours…"

   Academic Senate for California Community College (Spring 2016, Resolution Number 19.02). Career Technical Education and Laboratory/Activity Faculty and College Governance. Retrieved May 18, 2016, from http://www.asccc.org/resolutions/career-technical-education-and-laboratoryactivity-faculty-and-college-governance

   The Journal of College Science Teaching notes that in lab activities, which are essential to good instruction, are often more work to prepare and teach than lecture classes. The author writes that the practice in some community colleges of awarding less load credit to labs is "inconsistent with nationwide goals of science excellence and the standards set by multiple professional organizations."

   Nicols Boyd, B. Journal of Science Teaching. (May/June 2015). Laboratory Workload Calculation and Its Impact on Science Instruction at the Community College Level. Retrieved May 18, 2016, from http://digital.nsta.org/publication/?i=254738&article_id=1986970&view=articleBrowser&ver=html5#{%22issue_id%22:254738,%22view%22:%22articleBrowser%22,%22article_id%22:%221986970%22}

IV. Office Hours (18.F.3)

Background:
Currently FT faculty are required to hold two office hours per week. The District has proposed increasing this to five hours per week, with no additional pay. AFT 2121 rejects this proposal.

Rationale:
Over the past four years, faculty workload has increased, with a disturbing decrease in pay. This work speed-up on steroids, along with the increasing distrust of administration, has precipitated the lowest faculty morale in the history of the college. Yet, faculty have continued to work tirelessly for the college and for their students. In addition to the usual committee work and teaching responsibilities that FT faculty have shouldered, the past four years have seen a dramatic increase of work in areas of student assessment and reporting, accreditation work groups, and outreach to help enrollment. Hiring freezes, cuts, and the reduction of the numbers of faculty and staff have meant there are fewer people to share the workload. Instead of having these efforts appreciated, faculty have experienced a disheartening lack of respect from the administration. This proposal to increase office hours, with no additional pay is one more piece of evidence of this.

On the practical side, teachers are already spending more than 2 hours per week in "office hours." Students have restrictive schedules. The official office hours of their teachers are often not convenient or even possible for them to attend. Often they just schedule appointments with their teachers that more accommodate their complicated lives. The current structure of 2 hours per week plus "by appointment" works well. To schedule 5 hours per week would cut down on flexible time a teacher has and actually makes it harder for students to see teachers in their offices.

Furthermore, this proposal will require that faculty lose some of the flexibility in their weekly schedules needed for committee work and other meetings.

V: STRS Reporting (18.I.4)

Proposal:
Section 18.I defines load for the purpose of reporting to STRS. AFT's proposal includes changes in 18.I.4 that reflect our proposed changes in load factor.

VI. Alternative Assignments (18.J.1)

Proposal:
AFT 2121 proposes that when there are not enough classes to give a full-time faculty their normal load, faculty be offered voluntary re-assignment.

Rationale:

1. The administration is responsible for enrollment, not faculty. Faculty should be held harmless for administration's failure to provide them classes.

2. Without a re-assignment, FT faculty go under load and have to make it up in a later semester, teaching more than a normal load. This is very difficult for instructors in credit and almost impossible for instructors in non-credit, since they are already working so many hours. It decreases the instructor's ability to perform well and hence decreases the quality of instruction.

3. Faculty have many skills that can be tapped to help with needed work. Across the college, there is coordination work that needs to be done, grant-writing, and developing new pathways and certificates. Another example is the Enrollment Campaign. Faculty began a volunteer community outreach campaign to advertise the college and increase enrollment. It has since been institutionalized, and now the paid faculty and volunteers working on the campaign constitute the backbone of CCSF's outreach. We all agree that we want to grow enrollment. Faculty who know their programs should be on front lines. The Enrollment Campaign is an excellent example of using faculty expertise to help the college. If full-timers who suffer underloads due to class cancellations were reassigned to the enrollment campaign or to other useful work, everyone would benefit.

VII: Reopener (18.K)

Background:
The District proposal only covers 2 years. They would like to add a new section, 18.K, which would call for a reopener on load. Their wording ("The parties shall discuss load in reopener negotiations for 2016/2017") means we would have to be in the middle of the reopener now to determine load for Fall 2016.

Maybe they meant something different. But whether this is a proposed reopener for the for the second year of a two-year contract, or the third year of a three-year contract, AFT rejects adding re-opener language to Article 18.

Rationale:
AFT's proposal covers all 3 years, from July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018. We are already almost one year into this timeframe. A reopener for the third year would mean that we would need to start negotiating again in just a few months (maybe even just weeks) after this contract is ratified.

The issue of lab loads is not new. It has been put on hold for many years. It serves no one to delay resolution even further.