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The California Faculty Association is the exclusive collective bargaining representative for the California State University faculty, including tenure-track faculty, lecturers, librarians, counselors and coaches.

According to the CFA Bylaws, last revised October 2003...

The CFA is established to:

• Strengthen the cause of higher education for the public good;
• Promote and maintain the standards and ideals of the profession;
• Provide a democratic voice for academic employees;
• Provide legislative advocacy;
• Maintain collective bargaining agreements covering salaries, working conditions, and other items and conditions of employment.

These agreements shall seek to:

a. Obtain explicit guarantees of academic freedom, tenure, and academic due process;
• b. Create orderly and clear procedures for prompt consideration of problems and grievances;
• c. Promote and protect the professional and economic interests of CFA and all bargaining unit members and,
• d. Promote unity among academic employees and thereby enhance
ACTION FOR THE FUTURE

- Massive number of protests against cuts
- CFA calls for nation to recommit to funding public education

Story page 4
March 4 actions highlight harm of funding cuts

By Brian Ferguson
Managing Editor

CFA and those who support public education reached a high point this spring in the fight to return public education to the people.

All over California and the nation, and even across the sea in France and in the Philippines, students stood shoulder-to-shoulder with faculty members, educators and supporters of all stripes to proclaim that budget cuts to education must cease.

In total, CFA members put on 31 events ranging from rallies and teach-ins to full scale marches and protests during the “National Day of Action for Public Education.”

These events were among hundreds in 32 other states, including Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas and Washington (state).

But the movement didn’t stop there. Solidarity strikes were called.

Dispatches from the front lines

A brief overview of the campus events and regional rallies that took place March 4, 2010

Bakersfield: About 600 faculty and students held a rally for “Keeping the Doors Open” that attracted strong regional media attention. After the speeches, the ralliers signed letters to lawmakers advocating more funding for public higher education.

Channel Islands: After a rally at Broome Library, where CFA members, students, and staff heard speakers advocate for increased CSU funding, people with banners and signs boarded a bus bound for the San Fernando Valley Regional action at CSU Northridge.

Chico: CFA held an 8 am send-off rally on campus for people who rode the bus with a giant “Charlie” puppet to the “Educate the State” action at the State Capitol. Chico’s March 4 action was followed by a large campus rally on March 10 with nearly 1,000 students and faculty members.

Domínguez Hills: Students and CFA members staged a midday “All Aboard the Fast Track to Graduation” train on a main walkway with games and “Action Tables” about public education costs, access and quality. Then, they traveled to regional actions at Wilson High School in Long Beach and in downtown Los Angeles.

East Bay: The day started at 5 am when student intern Courtney Symonds and others did live TV interviews on campus.

Continued on Page 12
Dear Colleagues,

For several years now the profile of public higher education has been on the rise. The March 4 Day of Action for Public Education represented a high point. It was an amazing outpouring of unity among all the segments of education and our allies who support reinvestment in all of public education—pre-K through Ph.D.

The March 4 actions took place at hundreds of schools and public places. CFA alone turned out 35,000 faculty, students, staff and allies up and down the state. And our message—fund public education pre-K through Ph.D.—resonated across the country; actions were held in 33 other states, and around the world.

The work we have been doing for years in many arenas has moved us to a tipping point. In January, for the first time in anyone’s memory, the governor, in his State of the State address, gave higher education a position of importance in his remarks. Not a week later, he went on to recommend a small down payment of $305 million on what is owed to the CSU after years of deep cuts.

The profile of public higher education also is rising at the State Capitol. At his March 3 inauguration, John Perez, the first openly gay Speaker of the Assembly, singled out higher education as an important priority for the state.

The next day, on March 4, State Senate Pro Tem Darrell Steinberg worked his way to the podium in front of the Capitol and told the assembled demonstrators, “You have already made a huge difference. You have already changed the debate, but there is a long way to go. Let this be the year that we begin restor-

Imagine it. Just since January the top three political leaders of state government openly talked about the importance of public higher education in California.

In addition to capturing the attention of our political leaders, the organizing for March 4 showed that we can build coalitions with our brothers and sisters in all segments of the education community. As I told the crowds in Sacramento and San Francisco, it was a historic day. It was the largest demonstration of public support for public education in the history of California. Instead of being divided from one another, all of public education stood together.

From Humboldt to San Diego—on all 23 campuses—we sent a clear public message that we are prepared to fight for the future of our state. Most importantly we sent the message that we intend to fill the leadership gap by being our own leaders!

Massive news coverage of March 4

The response of the news media was mind-boggling. We got calls from nearly every outlet imaginable, and we were ready for them. On many campuses more than one hardy soul was up at 5 am to meet the TV cameras on campus and talk—coherently and passionately—about the meaning of March 4.

At each event, faculty and staff members took their media assignments to heart. They articulately delivered the message that public education is in dire need of public support.

There were several national media high points. At 6:45 am on March 4, with intern Honora Keller in San Francisco and me in Sacramento, we went live on CNN morning news. Colleagues and affiliates from all over the country and around the world (a CFA staff member’s dad saw us in India) knew CFA was a key player in the success of March 4.

The second national media high point came later that day when MSNBC’s Ed Show did an entire segment on the day’s nationwide events for public education. It was amazing to see and hear the extent to which our viewpoints informed the report. Our message about the role of public higher education in a successful society is getting across.

March 4 launched our movement. Now it is up to us to make sure that we do the work needed to achieve our goals.

Next: Keep alive the $305M

We have three main objectives that will be critical to protecting public higher education for all the people of California...

• Improve the CSU budget
• Bargain our contracts
• Stave off negative attacks on academics

The latter objective alludes to policy initiatives coming from the CSU’s executive offices known as “Deliverology,” “prioritization,”

Continued on Page 6
“restructuring,” “re-engineering” and other code words for retrograde program cuts and market-styled education policies. That is addressed in depth in this magazine, including in a review of the book by Michael Barber who coined the term “Deliverology.”

Many of us know from bitter experience that budget cuts combined with deliverology-style initiatives have taken a deep toll on our campuses. CFA’s Equity Conference in March examined the disproportionate cost to underrepresented communities. Staggering fee increases, tens of thousands of qualified students excluded from access to the CSU, policies that require students to live in costly dormitories, declarations of “impaction,” limits on the numbers of students admitted from campus “service areas,” threatened changes to successful remediation programs. All of these slam the door to opportunity on the poor and students of color.

And so, we must use the momentum of March 4 to ensure that we keep the $305 million in the budget for the CSU.

While we all know that this money will not fill the gaping $1 billion hole that has been created in our budget in the last three years, next year it could be used to pay for 48,000 additional courses for our students. That would be an important down payment toward rebuilding our crumbling CSU system.

But this money is far from a sure thing. As Sen. Darrell Steinberg pointed out on March 4 – “there is still a long way to go” at the Capitol before we get to the final decision about CSU funding for the next academic year.

Our work from now through the end of the budget process—however long it takes—will be to do everything we can to keep all or as much as possible of the $305 million in the final state budget.

In the wake of March 4, faculty members prepared for lobby visits to members of the state legislature. We have to make sure that our Legislators know that March 4 was not a “one day wonder” and that they must commit to funding education in general and the CSU in particular. I urge you to join in that work. Contact your campus CFA chapter and indicate your willingness to help out.

‘May Revise’ coming right up

In addition to lobbying, we will have other opportunities for action building up to a key date in the budget decision-making process—

It is vital that everyone recognize that our success in organizing for March 4, and our ability to continue to build our strength will translate into power at the bargaining table.

Next steps

We have the attention of the public. Let’s drive the message home! Please study the CFA White Papers and other documents that help us critique regressive initiatives like “deliverology,” which also goes by other names and incorporates GE redesign, program elimination, Early Start (cuts to remediation), and the so-called “Graduation Initiative.”

These initiatives, combined with the 40,000-plus students who are being turned away from the CSU threaten access to, equity in, and quality of education on our campuses. These ideas are flowing top-down and CSU administrators have uniformly excluded input from the faculty and students.

I know that some of you have already been involved in resisting these destructive efforts on your campuses and at the CSU Board of Trustees. Those who are fighting against poorly considered changes to remediation are doing a fantastic job of educating the Trustees about...
Feeling empowered
Faculty support in 23 campus visits strengthens bargaining team

By John Travis
Political Science, Humboldt
Chair, CFA Bargaining Team

Nearly all faculty members in the CSU realize that the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between CFA and the CSU Board of Trustees expires on June 30 this year. Union officers and members of the bargaining team visited all 23 campuses last fall to discuss the expiration.

Much of the focus in these meetings was on the context surrounding the CSU in 2010, especially the depressed economic conditions of the state and nation. Because of the reductions in funding to the CSU over the past several years, many suggested the possibility of extending the contract for a year in order to concentrate on political activities on which we could cooperate with the chancellor and Trustees in securing a partially restorative budget.

CFA approached the chancellor with this idea, but he refused.

We gained a great deal of material from those fall visits, and collected a number of ideas concerning CFA’s bargaining positions. CFA also recently concluded an online bargaining survey. Nearly 3,500 CFA members filled out the surveys, providing direction to the Bargaining Team and to the Contract Development/Bargaining Strategy Committee.

First in the bargaining process is the exchange of public notice, known as “sunshine” proposals. Either party can propose changes to any of the 41 articles in the CBA.

Among the top priorities of the CFA Bargaining Team will be to oppose any “take backs” put on the table by the administration. That is, we must be vigilant in protecting against attempts to weaken advances we have made in past contracts. The Team also, of course, will seek to improve the working and financial conditions of members of the bargaining unit.

No one should think that successor contract negotiations will be easy this year. The administration’s continued anti-labor attitudes and actions in a fiscally challenged environment will test our commitment and resolve. But the union’s leadership is hardened and experienced. With the support of the membership throughout our 23 campuses, we will succeed.
Affirmative action in a time of economic crisis
U.S. Labor Secretary Solis, other dignitaries, address CFA conference

LOS ANGELES — At the CFA Equity Conference 2010, participants from the 23 campuses took their two days of work seriously.

“I saw people really engaged in this important work and bringing their own focus to it. Each caucus and workshop had people engaged in very important discussion,” said Cecil Canton who chairs the CFA Council on Affirmative Action (CAA), which hosted the conference. He added, “Undoubtedly, the active involvement of the caucuses in designing the conference program contributed to its success.”

The Equity Conference, which is held every two or three years, allows CFA members to network and learn with others through the seven CAA caucuses and to get information in plenary so that the conference outcomes can add ideas for CFA’s work. Outcomes include recommendations for CFA’s legislative program, building community alliances and bargaining the faculty contract.

A highlight this year, one that lent a new stature to all of CFA as well as to the Equity Conference, was a keynote address by U.S. Secretary of Labor Hilda L. Solis, a graduate of Cal Poly Pomona. She spoke and answered audience questions on Saturday. The Secretary reminded participants of the university’s importance in shaping individual lives that build stronger communities, states, country and world. At the conclusion of her presentation she spent several minutes greeting and taking photos with CFA members and students.

Other speakers at various plenaries on aspects of affirmative action in the CSU included Alice Huffman, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Cindy Marota, San Jose State Employment Accommodations Resource Center; Vincent Pan, Chinese for Affirmative Action; Nancy Ramírez, Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund; Peggy Shorey, AFL-CIO Pride at Work; and CFA president Lillian Taiz.

The conference ended with a lively discussion with Patricia Gándara and Gary Orfield, the co-directors of the UCLA Civil Rights Project (CRP). CFA is working with the CRP to study ways in which the civil rights of students have been affected by budget cuts.

The Conference co-chairs were Charles Toombs of San Diego State and José Cintrón of CSU Sacramento. They were joined in their work by several faculty members including Rita Ledesma of Cal State Los Angeles, who helped schedule Secretary Solis. CFA staff Audrena Redmond was overall coordinator. CFA staff David Berman provided staging expertise for the presentation by Secretary Solis.

Canton mused that CFA as a whole is strengthened by the conference: “A lot of people had never been to a CFA statewide meeting or conference before. They showed up and wanting to get engaged. We have built lots of leaders over the years out of these conferences and other events sponsored by the Council on Affirmative Action. It’s building capacity for the CFA organization—and giving people a reason to join and become active.”

The written evaluations of the conference indicate that faculty participants appreciated the time to engage with others of like mind, that they left with a fuller understanding of the function of the union, and that they recognized the challenges facing the CSU community and Affirmative Action in a time of economic change. One faculty member wrote that the conference was “one of the most valuable experiences I’ve had in a long time.”

The Council for Affirmative Action encompasses these caucuses: African-American, Asian-Pacific Islander, Coaches, Disabilities, Latina/o, LGBT, Teacher Education, and Women. Caucuses are formed based on requests from CFA members. Learn more about the Council at www.calfac.org/affirm.html and see links to caucus pages at www.calfac.org/committees.html.

Also see “Changing Faces of CSU Faculty and Students, Vol. III (Equity Conference Report, 2010)” at http://www.calfac.org/research.html#demos
Hilda Solis on diversity, health care and education

U.S. Secretary of Labor Hilda L. Solis addressed the CFA Equity Conference on March 20. That same week, legislation to make federal loans less expensive for college students was under consideration. The bill has been signed into law by President Obama.

In her talk, Solis spoke about diversity in the Cabinet, tackling unemployment particularly among youth, and federal policy on health care and education.

Many found the most moving parts of Solis’ talk were those in which she related how the California State University made it possible for her to get the college education that set her on the path to becoming the first Hispanic woman member of a presidential cabinet. Here are excerpts from her remarks.

First-generation college student

I grew up here in Southern California and attended Cal Poly Pomona…. At the time I was going to high school, very few of the student body (in my home town La Puente) went on to college. In fact, I can count on one hand how many of the students in my class actually went to college and an even fewer number actually graduated.

That is another part of this challenge. While we are seeing more students have the opportunity to go to college, not all of them are retained. I think that is were the faculty like yourselves and other students can be helpful, to form the special bonds that are needed. That was the safety net that helped me….

… I got the best education because I had one-on-one time with my faculty (mentors). They motivated me; they made it easy for me. I enjoyed having that relationship with faculty members and having them tell me, “You can do more,” to go on. Each of them told me what I could strive for. I haven’t seen them in a while; they may see me and think, “I had something to do with that,” — and they did.

(There was a) high school counselor who took an interest, who actually got me to fill out my financial aid forms, who talked with my mother and told her, “she is not going to get into any trouble.” You need that to get through the cultural barrier.

I was the first in my family to go to college. It was quite an experience even to think about the possibility of going to college. No one in my family had ever gone and no one told me that you had to take so many courses to do this, and to complete that. By the time I got wind of most of that, I was lucky that I had a decent enough GPA that I was able to get admitted to Cal Poly Pomona.

And it was through the Educational Opportunity Program. Most of these programs (like EOP) have been under the gun every fiscal cycle. Programs that help students that are non-traditional are the first programs to be cut.

Educational opportunity in South Carolina

I know right now a lot of things are happening. The faculty are not getting your contracts renewed. They are cutting back on your time, on your wages, and, of course, that has an impact on the student body. because they too are looking for help.

Now, it probably takes five, six even seven years to get through to an undergraduate degree, and I am not even speaking about higher degrees like masters and PhDs. For minority communities and women it’s very hard, especially if you are married and have other responsibilities in your household. That is something I think that this administration and this president understand.

…I am pleased that he has given me this opportunity (to serve as Secretary of Labor). Given my background, I never thought I could be the first woman of color, a Latina, in the history of our U.S. cabinet.

It speaks about our public education system because I am a product of the public schools and also the Cal State system. Our great state many years ago through governors like Gov. (Edmund) Brown paved the way for higher education, to
UCLA Civil Rights Project to examine real costs of ongoing CSU budget cuts

The personal cost of funding cuts to public higher education has been broadcast on countless TV news reports over the past two years. Students have been speaking up, notably at hundreds of sometimes-rowdy protests in March, and Californians are well aware there is trouble at the CSU.

Yet, there is little objective documentation of exactly what the impacts of the cuts are on the largest system of four-year college education in the U.S.

To that end, CFA asked the UCLA Civil Rights Project to investigate. The Project, which marks 14 years of applying academic rigor to thorny problems associated with college opportunity, has gathered proposals for independent research “on issues of access and opportunity at the CSUs, and the impact of the financial cutbacks growing out of the national and state financial crises and budget decisions,” according to the call for proposals.

The Project’s co-directors, Patricia Gándara and Gary Orfield, addressed the CFA Equity Conference in March. Orfield explained that college opportunity was at its highest in the mid-1970s, largely the result of the G.I. Bill, Land Grant Colleges, civil rights legislation that removed legal barriers, and War on Poverty bills that introduced large-scale financial aid, notably the Pell Grant.

By the late 1970s, court decisions pared back affirmative action. Funding cutbacks during the Reagan-era reduced Pell Grants and shifted much of the aid from need to merit.

“In every year since 1980, college costs went up faster than family income,” Orfield said.

Gándara praised California’s Master Plan for Higher Education, adopted in 1960, as “a visionary document” that made tuition-free higher education “virtually a right,” and which “propelled a vibrant economy.”

Gándara described the astronomical growth in the number of students of college age, especially of those of Latino origin, while investment in the CSU, UC and community colleges has stalled. “You are the front line now. California and Texas are similarly situated,” Gandara said.

Orfield told the conferees that the research is being conducted independently and objectively. At the same time, he said, “We do research that makes a difference,” in this case, for the future of the CSU. “That’s how we know if we are successful.”

In addition to supporting research papers, the Project is convening a panel of national experts who will select the research proposals and examine the research.

To learn more about the UCLA Civil Rights Project, go to: http://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu

— Alice Sunshine

SOLIS continued from Page 9

make that pipeline available, to pay to make sure everyone would have an equal chance to get an education. (That was a) really important milestone in our history in California.

I am probably one of the few cabinet members serving who used ALL of those programs. I was a work-study student at Cal Poly Pomona, in the EOP program and the admissions program. I also received the Pell Grant and the Cal Grant. I also had to take out additional student loans.

I will never forget that, because the minute you do not keep up a payment, boy the bank went after you. And here I was doing everything I could and even working part time outside of the school system. That is how hard it was.

New legislation on student financial aid

I think now about the changes the president is saying need to be made. He is saying let government take responsibility for student loans and not allow banking institutions to charge high interest rates then not put that money back into the (educational) system.

In the House, our chairman (of the House Labor & Education Committee) George Miller is a good friend of mine. I was pleased when I

Continued on Page 11
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was first elected to Congress to serve on the Labor & Education Committee. I will never forget how hard he fought... A lot of these proposals (regarding higher education) were under the radar for eight years because we didn’t have conducive factors in the previous administration, one that really hadn’t understood what was happening in higher education. I think that has changed.

Now we have the opportunity to make it happen. I am very pleased to hear from the President how we are expanding the amount of Pell Grants that are going to be available, and in record numbers here in California. It is refreshing to see that, even though some of you may say, “Gee it is not enough.” But you have to think about where we were seven and eight years ago....

I am happy I am working with the president to get (these policies). He also had student loans. I believe he also benefited from financial aid programs....

He is reflecting in the cabinet the aspirations hopes and dreams of many of you—the people who toil to get good procedures and programs in place. We can’t allow that to be further eroded. We have to do everything in our power to continue, in our own ways, to motivate students and our communities....

March 4 day of action

I just heard (about the March 4 day of protests for public education), and I’m sorry I wasn’t here, but I heard you had big rallies all across the state. It’s about time. Why not?...

...Everything was shown (on TV) in Washington DC and of course it was my state. Usually it’s just the students. Seeing that the teachers were getting involved and not just for K-12 and not just for Higher education, (but the education) community at large. I was very moved by that.

On giving back

When I was living in El Monte back in 1984, I had friends who asked me if I would consider running for public office for community college (board), Rio Hondo College, to represent the district where I lived which was the City of El Monte. El Monte was about 80-85 percent Hispanic but never did they have someone (on the board) who had higher education and really cared about the community.

It was a daunting experience to knock on doors and ask people to support me. A lot of people said you are too young, what are you going to do on the school board. And I said I benefited from a good public education and also a four-year college education. I know the value of that. I can’t promise you I can change everything but I promise you I will be committed. I served on that board for about 8 years.

I also worked in education.... I worked with Cal States and community colleges and school districts. My goal was to provide (others) with the assistance that I had received, to recruit students of color, people from low-income backgrounds, and get them prepared for college. (I tried) to minimize the fear, to take away the mystique about college.

I loved my job. I did that for about 10 years. I helped students get financial aid, connecting them with programs that could admit students. For me, what was so exciting was that we could change the life of a student so dramatically that it impacts their neighborhood, it impacts their immediate family, it makes change.

…I am excited (about my job now) because my philosophy has always been that when someone gave me an opportunity, to better myself, it is my responsibility to help other people to do (the same). Sometimes, we forget, especially in hard economic times, that we have to give back, whether it is mentoring someone, or creating some club for students, or even nurturing relationships with faculty members...
at the Universidad Nacinal Autónoma de Mexico in Mexico City and students in southern France briefly occupied a building in support of the March 4 action in the U.S.

Unlike any previous education protests, March 4 featured the coming together of those teaching and learning at every level of public education from pre-schools all the way through PhDs, all working together with the common goal to raise awareness about the crisis in public education and the need to fully fund our schools, colleges and universities.

During these historic protest tens of thousands of Americans showed that they are deeply concerned about the state of public education. And, perhaps more importantly, they showed are willing to do something about it.

“On March 4 education supporters from every walk of life came together to fight for our collective futures,” said CFA President Lillian Taiz, a professor of history at CSU Los Angeles.

Taiz continued, “Not only did we send messages through the traditional channels but we now have taken to the streets to say loudly and clearly that the time has come for our state to reinvest in public schools and colleges.”

Last summer and fall, student protests in both CSU and the UC, with faculty support, intensified as both systems hiked students fees by 32 percent even as budgets and class offerings were slashed, and faculty and student support staff were laid off or furloughed. Finally, after a week of protests and building occupations at UC campuses and San Francisco State, more than 800 students, faculty members, and members of staff unions from all over the California met at UC Berkeley for a coordinating meeting about what to do next.

CFA leaders and student activists who attended this meeting helped shape this grand coalition. Stan

An (inter)national movement that started in California

While the March 4 actions grew into an international phenomenon, the idea for the day emerged from a small group of organizers—including CFA—right here in California.

“During times of economic downturn, people are looking to California for ideas to emulate and ways to protect important public assets like public higher education,” said Taiz.

The planning for March 4 was months in the making, and emerged in an unlikely but refreshingly grassroots way.

DISPATCHES continued from Page 4

Throughout the day faculty and students distributed fliers about an on-campus walkout. By 11 am, more than 500 students, faculty and staff—their largest campus action in recent memory—marched through campus to a rally at Agora Stage. Later, nearly 100 boarded a bus to the San Francisco regional protest. State Senator Ellen Corbett even made a surprise visit to see the group off.

Fresno: About 500 students, faculty, and education supporters marched that from downtown Fresno to a rally at CSU Fresno. When the marchers arrived, hundreds more students walked out of classes to join the rally. Later, dozens of students marched to the administration building for a sit-in.

Fullerton: Students gathered in front of the Humanities building shortly before noon to march and rally. Then, some 65 faculty and students filled a bus headed for the downtown Los Angeles regional rally.

Humboldt: About 400 members of Students for Quality Education, faculty members and education supporters from K-12 protested in front of the Humboldt County Courthouse in Eureka.

Long Beach: CFA teamed with students and other campus allies to host a “Stop Clowning with Our Education” rally in the campus quad. There were music, performers, carnival-esque action

Continued on Page 13
Oden, a CFA leader from CSU Sacramento, chaired a large CSU breakout session that day.

“It was truly stirring to lead those sessions and be involved at the beginning of this movement,” said Oden, a professor of Government. “I was really inspired by the spirit and enthusiasm of the students, faculty and other activists. It was their decisions that led to the loud and unprecedented actions of March 4.”

CFA Vice President Kim Geron, who was one of the CSU faculty members at that first coordinating committee meeting, said: “Our goal in attending those early meetings was to make sure CFA was involved in this growing movement and had a voice in shaping a message that would resonate not just on our campuses but also with the public and in the halls of the Capitol.”

After a great deal of discussion, the organizing committee chose March 4 for its day of unified day of action during the spring term.

The idea was for something to happen that would advocate for public education at every campus in the California higher education system, and every public school possible—rallies, demonstrations, sit-ins, strikes, whatever people felt would work best for them.

By mid-December, this idea had grown to the point that a call for a national day of action to defend public education was issued.

Little did anyone know at the time just how widely this call would be heard—and how strong the response would be.

The time is now

One of the driving forces behind the magnitude of the March 4 actions was the need to take immediate and assertive action to prevent further budget cuts.

In the CSU alone, budget cuts have already taken a disastrous toll as the system has lost some $1 billion in state funding since 2007, let go of more than 2,000 faculty members, slashed course offerings and sent student fees soaring. Tens of thousands of eligible students have been turned away or given up because of rising costs and inability to get classes.

“What we are seeing here is an entire generation of college students on the verge of watching their future die because we have sold the future of California education to Wall Street.”

Continued on Page 14
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American Dreams slip away,” said Cecil Canton, a professor of Criminal Justice at CSU Sacramento and Chair of CFA’s Council for Affirmative Action.

Canton said, “It was critical that we act quickly to ensure students receive an affordable, accessible and high quality public education.”

Protests put education cuts in the national media spotlight

The March 4 actions generated an immense amount of media attention and allowed CFA to spread its message about funding public education far and wide.

Beginning a month before the event, CFA’s Communications Team started sending announcements of events and continued to update media outlets — large and small alike — with new information and interesting details as the events drew closer.

Those efforts paid off in a big way.

In the week prior to the event, many media outlets began to run “advance” stories about the March 4 actions. These stories, in turn, helped build interest on campus and continue to create greater buzz for the

Continued on Page 15
rest of the media.

When March 4 finally rolled around, CFA was ready. Students and faculty members literally started conducting interviews at the crack of dawn. Hearty souls at CSUs Bakersfield, Long Beach, San Jose, East Bay, San Francisco, Sacramento and Cal Poly Pomona met the media beginning at 4:45 am to tell their stories.

At 7 a.m., CFA President Lillian Taiz and San Francisco State student organizer Honora Keller were live guests on CNN’s “American Morning,” beaming the March 4 message across the country. See March 4 videos at www.youtube.com/cfalo-cal1983.

With strong media turnout already assured before breakfast, faculty and students set out for their respective events across the state. For the remainder of the “Day of Action” and in the days that followed, CFA’s events generated thousands of media “hits” from a wide variety of news outlets—both conventional and emerging types.

National outlets like the New York Times, Washington Post, USA Today, CNN, and MSNBC all did sizeable stories on the day. Web-based media like the Huffington Post and hundreds of local newspaper and TV stations contributed to the coverage.

“It is clear from the amount of news hits we got that the events of March 4 captured the imagination of the news media and the public,”

Continued on Page 16

Music was an important part of March 4 activities whether it was faculty taking the mic at Sacramento (above) or celebrities like Tom Morello (left) of Rage Against the Machine, who performed at the Long Beach event.

filmed dozens of video testimonials and gathered hundreds of written statements about budget cuts. A large “scoreboard” showed the number classes that have been cut, students who have been denied access and faculty who have lost their jobs.

San Francisco: About 1,000 students, faculty and supporters picketed along the busy main street by campus. Guerrilla theater, giant puppets, hand-made signs, and loud chanting drew a cacophony of horn-honking support from passing drivers. Then the crowd jammed Muni and BART to travel en masse to a huge rally in downtown San Francisco where they joined thousands of community college and K-12 protestors who marched in from schools all over the city.

San Jose: San Jose got an early start March 4 as CFA members and students met at 4:45 am to do interviews with a cadre of TV and news radio. Later, some 700 students, faculty and staff took to the streets, marching peacefully from San Jose City Hall to the State Building and into campus for a rally at César E. Chávez center.

San Luis Obispo: More than 150 CFA, students and community supporters rallied with banners at state Sen. Abel Maldonado’s office. The rally was so successful that Sen. Maldonado—who is Gov. Schwarzenegger’s nominee for the Lt. Governor post—came out to address the crowd.

San Marcos: Faculty staged a teach-in about budget cuts for close to 200 participants. After the teach-in several hundred more rallied. The teach-in was simulcast across campus.

Sonoma: Students for Quality

Continued on Page 16
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said CFA Secretary John Halcón, a professor of education at CSU San Marcos.

Even commentary and entertainment programs got into the mix.

Late night TV institution Saturday Night Live used the March 4 protest as the theme of a skit mocking CNN’s Wolf Blitzer.

Fox News personality Glenn Beck even took a macabre interest in the March 4 protestors, dedicating two consecutive days of his nationally televised show as well as an hour-long special to shaking both his literal and figurative finger at the “communist protestors.” The March 4 “Save My Education” poster was displayed prominently.

**Rallies go viral**

In addition to traditional media outreach, CFA used new technology tools to organize for March 4. Social media played a starring role. CFA’s rallies went “viral.”

This is no surprise. Over the last few years, the rise of Facebook, Twitter and other social media have changed dramatically the way people communicate.

In late February, CFA joined the conversation by launching its first Facebook fan page.

“We believe that a robust presence in social media will help us protect and improve the CSU, which is one of the greatest university systems in the world. Facebook will be one more way for us to advocate for the CSU in the public arena,” said CFA Communications Director Alice Sunshine.

On the CFA fan page, participants learned about “Day of Action” events, shared news articles and links, and communicated with like-minded activists.

“We believe that social-media communities—in this case, the many

Continued on Page 17
March 4-themed communities that flourished on the Internet—lead to greater participation in the day and a greater appreciation for the important issues that are at stake,” said Sunshine. “We were able to act locally, at all our campuses and schools, on a need we all share, that we need to save public education.”

March 4 demonstrated that when you combine the outrage the education community is feeling with the social media tools that allow people to communicate and organize in real time, you magnify your power.

What’s next

With March 4 now in the rearview mirror, faculty, students and education supporters plan more action to ensure that lawmakers and university administrators remain accountable for properly funding public education.

“How now we must build upon the success of March 4th. We have started a movement that can lead this state into the kind of future we all believe in—one that not only invests in public education but achieves social justice,” said CFA President Taiz.

“The people have spoken; the time has come for our state and federal leaders to respond and fully fund our public schools, colleges and universities.”

CFA remains active in both advocating and agitating for proper funding for the CSU and all of public education.

In his state budget proposal for 2010/11, Gov. Schwarzenegger proposed restoring $305 million of lost funding for the CSU.

But that $305 million increase remains just a proposal. It is critical that faculty, students, staff and education supporters continue to take part in actions like March 4 to raise public awareness about the need to fund our public higher education institutions and other vital state services.

“We must make our voices heard and show the public the pain these budget cuts are causing local students, educators and schools. Standing with other education groups and labor unions makes all of us more powerful,” said Taiz.

‘During times of economic downturn, people are looking to California for ideas to emulate and ways to protect important public assets like public higher education.’

college campuses shut down campus entrances
• Marches, rallies and protests in San Diego, Oakland, Santa Barbara and at schools and street corners all over the state

Across the Country:
• In total, more than 100 universities in 33 states
• At the U. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee some 150 students delivered petitions to the chancellor
• About 200 instructors marched at the U. of Illinois against furloughs and pay cuts
• At the U. of Texas at Austin, students and staff rallied on campus against a tuition hike approved a day earlier
• Hundreds of students blocked the entrance to Central Park in New York City to protest budget cuts

• In Colorado, students marched on the state capitol to protest tuition hikes

Across the Globe:
• A solidarity strike was called at the Universidád Nacional Autonoma de Mexico in Mexico City
• CFA leaders were interviewed about the day by RTVí (Russian Television International)

• Scholars from the Philippines sent a resolution of support to March 4 organizers
• Students in southern France briefly occupied a building in support of the March 4 action in the US
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Amid the distress over financial crises, state budget cuts, and soaring student fees, something else is happening on CSU campuses.

Initially, we expected short-term measures for the CSU to cope with less public funding. But many of the measures being taken are not short term.

It has begun to feel that a radical change in the mission of the CSU is being perpetrated under cover of the economic crisis and not because of it.

It is no secret we have a cottage industry in “education consulting” in the United States. A consultant gloms on to a “great idea” to “fix public education,” writes a paper, starts a consulting firm, and goes to school administrators with his or her magic bullet to solve their problems.

Code words for the “great ideas” can be mundane (“prioritization”), scientific (“restructuring” and “reengineering”), buoyant (“rightsizing”) and just plain puzzling (“deliverology”).

These have popped up on CSU campuses to name a process of narrowing down what is taught and who will get to learn it, making it cheaper to teach it, and shifting more of the cost of learning onto students. The newly imposed measures are familiar to those who work day to day in the classrooms.

The “great ideas” seem to share a commitment “to run education like a business.” But is public education, with its goal to teach every student to the best of his or her ability, consistent with a business model of winners and losers in which the “goods” go to the highest bidder? That is one of the questions being played out on CSU campuses right now.

In this issue, CFA looks at “deliverology.” Michael Barber, who coined the term, tested it on people in England for at least a decade.

An outspoken critic, John Seddon, says it was gimmickry that failed. Seddon traveled to the U.S. from England to address CFA’s Assembly in April. Both Barber’s and Seddon’s books are reviewed.

CFA also invited geography professor Ali Modarres to map the realities of his own campus, Cal State Los Angeles. He explains why the CSU’s special mission means adapting to students’ realities, rather than trying to stuff the students into someone’s “great idea.”

Finally, CFA issues a White Paper analyzing the chancellor’s system-wide graduation initiative. Everyone cheers when a student receives a diploma. So, what is wrong with a plan to improve graduation rates? Having a plan is great, but this plan?... Please read on.
A CAUTIONARY TALE
Michael Barber’s “Deliverology” in the UK & the CSU

By Susan Meisenhelder
English, Professor Emeritus
San Bernardino

Last November, CSU Chancellor Charles Reed announced to the CSU Trustees that he, the campus Presidents, and other administrators had met the previous month with a new face on the California scene, Michael Barber. Reed was delighted to point out that Barber is a “sir,” having been knighted in his homeland.

Their goal, he said, was to develop a plan that would improve graduation rates and cut achievement gaps between students from under-represented groups and other students in the CSU. A more detailed plan was rolled out at the January CSU Trustees meeting and now administrators are working on it at the campus level throughout the university system.

Since this new plan, dubbed “The CSU Graduation Initiative,” bears the clear stamp of Michael Barber and his approach to “improving” public services in the United Kingdom during Tony Blair’s second term as Prime Minister, understanding the UK experience is an important first step in assessing the CSU plan.

In fact, the UK experience is a cautionary tale for us, showing how deliverology’s approach to “reform” produces very negative consequences for the quality of public services.

Who is Michael Barber and what is “Deliverology?”

Michael Barber has worked in various levels of education in the United Kingdom but is certainly most well-known for his role as head of the “Delivery Unit,” a small arm of government established under Blair for the sole purpose of improving public services.

Telling his version of the UK history of “deliverology” in his book Instruction to Deliver: Fighting to Transform Britain’s Public Services, Barber spells out the elements he sees as central to it.

Deliverology, he writes, “is a systematic process through which system leaders can drive progress and deliver results.”

By necessity, the process of change is driven from the very top since public servants or “producers” (as he calls them) are motivated solely by self-interest and are incapable of change.

Deliverology also requires a sharp focus on a very limited set of priorities in order to succeed. Top-level managers drive this change by developing an even narrower set of numerical targets, by holding those under them accountable for progress towards those targets, and by providing incentives to shape behaviors that will help achieve the targets.

The whole process is extraordinarily data-driven, grounded in trajectories that show the steps towards the goal, and tracked through numerous meetings and reports.

On the surface, deliverology seems a very familiar approach to management and, for many perhaps, even a commonsense way to make change in large institutions.

The reality of deliverology—what it actually produced in the UK, however—is another story.

John Seddon: The Failure of Deliverology

In his book, Systems Thinking in the Public Sector: The Failure of the Reform Regime and a Manifesto for a Better Way, John Seddon, a British occupational psychologist and management consultant, argues that “deliverology” actually made public services in the UK worse from a user’s point of view. In fact, even after three years of deliverology and improved government numbers, public satisfaction with services was not improving.

In a nutshell, he argues, “deliverology” failed to deliver in ways that really matter, and this was its greatest weakness. Seddon discusses numerous problems with Barber’s “deliverology,” problems that doom it as an effective management strategy for improving public services.

One major problem is its top-down approach to driving change, what Seddon calls its “Mickey Mouse command and control.” That basic mindset produces several counter-productive consequences for truly improving public services. It fails to take advantage of the knowledge people who actually deliver the service have; and it ultimately destroys the sense of public duty that most effectively inspires those people
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Michael Barber. Instruction to Deliver: Fighting to Transform Britain’s Public Services. (Methuen Publishing Ltd, 2008; Originally published: London: Politico’s, 2007.)
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to provide quality service.

While Seddon points to several other fundamental shortcomings of deliverology as a method, he gives special attention to problems that result from Barber’s almost obsessive emphasis on very narrow, rigid targets as the sole measure of improvement in public services. In fact, he argues this use of targets in public service, buttressed by strong punishments and rewards for meeting them, can actually make services worse because the purpose is bent to reaching the chosen targets rather than to improving the service for the public.

This is often what happened, he argues, as a result of deliverology in the United Kingdom.

Examples of “gaming” the system to meet targets, not mission

One example will suffice to illustrate this weakness in deliverology’s method. To bring about improvement in the national healthcare system, one of the government’s chosen priorities, the Delivery Unit chose decreasing waiting times in hospitals as one narrow numerical target. The Delivery Unit collected mounds of data on waiting times; managers doled out rewards and punishments; and…not surprisingly, reported waiting times decreased.

But as Seddon points out, the “numbers” improved and the targets were met, not because patients were getting better care, but because people working in hospitals figured out what mattered—how to give their superiors the decreased waiting times they were demanding by any means they could.

In this case, patients were being left waiting in ambulances rather than in the emergency room itself. Since the official government clock did not start ticking on “waiting time” until the patient was actually in the ER, hospitals made their targets even though, surely, those patients waiting in the ambulances did not feel health service had been improved.

As this example suggests, deliverology as a method invites various kinds of cheating and gimmicks—and produces perverse consequences.

When the quality of service is defined by a few very narrow numerical markers and when everyone is either punished or rewarded based on meeting those targets, the larger public value of that service gets lost and the quality of the service suffers.

As numerous UK examples in Seddon’s book suggest, targets can, in fact, be met; and service still decline.

This is exactly what happened with attempts to “improve” policing in the UK. The target chosen was number of arrests; and the predictable happened when everyone in policing learned that that was what mattered. The number of arrests went up through various gimmicks such as booking for minor offenses and multiple bookings for one event; but again, the public opinion did not improve.

Why? In Seddon’s analysis, everyone involved in police work had forgotten that the purpose of police work wasn’t to arrest people but rather to prevent crime and disorder. The “reform” had achieved its targets but taken the public value out of policing.

Police workers at every level forgot the larger purpose of their service.

CSU may be heading down similar path

These examples provide a warning for us. The same principles of deliverology have shaped the CSU’s graduation initiative. We must be concerned that our own top-down initiative with its very narrow targets may produce the same problems that deliverology created in the UK.

As that experience suggests, we also must be alert to “gimmicks” that may help campuses achieve very narrow targets but not improve the service the CSU is supposed to provide—a quality education for our students.

And finally, we must ensure that attempts to improve graduation rates do not undermine the purpose and public value of the CSU—to provide broad access to a quality education at an affordable price.

We certainly haven’t “improved” higher education if we make our campus graduation targets but fail to deliver on our purpose—to produce a larger, more diverse, and better educated set of graduates for our state.

Other Recommended Reading

An expert on K-12 curriculum and standards who served as Assistant Secretary of Education under the first President Bush, Ravitch favored corporate-style accountability, measurement and targets—until she saw what it produced. She explains in this book what led her to change her mind, arguing this so-called reform movement has replaced education with data. In instance after instance, she discusses how careful examination of the facts reveals that many celebrated successes of the accountability movement in K-12 are not educational successes at all.

Raising the Bar: Employers’ Views on College Learning in the Wake of the Economic Downturn. A Report from the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2010. The statement and report from AACU makes an urgent appeal to university leaders not to abandon the broad liberal arts foundation of a quality college education in the rush to cut costs due to funding pressure. AACU argues this is not only a concern for educators, but also for the very business community that leaders claim they are trying to serve by implementing “efficiency” measures. Both business and our democracy need people who can think, read and write well.
THE CSU IS “THE PLACE FOR PROMISE” FOR COUNTLESS CALIFORNIANS
An examination of academic cuts & changes:
Reflecting on Cal State Los Angeles

By Ali Modarres
CSU Los Angeles
Chair, Geography & Urban Analysis

There is little doubt that California’s higher education faces a dire financial situation. Increased student tuition, furloughs, a reduction in the number of adjunct faculty members, and programmatic consolidations and streamlining have been the results of reduced funding for the service sector that fuels the state’s economy in the long term, and more importantly, assures all of us that future Californians can compete in a global market.

There have been a number of reports, articles, and opinion pieces written on this topic. Casting academia as an ‘Ivory Tower’ has legitimized the discourse on its destruction and/or reduction in size.

This is nothing new and not even necessarily Californian. Anti-academic feelings and anti-intellectual sentiments have long co-existed with the belief that America should be built upon reduced government and an unabashed market economy, with few taxes and pay-as-you-go services. In such an America, everyone is part of the middle class and no one is “left behind” who does not “deserve” to be.

This vision has helped construct the figure of the ideal “average” American who works regularly and remains committed to a nation that demands from her/him a life of devotion in return for unending opportunities to attain wealth and success. In this imagined community, direct democracy is reduced to the “market.” By extension, this also means that we either vote with our money or our money votes for us.

This pattern of thinking leaves little room for the value of intellectual development, especially where a direct connection to the market is not manifest. In such an environment, comprehensive education, which includes the arts, humanities and social sciences, is rendered irrelevant because its benefits are not perceived as quantifiable.

In other words, a one-to-one relationship is created between the market and the world of education. In this schema, disciplines should pass the market test, as should the institutions of higher learning. In using the market as the ultimate measurement of success, professors, students, and the entire education system become tested as any other consumable product would be.

The individual in this process is also dissolved and reduced to a set of skills (reflected in the résume) and the systems that help produce those skills, akin to a factory. In this world, we know each other not as individuals but as extensions of the market economy. Policies are made for “average” citizens and the discourse on what ought to be done to solve problems (in this case, the state budget) seems to focus upon what the market can do without. In higher education, that would be everything that defines comprehensive education, which has long helped produce informed citizens.

Average citizens are easy to cater to, but in their anonymity, their differences are forgotten. This attitude can be seen in our current discourse on how to deal with the state’s financial crisis.

In retreating to the rhetoric of ‘what is good for the state,’ we have failed to answer two important questions: What is good for the state in the long run? And what is good for specific communities within California?

“As one of the largest university systems in the world, we remained visible to those who needed our services but were apparently invisible to some policymakers. Nonetheless, we remained a consistently available option…”
We are not all created equally. Our history of differential treatment of various groups (through social, economic, and political processes) has made each community and its institutions different. If we were not treated as equals when resources were distributed, why should we be treated as equals when the cuts come?

In the case of higher education, the history of funding and support has produced different kinds of institutions, which is apparent in the students we serve. If equity is still an important category in our search for the ideal society, we should understand that some sectors of our society have always been resource poor. So,

"Where a direct connection to the market is not manifest...a comprehensive education, which includes the arts, humanities and social sciences, is rendered irrelevant because its benefits are not perceived as quantifiable."

a cut for them is more severe and devastating than it is for others.

It is not my contention that research-one universities should face more cuts than other public universities. However, I do believe that the students we in the CSU serve should be an important consideration in how much of a cut we must implement.

What the CSU does that is different

The California State Universities were created to level the playing field in the state and make higher education accessible to those who could not afford higher tuition or the cost of moving to other states for their BAs or MAs. With the exception of a few campuses, the CSUs have remained local institutions, serving generations of Californians who have benefited from attending smaller classes and receiving more attention from faculty members.

In response to population growth in California, which was fed partially by rapid immigration, CSUs were there to serve the incoming immigrants and their children, as well as minority communities. Our university system served a growing economy and a population that built its industrial and post-industrial infrastructure.

As one of the largest university systems in the world in terms of the number of students served, we remained visible to those who needed our services but were apparently invisible to some policymakers. Nonetheless, we remained a consistently accessible option in California's educational system.

Our low tuition and the large number of students we educated meant that we delivered to the doorstep of the public and private sectors, K-12 institutions, and Ph.D.-granting institutions well-trained students who helped improve our communities, cities, and the state. Many of our graduates attained national and international prominence.

Because we were less restrictive in our admissions, we became the places of promise for Californians who may not have received adequate K-12 education, who had less financial means, and were locally-bounded because of their jobs, families and other commitments. We put the 'local' in higher education, an achievement in which we take pride.

Cal State Los Angeles

To illustrate this point, I will turn to my own campus. Among CSUs, the Los Angeles campus (CSLA) has a proud history as an urban campus serving a large number of minority and traditionally disempowered populations. Against a backdrop of a homogenizing language about 'higher education,' it is important to see who the budget cuts will hurt.

For the past decade, I have engaged in analyzing our Fall registration data. This began with a project for expanding our community service programs and translated into an unending curiosity about who it is we serve – their communities, demographic characteristics, and educational interests. Now my data spans over two decades: 1988 to 2009. Twenty-two years of data can tell a significant story and here is a brief version.
Over the last two decades, CSLA has seen its fall student registrations hover between 18,000 and 21,000, with the lowest level occurring in 1993 and the highest in 1990. From 1993 to 1997, the campus witnessed reduced registration levels, perhaps due to the other economic hiccup. These numbers alone, however, do not tell an important story about CSULA and its students.

In Fall 1988, nearly 30 percent of students who registered and whose addresses can be identified on a map lived within five miles, and another 32 percent within five to 10 miles, of the campus (see Figure 1).

That means that nearly two-thirds of our students were local Angelenos for whom we were the first choice, of our campus. Thirteen percent of our students were living within 10 miles to a better life. We also serve a slice of the population rarely served by others—older, female, and minority students.

Every year since 1988, our female students have outnumbered their male counterparts (see Figure 2). Starting with a low of about 57 percent in 1988, the percentage of female students grew to 63 percent in 2003 and stayed around 62 percent in 2009. Meanwhile, the average age of our students has remained above 25. In fact, by 2001, the average age reached 28, falling gradually since then.

This gradual change in the average age of our students indicates that we have been able to increase the number of freshmen who recently graduated from high school. However, our service to the traditionally older population still leaves the median age of our students higher (at above 25.5 in 2009) than a typical institution of higher learning.

In terms of the racial and ethnic composition, we are largely a Hispanic Serving Institution. Latino students, who made up close to 25 percent of the student population in Fall 1988, have grown to majority status, making up 46 percent of the student population in Fall 2009.

This growth directly corresponds to the demographic make-up of the communities within a 10-mile radius of our campus. These are immigrants, as well as long-established Latino populations, whose access to higher education has been gradually expanded—thanks to universities such as ours.

Clearly, budget cuts and the corresponding reduction in the number of admitted students translate to a reduced level of service to this population (mainly older, female and Latino). Not only does the financial data on our students suggest a dire and terrible consequence for raising the cost of education, but by all economic indicators, a slash and burn approach to higher education may have negative long-term consequences for the communities we serve.

Tables 1 through 4 provide selected information from The Institute for College Access & Success [College InSight (beta), www.college-insight.org]. The dire economic condition of our student body is laid bare by these statistics. Compared to other California public universities (four-year and above), a larger proportion of our undergraduates needed and applied for financial aid (see Table 1).

A significantly larger number of them also applied for Pell Grants. However, not only were their average Pell grants smaller than those in other California public universities, but a smaller percentage had their overall financial aid needs met.

The data on full-time freshman for the 2006/07 academic year is even more revealing (see Table 2). While a smaller percentage of our students were freshmen (suggesting a higher number of transfer students at CSLA), their need for financial aid was very high.

Combining this information with the geographic distribution of our students indicates the level of need for financial support among the communities we serve (if we want to increase the rate of educational attainment in low-income minority communities). While federal grants on an average were higher among students at CSLA, the state provided less to our students, compared to students at other California public universities. In fact, while the state supported 13 percent of full-time freshmen at CSLA, they supported...
Table 1: Financial Aid Undergraduates (2007/08 AY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Los Angeles</th>
<th>CA Public 4-year or above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of undergraduates who applied for financial aid</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of full-time undergraduates with financial need</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of full-time undergraduates whose need was fully met</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average percentage of need met of full-time undergraduates</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of institutional grants that are need-based</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of 12-month enrollment receiving Pell Grants</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Pell Grant amount per recipient</td>
<td>$2,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 percent of students at other institutions.

In addition to federal sources, institutional grants helped our students meet a portion of their financial needs. As the data suggests, obtaining student loans is not a possibility for many of our students. As such, federal, state, and institutional grants are needed if our students are to complete their education.

While Table 1 clearly indicates that the cost of attending CSLA is only slightly less than other universities, the tuition increases since the 2007/08 academic year have increased the financial burden on students.

Table 2: Financial Aid - Full-time Freshmen (2006-2007 AY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Los Angeles</th>
<th>CA Public 4-year or above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time freshmen - % of all undergraduates</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of full-time freshmen who received federal grants</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average amount of federal grants received by full-time freshmen grant recipients</td>
<td>$4,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of full-time freshmen who received state/local grants</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average amount of state/local grants received by full-time freshmen grant recipients</td>
<td>$2,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of full-time freshmen who received institutional grants</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average amount of institutional grants received by full-time freshmen grant recipients</td>
<td>$2,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of full-time freshmen who received student loans</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average amount of student loans received by full-time freshmen</td>
<td>$2,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among dependents, the dire economic condition of their families is striking. Whereas 26 percent of aid applicants at CSLA had a family income below $30,000, only 16 percent of their counterparts at other public universities fall into the same income bracket. However, before one assumes that all CSLA students are on some sort of financial aid, it should be remembered that 43 percent of dependents did not apply for aid. This is comparable to the rate of 44 percent at all other California public universities.

Further financial information on CSLA students can be seen in Tables 5 and 6. Using data from all Fall 2009 applications, we see that among the dependent1 student population, a majority live with parents whose annual income is below $36,000, with the largest group living in families with less than $24,000 annual income.

Given the age and other demographic characteristics of our students, it should come as no surprise that aid applicants at CSLA are less likely to be dependent members of a family. This means that increases in the cost of their education will directly affect their quality of life, or increase their dependence on financial aid.

Among dependents, the dire economic condition of their families is striking. Whereas 26 percent of aid applicants at CSLA had a family income below $30,000, only 16 percent of their counterparts at other public universities fall into the same income bracket. However, before one assumes that all CSLA students are on some sort of financial aid, it should be remembered that 43 percent of dependents did not apply for aid. This is comparable to the rate of 44 percent at all other California public universities.

Further financial information on CSLA students can be seen in Tables 5 and 6. Using data from all Fall 2009 applications, we see that among the dependent1 student population, a majority live with parents whose annual income is below $36,000, with the largest group living in families with less than $24,000 annual income.

Similarly, among those students who are independent, very few earn more than $36,000, with the largest proportion earning less than $24,000. We serve a student community whose financial status is beyond fragile. Their attempt to earn a BA or MA should be seen as a tremendous undertaking, which requires a significant financial commitment. To prolong their education by eliminating classes or increasing costs is to establish insurmountable obstacles to their education and their attempt to

1 For financial aid purposes, an applicant is considered independent if any one of the following applies: (a) is 24 years or older; (b) is a graduate student; (c) is married or has dependents; (d) is an orphan/ward of the court; or (e) is a veteran of the U.S. armed services. If none of the factors applies, the applicant is considered dependent.
improve their quality of life.

As Table 7 suggests, our students come from families in which less than 71 percent of the mothers and 66 percent of the fathers have earned a BA. In fact, nearly a quarter of the parents do not have a high school diploma. As such, we serve students who are the first in their family to attend college.

Remembering that they are mostly female, older, and members of minority communities, we realize the significance of higher education at CSLA. If the American Dream ever had a gateway, we would be its proud symbol. Closing this door or complicating the road to it amounts to postponing the American Dream and, for that matter, the California promise. No society can survive without educating and enabling its youth.

A 10 percent cut to our budget and our student body means that in a few years, we will have left a generation of Californians behind. Cuts at places like CSLA go even deeper. They remove the last hope for a population whose aspiration for social and economic ascendance is left at the doorstep of a single institution of higher learning.

Universities such as CSLA were not created equally and serve a student population unlike any other. We serve working class communities within a few miles of our campus—communities whose history is imbued with narratives of inequities. It would be cruelly ironic if places made unequal by our past social, political, and economic policies were treated equally when it comes to budget cuts.

Table 5: Gross Annual Income of Parents for Dependent Applicants (Fall 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Less than $24,000</th>
<th>$24,000-$35,999</th>
<th>$36,000-$47,999</th>
<th>$48,000-$59,999</th>
<th>$60,000-$71,999</th>
<th>$72,000 or more</th>
<th>Cannot estimate</th>
<th>Zero or No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Gross Annual Income of Independent Applicants (Fall 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Less than $6,000</th>
<th>$6,000-$11,999</th>
<th>$12,000-$23,999</th>
<th>$24,000-$35,999</th>
<th>$36,000-$47,999</th>
<th>$48,000-$59,999</th>
<th>$60,000 or more</th>
<th>Cannot estimate</th>
<th>Zero or No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 - Education of Parents (Fall 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s Education</th>
<th>Father’s Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No High School</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SomeCollege</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Year College Graduate</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year College graduate</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
Tables 1-5: The Institute for College Access & Success, College InSight (beta), http://www.college-insight.org. Most college-level data are taken directly from U.S. Department of Education sources and the Common Data Set (CDS). Derived variables and aggregate figures for states, sectors, and other groupings of colleges were calculated as described under “About the Data.” Student debt and undergraduate financial aid data are licensed from Peterson’s Undergraduate Financial Aid and Undergraduate Databases, (c) 2009 Peterson’s, a Nelnet company, all rights reserved. All data may be reproduced, with attribution, subject to restrictions under the Creative Commons license. Tables 6, 7: CSULA, Processed by the Author

See more resources for “Deliverology” online at www.calfac.org/deliverology.html
The CSU’s most important institutional goal, according to the California Master Plan for Higher Education (1960), is to provide broad opportunities for Californians to achieve four-year degrees that contribute to meaningful personal growth, economic productivity and innovation, and sustainable democratic communities. Access, equity, and quality are critical to achieving that end and to the CSU’s mission as “The People’s University.”

Unfortunately, the CSU Chancellor’s graduation initiative, recently rolled out to the Board of Trustees and underway on our campuses, has serious flaws that will hinder the CSU’s ability to reach this broad goal.

Perhaps most problematic is the administration’s failure to acknowledge the context in which this initiative is being introduced. Missing from the administration’s upbeat public discussions of the initiative is any mention of the overall decline in the CSU’s ability to serve the state as evidenced by even a few stark facts: a 20% cut in state funding since 2007, the termination of more than 2,500 faculty since 2007, and a projected enrollment reduction of 40,000 students.

This failure to warn the public that the CSU’s mission and future is profoundly imperiled—even if graduation rates are improved—is troubling. Silence on this bigger issue, while highlighting improvements in graduation percentages alone, risks being misconstrued as “evidence” the system can continue to do more with less. Any initiatives that make better funding appear less urgent and that take elected leaders off the hook to improve it are not good for the CSU or for California’s future.

Specific proposals being made by the administration as part of this initiative are also worrisome. As will be detailed below, a number of actions contemplated to increase graduation rates will have serious negative consequences for access, equity, and educational quality in the CSU—all fundamental to our mission and to a strong future for California.

Narrow, limited metrics lead to bad consequences

The Chancellor’s initiative contains an extremely narrow focus on a single metric, the percentage of enrolled students who actually graduate. While this is simple, it can lead to a misleading picture of our progress in meeting the future needs of the state and to some very serious and very negative consequences. Consider two of these:

1. Graduation percentages versus total number of graduates. We need not only an improved graduation rate but also an increased absolute number of graduates. (In “Closing the Gap: Meeting California’s Need for College Graduates,” the Public Policy Institute of California projects that by 2025 California will need one million more college graduates than the state is on track to produce.) By focusing only on the percentage of matriculated students who actually graduate, it is possible to improve our graduation rates while actually producing fewer numbers of graduates. Without
tracking and increasing the absolute numbers of graduates, the system risks creating a false sense of progress toward meeting the state’s and country’s needs.

2. Graduation rates without access and equity guarantees. One consequence of the exclusive focus on graduation percentages is that it can mask—and even exacerbate—problems with access for students to the CSU. Even worse, measuring success exclusively in terms of graduation rates opens the door to actions that harm access while improving the percentages. Most obviously, one way to improve graduation rates is to exclude students who face greater challenges to graduating.

National baseline project on grad rates, a bigger approach to improvement

The CSU Graduation Initiative is part of a huge national project involving 24 systems of public higher education representing 378 individual colleges and universities that collectively enroll more than three million students.


Given its genesis, it is particularly surprising that the Chancellor’s plan focuses solely on the metrics on graduation rates because this approach is explicitly criticized in the Access to Success founding document.

In “Charting a Necessary Path,” Jennifer Engle and Mary Lynch of the Education Trust emphasize that the nation cannot reach President Obama’s goal of returning the U.S. to its premier world status in higher education without large increases in both access to college and success in graduating.

In that study, the authors stress the importance of tracking and reporting a more complex set of data that answers questions in three key areas:

- “Access: Does a higher education system’s entering class reflect the socioeconomic and racial/ethnic profile of its state’s high school graduates?”
- “Success: How does the success rates of low-income and underrepresented minority students compare with those of other students within the system?”
- “Access + Success: Do the system’s graduates reflect the diversity of the state’s high school graduates?” (p. 5)

The CSU plan focuses on only one part of that equation. And that is a flaw underscored in “Charting a Necessary Path”:

…the simultaneous focus on both access and success in the Initiative and its metrics is fundamental to achieving increases in the number of college-educated residents in A2S [Access to Success] states. Otherwise, the temptation for participating systems is to take one of the two routes that thus far have proved to be so unproductive: (1) widen access without focusing on graduating more students or (2) become more exclusive, so graduate rates will improve without any effort. Neither course will produce more citizens with degrees, which is what our country needs to accomplish (p. 7).

Implementing the grad initiative in the CSU

A CFA task force has reviewed all of the campus “delivery plans” and related documents and has identified a number of problem areas.

Threats to Access. It already appears that the exclusive focus on graduation rates is leading to actions that threaten access for all students, but especially for low-income students and students from underrepresented groups.

For example, there are plans to declare “impaction” on more campuses while raising admission standards to exclude some students who had historically been guaranteed admission. These measures may improve graduation rates but they surely will reduce access, especially for students...
who come from low-income school districts and who often have had the poorest preparation for college.

Changes in policies on remediation risk similar unintended consequences for those student groups with the biggest access problems and the biggest achievement gaps. Moving remediation to more expensive summer session and requiring students to begin their remedial work before matriculating may improve graduation rates but hurt access for many of the groups—low-income students and students from underrepresented groups—the initiative is supposed to be helping.

These proposed actions, and others, such as requiring freshmen to live in the dorms, pose serious problems for equity and access—even though they may improve graduation rates.

Threats to equity. Exclusive focus on graduation percentages and the drive to meet that narrow target may also damage equity. Proposals under public discussion, such as increased fees for “excessive” units, decreased financial aid for units over those required for graduation, and limitations on repeating courses, could actually lower the graduation success of many students, especially low-income students and those whose high school education has not adequately prepared them for college work.

Threats to quality. Focusing exclusively on graduation rates can mean insufficient focus on the fundamental purpose that should be driving the initiative—the need for better-educated Californians and for more of them. If this purpose is overlooked, it is all too easy to explore actions that can improve graduation rates but decrease the quality of education we provide our students.

Missing from the administration’s upbeat public discussions is any mention of the overall decline in the CSU’s ability to serve the state as evidenced by a few stark facts: a 20% cut in state funding since 2007, the termination of more than 2,500 faculty since 2007, and a projected enrollment reduction of 40,000 students.

A number of proposals under discussion, many of which involve simply reducing graduation requirements in some way, raise serious concerns about quality. Some of these include:

- Artificially lowering the number of students who need remediation by lowering the cut-off score necessary to bypass remedial classes. This change does not make students more prepared for college work and could mean they miss developing vital skills needed for success in college and beyond.

- Decreasing the number of required writing courses while increasing the number of students in other courses that are writing intensive. This inevitably reduces the total amount of writing done by students during their time in college. This is particularly puzzling since quality writing and critical thinking skills are widely recognized as essential by the public and by employers. (See, for instance, “Raising The Bar: Employer’s Views on College Learning in the Wake of the Economic Downturn.”)

- Decreasing General Education requirements. These are the broad liberal arts component of every CSU graduate’s education. While reducing requirements could obviously make it easier to graduate, we need to ask if the resulting graduates will be prepared for the future economy and society in which they will live.

The breadth and quality of college education is a national concern

The latter point has been elaborated in a statement by the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges and Universities titled “The Quality Imperative: Match Ambitious Goals for College Attainment with an Ambitious Vision for Learning.” In the view of
this group, improving the quality of education and the breadth of student learning is just as essential as improving graduation rates if we are to reach President Obama’s goals for a highly-educated America.

Both our economy and our democracy need broadly educated citizens rather than the narrowly trained graduates that too many universities produce. Narrowing the scope of our students’ education, even if it were to increase graduation rates, would fail them and our society.

**Getting to 1 million**

Broad access, equity, a quality liberal arts foundation, and ultimate success in achieving degrees are all critical pieces of providing for the needs of our students and of our state and nation. Graduation “success” is only one piece of a complex equation; improving graduation rates at the expense of access, equity and quality education is not the answer.

A first step toward improving graduation rates and increasing the absolute numbers of graduates needed would be to listen to what students have been saying about the difficulties they encounter in completing their degrees. Reporters have been asking them just this. In virtually every newspaper article on the budget crisis in the CSU, students constantly name two roadblocks they experience in trying to graduate:

1. **Cost.** Skyrocketing fees and financial pressures that force them to work more (and jeopardize their studies), run up more debt, or leave school altogether (the CSU administration raised student fees 45% in the past two years and 182% since 2002; and

2. **Classes.** Inadequate numbers of course offerings make it impossible for them to get the classes they need to graduate (this fall there were 5300 fewer course sections and 2200 more students than in 2007).

Failure to acknowledge, in this initiative or in public comments about it, the consequences of inadequate funding paints a misleading picture of the CSU to the public and to elected leaders.

The facts are plain: grossly inadequate funding for the CSU plays a huge role in making graduation more difficult; and grossly inadequate funding for higher education in this state will prevent California universities from educating the one million-plus extra graduates it needs by 2025.

---

**A first step toward improving graduation rates and increasing the absolute numbers of graduates needed would be to listen to what students have been saying about the difficulties they encounter in completing their degrees.**

As the original “Access to Success” document emphasizes,

*To reach President Obama’s goal of regaining our position as the most educated workforce in the world, America’s colleges and universities will have to… increase enrollments, narrow their access and success gaps, and improve success rates for ALL of their students (“Charting a Necessary Path,” p. 13).*

And making that happen will require better funding for the CSU and for higher education throughout the country. It would be a most unfortunate consequence of this initiative if it masked this stark truth with a false sense of progress.

---

**Publications Cited**


---

1 As a survey of employers sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (titled: “Raising The Bar: Employer’s Views on College Learning in the Wake of the Economic Downturn”) suggests, employers want graduates who have a broad education rather than narrow training.
The Mission of the California State University

To advance and extend knowledge, learning, and culture, especially throughout California.

To provide opportunities for individuals to develop intellectually, personally, and professionally.

To prepare significant numbers of educated, responsible people to contribute to California’s schools, economy, culture, and future.

To encourage and provide access to an excellent education to all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate study.

To offer undergraduate and graduate instruction leading to bachelor’s and higher degrees in the liberal arts and sciences, the applied fields, and the professions, including the doctoral degree when authorized.

To prepare students for an international, multi-cultural society.

To provide public services that enrich the university and its communities.

To accomplish its mission over time and under changing conditions, the California State University:

- Emphasizes quality in instruction.
- Provides an environment in which scholarship, research, creative, artistic, and professional activity are valued and supported.
- Stresses the importance of the liberal arts and sciences as the indispensable foundation of the baccalaureate degree.
- Requires of its bachelor’s degree graduates breadth of understanding, depth of knowledge, and the acquisition of such skills as will allow them to be responsible citizens in a democracy.
- Requires of its advanced degree and credential recipients a depth of knowledge, completeness of understanding, and appreciation of excellence that enables them to contribute continuously to the advancement of their fields and professions.
- Seeks out individuals with collegiate promise who face cultural, geographical, physical, educational, financial, or personal barriers to assist them in advancing to the highest educational levels they can reach.
- Works in partnership with other California educational institutions to maximize educational opportunities for students.
- Serves communities as educational, public service, cultural, and artistic centers in ways appropriate to individual campus locations and emphases.
- Encourages campuses to embrace the culture and heritage of their surrounding regions as sources of individuality and strength.
- Recognizes and values the distinctive history, culture, and mission of each campus.
- Promotes an understanding and appreciation of the peoples, natural environment, cultures, economies, and diversity of the world.
- Encourages free scholarly inquiry and protects the University as a forum for the discussion and critical examination of ideas, findings, and conclusions.
- Offers degree programs in academic and applied areas that are responsive to the needs of the citizens of this state and provides for regular review of the nature and extent of these programs.
- Offers or proposes to offer instruction at the doctoral level jointly with the University of California and with private institutions of post-secondary education, or independently in the field of education where the need is clearly demonstrated.

See the mission statement at: http://www.calstate.edu/PA/info/mission.shtml
The impact of the Early Start policy on communities of color and the poor. It appears that their work is yielding some movement at beating back some of the most destructive elements of this initiative. (See California Faculty, 2010 #1 for more on Early Start.)

The CFA White Paper on restructuring that appeared in the last issue of this magazine, now has a companion piece, published herein, that is devoted to an analysis of these initiatives. John Seddon, whose critique of deliverology in England is reviewed on page 19, addressed CFA’s Assembly in April.

Civil rights & budget cuts

CFA also has asked the UCLA Civil Rights Project to investigate the impact of budget cuts and initiatives like deliverology on the civil rights of the people of California. The Project has decided to organize a panel of experts and has issued a call for independent research papers on the topic.

I am optimistic that the Project’s work will result in a publication that will shed critically needed light on the state of our university system and how the cuts are affecting the people of California whom we serve. This Project has done extensive work, producing vital research for our democracy for 20 years. It recently issued an important report that reveals the re-segregation of public education as a result of the growth of charter schools.

Budget, Bargaining and “Deliverology-Plus” are big areas of work. Each is essential to our faculty’s success.

We must take the energy of the March 4 protests and build teams of faculty members on our campuses. This is not work that can be done by your CFA campus executive board or the CFA chapter president on your campus alone.

I know those of you reading this care about the CSU and the way in which the cuts and “restructuring” are harming our campus communities. Now, I urge you to take the spirit of March 4 and turn it into meaningful change. We took our first steps to being leaders — now we must complete the job.

Contact your CFA chapter. Find a way to participate, however you can in this righteous fight.

Stay informed and respond to calls to action issued in CFA Headlines.

Fighting for public education is the right thing to do, and I know that if any group can do the organizing to make this work, it is the faculty of the California State University and the California Faculty Association! ▲
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