THE MISSION & PURPOSE OF THE CALIFORNIA FACULTY ASSOCIATION

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 April 2009...

The CFA is established to strengthen the cause of higher education for the public good; to promote and maintain the standards and ideals of the profession; to provide a democratic voice for academic employees; to provide legislative advocacy; and to maintain collective bargaining agreements covering salaries, working conditions, and other items and conditions of employment. These agreements shall seek:

a. To obtain explicit guarantees of academic freedom, tenure, and academic due process;
b. To create orderly and clear procedures for prompt consideration of problems and grievances;
c. To promote and protect the professional and economic interests of CFA and all bargaining unit members and,
d. To promote unity among academic employees and thereby enhance the effectiveness of the CFA in representing these employees.

THE MISSION & PURPOSE OF THE CALIFORNIA FACULTY ASSOCIATION

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 April 2009...

The CFA is established to strengthen the cause of higher education for the public good; to promote and maintain the standards and ideals of the profession; to provide a democratic voice for academic employees; to provide legislative advocacy; and to maintain collective bargaining agreements covering salaries, working conditions, and other items and conditions of employment. These agreements shall seek:

a. To obtain explicit guarantees of academic freedom, tenure, and academic due process;
b. To create orderly and clear procedures for prompt consideration of problems and grievances;
c. To promote and protect the professional and economic interests of CFA and all bargaining unit members and,
d. To promote unity among academic employees and thereby enhance the effectiveness of the CFA in representing these employees.
Back in Fall of 2014, CFA settled a strong three-year contract that contained workload relief for all California State University faculty along with some significant non-economic gains.

Increases to our salaries during the second and third years of the contract were left to be re-negotiated. CFA mounted what became the “Fight for Five” campaign, countering management’s low-ball salary proposal of just 2% in each of 2015 and 2016.

Most of you reading this article know how that turned out. At the 11th hour, just before we in the CSU faculty began a systemwide strike, CFA was able to settle the contract winning not just the 5% in 2016, but significant salary and related increases through 2017.

As chair of the CFA Bargaining Team, I know that everyone on the team worked all-out for this victory. But, it was only possible because you, the CSU faculty, rose to the occasion and seriously
prepared to go on strike. There is no doubt that you, and all of us, were ready.

So, let’s recap what was won. Specifically, the salary agreement extends over three fiscal years, with:

- 5% paid on June 30, 2016,
- 2% more paid on July 1, 2016, and
- 3.5% paid on July 1, 2017.

Also in 2017, on a faculty member’s anniversary date, a Service Salary Increase (SSI) will be paid to those who are below the SSI maximum for their rank or range.

The agreement also provides tenure-line faculty a new minimum increase of 9% at the time of promotion (up from 7.5%), as well as a commitment to remove the requirement that Lecturers be at the SSI maximum in order to apply to move to the next higher salary range, a process known as range elevation.

By extending the contract for an additional year, both sides agreed to bargain ahead of the State Budget process. This will allow future agreements on salary to be included in the CSU Board of Trustees funding requests made to the state Department of Finance each year.

What next?

RANGE ELEVATION: The CFA Bargaining Team is negotiating with management to adopt and implement the new range elevation process for Lecturers. Both sides have met to discuss the issues and, if common ground cannot be found, the subject will be moved to a binding arbitration process. According to the Agreement, the new range elevation process will be implemented by Fall of 2017.

SALARIES: Returning to the issue of faculty salaries, in order to reach an agreement in time for the CSU Trustees to submit a budget request for the 2018/19 fiscal year, bargaining will have to commence in July 2017—a scant nine months from now.

CAMPUS MEETINGS & BARGAINING SURVEY: As we move through the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 academic terms, the CFA Bargaining Team and CFA’s Contract Development & Bargaining Strategy Committee will hold meetings on all CSU campuses and survey faculty members as to what issues will be addressed in bargaining.

Look for announcements from your campus CFA chapter leadership about the meetings and the survey. We on the CFA Bargaining Team want and need you to include your voice in our union.

One huge issue that, due to a new law, will be open to negotiation in our next talks is contributions for our pension and health benefits. (See more on this starting on page 16.) This will constitute a serious issue for our union, since CSU management is likely to seek to increase our benefits contributions. CFA will fight for salary increases and mechanisms to offset any increases in contributions that faculty will have to make in the future.

In addition to serving as chair of CFA’s Bargaining Team, Kevin Wehr is CFA Associate VP North and President of the CFA Capitol Chapter. He teaches Sociology at CSU Sacramento.

TESTIMONIALS

How do I feel about the 7% raise this year?

“It’s a validation of what we do. We’ve waited so long for this raise. It’s really good to see it in a real paycheck and to know how hard CFA worked to make that happen.”

Erma Jean Sims, Representative, CFA Council for Affirmative Action Education, Sonoma State

“After seven years of stagnation, it was great to see the needle finally move.”

Graham Archer
President, CFA SLO Chapter
Engineering, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

“It isn’t about the money; its more about respect. I feel a sense of hope and that everything is going to be better.”

Antonio Gallo
Chair, CFA Bargaining Strategy & Contract Development Committee
Chicano Studies, CSU Northridge

“I feel relieved from the constant worry of falling farther and farther into debt. This 7% raise will finally allow me to pay my bills in full each month and start saving for my children’s college fund. And, honestly, I finally feel respected for the work I do. People say they value education and respect educators, but words are cheap, and I never felt very respected before. This raise changes that, even if we had to come within days of a strike to get it.”

Darel Engen
President, CFA San Marcos Chapter
History, CSU San Marcos

See details of contract on page 23
Dear Colleagues,

Last year was a big one for CFA. We fought for greater financial stability for our families and came just shy of conducting the biggest higher education strike in U.S. history.

When people ask me how we fought for five and won, I say that it was the solidarity of the faculty. It was the faculty working together on the campuses, talking about our fight to the community, lobbying the legislature, and actively preparing for a five-day strike on all 23 campuses. Plus, we got help from a lot of friends who value public higher education in California.

As the chant goes, “There ain’t no power like the power of the people ’cause the power of the people don’t stop!” And we don’t stop either…there’s more work to do.

We displayed the power of the faculty in spectacular fashion last year, and we must keep wielding it to fight for our students, our colleagues and our system.

The CSU Needs Our Help!

We devoted last year to getting back on our feet and securing substantial salary increases, but that’s not all our union cares about. We care about our students. We care about our profession. We care about our university system. The faculty, students, and staff of the California State University still face serious challenges that we need to address.

First, we all suffer from a lack of state investment in the CSU combined with the questionable spending priorities of the CSU administration. In terms of where the money is spent, the lack of focus on instruction and on student experience has made the state’s disinvestment in the CSU even worse.

Second, the CSU student body is becoming larger and more racially diverse. Due to the lack of tenure-track hiring and a lack of investment in faculty overall, the diversity of the faculty has not kept pace with our diversifying student body.

Our students need and deserve more and diverse faculty to help them graduate, find their passions, develop their talents, and guide them to their future paths.

Third, the cornerstones of the work of university faculty—academic freedom and shared governance—have been called into question and are under attack.

Throughout this year, our colleagues in the statewide CSU Academic Senate and in local academic senates have been asserting their right to determine curriculum and programs and considering guidelines to bolster academic freedom and intellectual
property rights in the contract. These goals have met with surprising resistance.

In both CFA and in the academic senates, faculty will be defining and defending the profession this year, and asserting our rights as faculty members.

Next, tenure density numbers keep heading in the wrong direction, including dramatic losses in tenure-line librarians and counselors.

Sixty percent of CSU faculty now work on temporary contracts, even though many of these faculty members are not really temporary; they have dedicated their energy and expertise to students for years.

We have to resist this two-tiered hiring system that degrades our profession and hurts our students.

Our profession as knowledge workers is degraded if some of us, much less the majority of us, are treated and paid as though their academic appointment is just a gig or a hobby. It’s not. Our lecturers teach the majority of our students, but without the institutional commitment and time that would provide them with a livable salary and more time to care for and nurture our students.

We need massive hiring into the tenure track to reverse these trends that disadvantage both the faculty and the students.

Only when the CSU makes a full commitment to faculty will our students receive what they deserve—faculty who can make a full commitment to them. By refusing to make a substantial enough investment in tenure-line faculty, CSU management disrespects the crucial role of faculty in the experience of students.

The faculty can use our power to reverse these trends, and we will this year.

**CFA’s Next Projects**

CFA is embarking on two critical projects in 2016/17.

First, we are preparing for successor contract bargaining, which will begin July 2017. Yes, we will be back at the negotiating table in less than a year! See CFA Bargaining Team Chair Kevin Wehr’s article on bargaining.

Second, we are launching an Anti-Racism and Social Justice Transformation Project in which CFA member-leaders and CFA staff will take part. This personal and collective journey will make our union more just and more powerful as we move into the future. See CFA Council for Affirmative Action Chair Cecil Canton’s article on the project.

The recent history of the CSU is rooted in race and class; it is a tale of disinvestment and inequity. It is a story that negatively impacts students, faculty, and staff in so many ways. Over the last 30 years, CSU students have become more economically and racially diverse. As we take closer looks at state funding, internal expenditures, and hiring practices, we have to ask ourselves why has there been growing disinvestment in our system? Why are our students now being taught by only 40% tenure-line faculty? Are we doing right by this generation of CSU students?

We’ll be talking about these issues throughout the year. Why? Because they affect the lives and working conditions of the faculty, and we’re a labor union. Why else? Because we’re the faculty of the CSU, and we’re invested in the future of California.

Our collective future is intimately tied to the social justice mission of the CSU, and we believe that mission must be protected and ensured for California now and in the future.

And all of this is in addition to tasks already underway—working on the fall election, continuing to pursue campus-based equity pay to address compression and inversion, and negotiating a solution to prevent lecturer faculty from being stuck in range.

I’m ready to roll up my sleeves and get to it. How about you? Let’s get to work! ■

**“The recent history of the CSU is rooted in race and class; it is a tale of disinvestment and inequity. It is a story that negatively impacts students, faculty, and staff in so many ways.”**
Themes emerge from report of CSU Chancellor’s Task Force on Ethnic Studies

Please read the full report on Ethnic Studies and the CSU Chancellor’s full response at: http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ethnicstudiesreport.pdf

By Charles Toombs
CFA Associate Vice President South Africana Studies, San Diego State

On July 13, California State University Chancellor Timothy P. White issued his response to and made public the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies.

How did the Task Force come to be? Did the CSU, out of the blue, decide it wanted to know more about how ethnic studies was faring?

CFA played a critical role in putting pressure on the CSU to convene a task force. CFA members in ethnic studies, over the years, have often brought to CFA’s attention the ways in which their departments and programs struggle to survive and carry out their mission under existing institutional policies and practices.

CFA’s Council of Affirmative Action, under the leadership of Dr. Cecil Canton, devoted time at Assemblies and at its Equity Conferences to extensive discussions of ethnic studies throughout the CSU. CFA members and ethnic studies faculty described in specific details the ways in which their departments and programs were faltering due to institutional neglect.

A common theme emerged: CSU campus administrators did not replace faculty members in these departments and programs who separated from the university through retirement, death, resignation, or other reasons.

In addition, campuses refused to recruit new faculty tenure-track members in these departments and programs as they were doing with other traditional disciplines. Often, when the number of faculty reached a critical loss, administrations began discussions of restructuring, collapsing departments into programs, moving programs to traditional departments, where ethnic studies would lose its disciplinary strength and vitality.

These trends were a part of the testimonies that CFA members presented to legislative hearings, District Campus Climate Hearings, to members of the Ethnic Caucuses in the California Legislature, and other forums.

The above are examples of the CFA activism that put pressure on Chancellor White to convene the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies.

Of the two recommendations in the report of the Task Force which require the Chancellor’s direct action, one asks the CSU to “Allocate monies from the Chancellor’s Office for hiring 50 faculty members in ethnic studies across the system with a matching contribution from Presidents to incentivize and support regular and consistent hiring” (Recommendation 2.2, Report page 37).

Chancellor White responded to this recommendation with the following: “It is inappropriate for the Chancellor to...”

CONTINUED ON PAGE 8
Why We Can’t Wait!

Unions are stepping up to the urgent challenges of our time. It’s adding a new vibrancy to organized labor, including CFA where we are preparing for steps to do even better at inclusion and justice

By Cecil E. Canton
CFA Associate VP Affirmative Action
Criminal Justice, CSU Sacramento

I  n 1963, at the height of the Civil Rights Movement, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King wrote a book about the nonviolent movement against racial segregation in the United States. The book was entitled Why We Can’t Wait. In that book, King eloquently articulated the reasons for continuing to press forward with the demands for societal change and justice:

“Perhaps it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say, ‘Wait.’

“But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fa-
thers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim... when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of ‘nobodiness’—then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait.”

Today, that urgency is being felt in labor unions all across the country.

SEIU is feeling it. So are NEA and AFT. There’s a new vibrancy in the air for labor unions, and it is being fueled by rising income inequality, massive unemployment and a growing sense of political frustration. It is animated by an increasingly strengthened bond of union brotherhood whose exigency one can feel at the most basic organizational level.

It’s a feeling that hasn’t been there for a long time. There’s an inexorable feeling of hope and a desire for change: labor unions are on their way back! They have found their social justice “mojo” and they are making moves to end discrimination in their ranks and to begin the hard work of challenging the status quo of racism and inequality! The leaders can feel it, and so can the members. And we can’t wait!

This makes sense because racism and inequality are and have been the barriers to sustained economic growth and participation in the full democracy for our society.

While we acknowledge that labor unions have not always historically and deliberately acted to uphold and defend norms of justice — the early exclusion of historically under-represented populations from membership or protection serves as a poignant example to that fact — we must also recognize their value in building and protecting the middle class and those aspiring to it.

When labor unions are inclusive and open, they are strong and invincible!
CFA—Taking Up the Challenge

The California Faculty Association (CFA) is one of those progressive unions taking a hard look at how it has functioned in the past and how it can operate in the future as an intentional anti-racist and socially just organization.

There are those who would say that CFA doesn’t need to change; that it has been at the forefront of inclusive and just unions today, and that to change is to admit that we are not who we think we are.

To those I would express agreement up to a point: We have been as inclusive and just as we knew how to be, but we can always be better! Labor organizations that wish to remain progressive, viable and strong require periodic self-examination in order to continue their growth, viability and strength. No labor union worth its salt can afford to deny or delay this self-critique process. The stakes are too high. And that’s why we can’t wait!

On October 18, 2015, at the 83rd CFA Assembly, the delegates discussed, debated and unanimously adopted a resolution affirming CFA’s commitment to anti-racism and social justice transformation.

What does that transformation entail?

It means that CFA desires to continually transform itself into a more inclusive and socially just organization through the adoption of anti-racist and social justice principles, values, practices and policies.

It means that CFA acknowledges that we live in a racist society and are implicated in racism, but we also acknowledge that we can be part of the solution through intentional commitment and action.

It means that CFA is committed to furthering the pioneering work of its Council for Affirmative Action on Unconscious Bias, which has begun to influence conversations about campus climate and hiring and promotion practices on CSU campuses.

Finally, it means that CFA will commence taking steps to develop a comprehensive approach towards anti-racism and social justice transformation that will address institutionalized racism in our union and move it towards that transformation.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 10
Courageous Conversation

How will we do that? We will do that by beginning a courageous conversation among and between ourselves that seeks to answer the following questions:

- What do we know about racism in our union, on our campuses and in the CSU system?
- How does racism/bias influence our values, strategies, interactions, policies, practices, etc.?
- What do we want to accomplish for ourselves, our colleagues, our students and the CSU?
- How do we want to get there? What skills do we need to interact effectively in an anti-racist way?

Engaging in courageous conversations is difficult; yet, those conversations animate and illuminate the way forward for our union.

As enlightened as we are, facilitating those conversations among ourselves is a challenge best left to neutral experts. The transformation requires that we identify skilled trainers and/or facilitators who understand where we are trying to go and what we are attempting to do.

They must understand and be conversant with the philosophy, method and curriculum of the change we seek to achieve. They must be available for our leaders to interact with them in planned and intentional ways, at Assemblies, Kick-offs, Board of Directors and Council meetings and other opportunities as may be needed. By design and necessity, this must be a total organizational commitment!

As part of that commitment, we must develop our own capacity to sustain and evolve this transformation on a continuing basis. By developing our own in-house training curriculum and trainers, we can continue to offer it to our new and emerging union leaders.

We must be the change that we seek! We must represent that change for our members, our colleagues, our students and our institutions. It must begin and continue with us. And that’s why we can’t wait!

“Engaging in courageous conversations is difficult; yet those conversations animate and illuminate the way forward...”

CUNY Faculty waged a contract battle over salaries—and they won, too

Barbara Bowen, president of the Professional Staff Congress at the City University of New York, led a protest march in Manhattan earlier this year as the 25,000 CUNY faculty and staff headed for a walk-out over salaries.

AAUP Vice President Henry Reichman wrote of the contract battles in 2016: “Our colleagues in CFA and PSC are standing up not only for the economic security of all faculty but even more importantly for keeping the promise of public higher education for all.”

After a strike vote and more public action, PSC and CUNY management finally settled and, in August, 94% voted to ratify the contract. Learn more at www.psc-cuny.org.

CFA Lecturers headed north to empower more faculty

CFA members headed north this summer for the 12th conference of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor where they explored strategies to improve conditions in higher education for contingent faculty in the US, Mexico and Canada.

“It was an enriching and inspiring weekend,” said Leslie Bryan, CFA’s Associate Vice President of Lecturers South. “I’m proud of our CFA activists for bringing so much knowledge to the table.”

See Meghan O’Donnell’s photo gallery of CFA@COCAL: www.calfac.org/photo-gallery/cfa-cocal.
Vote “Yes on Prop. 55” to continue vital funding for public education

By Lillian Taiz
Chair, CFA Political Action/Legislation Committee
History, Cal State Los Angeles

Nora Lynn,
CFA Legislative Director

It’s hard to believe that it was only four short years ago that California was at a serious economic crossroads.

The Great Recession had wreaked havoc on the state’s finances, and the state’s children and communities faced an unprecedented crisis.

Classroom sizes ballooned. Billions were cut from critical public services like health care for children and home care for the elderly and disabled. And college seemed further out of reach than ever for many of the state’s university students—by 2013, the state had cut its per-student funding by 11%; at the same time, average tuition for a public college in California increased by 62% from 2008 to 2014.

But then in 2012, a broad coalition came together and decided that something had to be done to stop these devastating cuts. The group—including Gov. Brown, teachers and school employees, the Democratic Party and dozens of organizations—put Proposition 30 on the ballot. Approved that November, Prop. 30 “stopped the bleeding” as a state and began the process of reinvesting in our schools and other important public services.

The State Controller estimates that Prop. 30 brought an additional $31.2 billion into state coffers. These funds turned deep deficits into balanced budgets, funding schools and preventing cuts to other vital public services. Class sizes were reduced, teachers and social workers were rehired, and $250 million was added to the California State University’s annual base budget.

Now, this investment is at risk—Prop. 30 is set to expire.

The initiatives’ quarter-cent sales tax increase will sunset at the end of 2016, and the increase on high earners only applies through the end of 2018. The timing of this expiration is critical. Our public schools and universities are just starting to recover from the long-term impacts of the recession, and it would be devastating to lose these additional, critical revenues and return to the days of deep cuts and uncertain budgets.

This is where Proposition 55 comes in.

It would extend for 12 years the current income tax rate on the wealthiest Californians—individuals earning more than $250,000 per year and couples earning more than $500,000. Prop. 55 contains no new taxes—it simply extends the current tax on the wealthiest in the state. Lower-income Californians might actually see some savings from Prop. 55; the quarter-cent sales tax in Prop. 30 is not extended by the new initiative, so consumers will see lower prices in the coming year.

It’s estimated the initiative will generate $8 billion per year on average, with revenues going into the Education Protection Account, a dedicated fund that the Legislature can’t touch. Of these revenues, up to $2 billion can be used to improve access and preventative health care for low-income children and their families.

A portion of the funds will also go to the state’s Rainy Day Fund, and Prop. 55 includes stringent accountability and transparency requirements, including annual audits, so the public can be sure where its money is going.

Prop. 55 is critical for education at all levels in California. Gov. Brown has said that without its passage, the state will again be facing budget cuts, some estimate of as much as $4 billion. And without the dedicated K-14 education funding this initiative provides, the broader General Fund becomes even more impacted.

At a minimum, if the initiative does not pass, the CSU can expect to lose its recent $250 million base budget increase. And schools, health care and other vital public services would again face funding shortfalls and cuts.

There are nearly 20 initiatives facing voters on November’s ballot, on topics ranging from the death penalty to marijuana legalization to multicultural education. Among these many worthy proposals, Prop. 55 deserves your vote.

It extends tax rates on the wealthiest Californians for another 12 years—more time for the state to recover from the Great Recession and continue its reinvestment in public education and the people of California.
Each election cycle, the California Faculty Association interviews candidates for state legislature and state offices, and evaluates propositions. The results are these endorsements to help CFA members.

Learn more about CFA’s endorsement process and find links to these endorsed candidates at www.calfac.org/endorsements

CFA Candidate Endorsements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate District 3: Bill Dodd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 5 Cathleen Galgiani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 9 Dual Endorsement: Sandre Swanson &amp; Nancy Skinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate District 11: Jane Kim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 13 Jerry Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 15 Jim Beall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 17 Bill Monning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 19 Hannah-Beth Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 21 Johnathon Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 25 Anthony Portantino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 27 Henry Stern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 31 Richard Roth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 33 Ricardo Lara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate District 35: Steven Bradford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 39 Toni Atkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 2 Jim Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 4 Cecilia Aguiar-Curry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 7 Kevin McCarty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 8 Ken Cooley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 9 Jim Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 11 Jim Frazier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 13 Susan Eggman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly District 14 Mae Torlakson |
| Assembly District 15 Tony Thurmond |
| Assembly District 16 Cheryl Cook-Kallio |
| Assembly District 17 David Chiu |
| Assembly District 18 Rob Bonta |
| Assembly District 19 Phil Ting |
| Assembly District 20 Bill Quirk |
| Assembly District 21 Adam Gray |
| Assembly District 22 Kevin Mullin |
| Assembly District 25 Kansen Chu |
| Assembly District 27 Ash Kalra |
| Assembly District 28 Evan Low |
| Assembly District 29 Mark Stone |
| Assembly District 30 Karina Cervantez Alejo |
| Assembly District 31 Joaquin Arambula |
| Assembly District 32 Rudy Salas |
| Assembly District 33 Dawn Ortiz-Legg |
| Assembly District 35 Monique Limón |
| Assembly District 37 Christy Smith |

| Assembly District 48 Blanca Rubio |
| Assembly District 49 Ed Chau |
| Assembly District 50 Richard Bloom |
| Assembly District 51 Jimmy Gomez |
| Assembly District 52 Freddie Rodriguez |
| Assembly District 53 Miguel Santiago |
| Assembly District 54 Sebastian Ridley-Thomas |
| Assembly District 56 Eduardo Garcia |
| Assembly District 57 Ian Calderon |
| Assembly District 58 Cristina Garcia |
| Assembly District 59 Reggie Jones-Sawyer |
| Assembly District 60 Sabrina Cervantes |
| Assembly District 61 Jose Medina |
| Assembly District 62 Autumn Burke |
| Assembly District 63 Anthony Rendon |
| Assembly District 64 Mike Gipson |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly District 65 Sharon Quirk-Silva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate District 39 Raul Bocanegra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 41 Chris Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 44 Jacqui Irwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 45 Matt Dababneh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 46 Adrin Nazarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly District 47 Cheryl Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 66 Al Muratsuchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 69 Tom Daly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 70 Patrick O’Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 78 Todd Gloria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 79 Shirley Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly District 80 Lorena Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSITION 55:
California Children’s Health Care and Protection Act

CFA Position: Support

Prop. 55 is critical for all levels of education in California. Gov. Brown has said that if Prop 55 does not pass, the state again will be facing budget cuts; some estimates are as much as $4 billion in cuts. And, without the dedicated K-14 education funding this initiative provides, the broader General Fund, from which the CSU gets its state funding, becomes even more impacted.

PROPOSITION 56:

CFA Position: Support

This measure would impose a $2-per-pack tax on cigarettes and other tobacco products including electronic cigarettes to fund existing healthcare programs, tobacco-use prevention/control programs, and tobacco-related disease research. Prop 56 is also supported by SEIU and the California Medical Association.

PROPOSITION 57:
The Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act of 2016

CFA Position: Support

Also known as Gov. Brown’s Criminal Justice Reform Measure, Prop 57 would allow parole consideration for persons convicted of nonviolent felonies upon completion of full prison terms for the primary offense, would award sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior or educational achievements, and would require juvenile court judges to determine whether juveniles should be prosecuted and sentenced as adults. Also supported by SEIU.

PROPOSITION 58:
California Education for a Global Economy

CFA Position: Support

Also, called the “LEARN Initiative,” State Sen. Ricardo Lara developed Prop. 58 to require school districts and county offices of education to, at a minimum, provide English learners with a structured English immersion program. It would authorize parents or legal guardians of students enrolled in the school to choose a language acquisition program that best suits their own children. Also supported by SEIU.

PROPOSITION 62:
The Justice that Works Act of 2016

CFA Position: Support

There are two measures about the death penalty on the November ballot. Prop 62 would repeal the death penalty in California, including retroactively to persons already sentenced to death. Also supported by SEIU, Death Penalty Focus and the ACLU. Opposed by the Criminal Justice Legal Foundation.

PROPOSITION 63:
California Safety for All Gun Control Initiative

CFA Position: Support

Prop 63 would prohibit possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines, require most individuals to pass a background check to purchase ammunition, and prohibit persons convicted of stealing a firearm from possessing firearms. Also supported by SEIU, Lt. Gov. Gavin Newsom, and the Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence.

PROPOSITION 66:
Death Penalty Reform and Savings Act of 2016

CFA Position: Oppose

This ballot measure would expedite the death penalty process in California by imposing time limits on death penalty review and requiring certain attorneys to accept death penalty appeals. This measure is supported by Californians for Death Penalty Savings and Reform, the California District Attorneys Association, and Peace Officers Research Association of California. In addition to CFA, it is opposed by the California Democratic Party and SEIU.
Growing up in a bilingual household with five brothers and sisters, the concepts of language learning and cultural identity have always been important to me. But then Proposition 227 was passed, a law that restricted most teaching in schools to English. Instead of being proud of the fact that we could speak more than one language, many of us were shamed into not speaking languages other than English in public places.

That’s why I authored an initiative on the November 8 ballot—Prop 58, the Language Education Acquisition and Readiness Now (LEARN)—to change this nearly 20-year-old law.

Under our current system, too many California students are being left behind and not given the opportunity to learn English or a second language with the most effective teaching methods possible.

Substantial research shows that students learn languages in many different ways. Some students excel in language immersion programs while others do better learning in multiple languages. Yet, the California Department of Education reports that of the 10,393 schools in California, only 312 offer multilingual programs. This shortchanges all California students who want the opportunity to learn English and a second language.

That’s why Proposition 58 would amend Prop 227 to give school districts, parents and teachers the power to decide how best to teach English and other languages. The fact is that when it comes to teaching, one size does not fit all, and no politician should limit our kids’ ability to learn language with the method that works best for them.

We know that students with a strong proficiency in English who also speak other languages are better prepared to compete in the global workforce. Yet, while 66% of people around the globe speak more than one language, only 20% of people in the United States speak multiple languages.

Please join me in opening the door to student learning and help me pass Prop 58 in November!

By California State Senator Ricardo Lara
Prop 58 author

Yes on Prop. 58 to help Students learn

See pages 12 & 13 for more information on November 8 election propositions and a listing of candidates endorsed by CFA.
We have great retirement and medical benefits—and we will need to defend them soon

By Jonathan Karpf
CFA Associate VP Lecturers North
Anthropology, San Jose State

The California Faculty Association has fought long and hard to gain and protect pensions and benefits for all its members. We in the CSU are among a very small minority of American workers who still have a defined benefit (DB) pension that provides real retirement security.

If you go back even 45 years, most American workers, both in the private and the public sectors, had real retirement security tied up in a DB pension. With our DB pensions:

1) A certain percentage of our income is contributed to CalPERS,
2) There is legal requirement that the employer also make a contribution, which is currently almost 6 times higher than our own,
3) Trained investment managers invest these funds in the market,
4) We have the economy of scale as well as pooled risk, and
5) The amount of money we will receive monthly upon retirement is not predicated on our own contributions.

Consequently, we know exactly what our income will be as we get closer to our golden years.

This knowledge provides certainty, tranquility, and predictability, and this arrange-

CONTINUED ON PAGE 16

Social Security Works! Reich says: Just ‘Scrap the Cap’

Retirement insecurity is becoming a crisis and purposeful misrepresentations about pensions and Social Security are contributing factors.

To head this off, advocates in the field say the U.S. needs to expand Social Security, protect the pensions working people still have, and devise new retirement programs.

A national coalition of senior organizations, advocacy groups and unions including CFA affiliate, the Service Employees International Union, has a campaign underway on the first point—to save and expand Social Security. They are explaining that Social Security is not broke and if everyone pays their fair share, the benefits will be secure.

See Robert Reich explain in under three minutes how we can make Social Security work, if we “Scrap the Cap!” at robertreich.org/post/112958136170

Just three years ago, there was serious discussion in Washington DC about cuts to Social Security. Now, the consensus is growing that the benefits should be expanded, and that eliminating senior poverty is a social, economic and moral imperative.

Bernie Sanders argued relentlessly to expand Social Security and the Democratic Party moved to support it. Many Senatorial and Congressional candidates are running on the issue.

Check out Social Security Works! at www.strengthensocialsecurity.org/social-security-works/
By not tying the problems of state deficits and pension funds to the illegal and corrupt actions of mortgage companies and investment banks, unions and public employees become the displaced target of popular resentments.

Reagan Bashes Unions

But beginning with the Reagan presidency and his destruction of the air traffic controllers union, picking up steam through the 1980’s-1990’s, all but 11% of private sector workers saw their retirement security vanish and replaced with a defined contribution (DC) plan, principally 401Ks. 401Ks were never designed to provide primary retirement security; in fact, they were created at a time when most American workers had their retirement security tied up in a DB pension, and 401Ks were designed for higher-income workers to augment their DB pensions in a tax-deferred account—as well as enriching financial institutions that manage such funds.

More than half of U.S. workers today lack any employer-sponsored retirement plan. In DC plans, the worker invests a certain percentage of income—up to the federal limit—into a mixture of stocks and bonds. There is no requirement that the employer make any contribution, and in 2010 5% of private employers (13,811) stopped contributing, with an additional 2% (5,524) stopping in 2011.

As of 2011 a total of 42% of businesses no longer contributed to 401Ks and the average 401K lost 2% of its value. DC plans also require the worker to be an astute financial planner on top of their day job, and as the name implies, only the contributions are known in advance; the future benefit one will receive upon entering retirement is completely unknown. If the stock market, or the particular mutual fund in which your money is allocated, experiences a bad month, year, or decade around the time of your retirement, then your nest egg will be much smaller.

In general, the responsibility and risk are in the hands of the employee as opposed to the employer. The upshot of this is that we and other public employees are among the rare Americans who still possess real retirement security.

Working Overtime to Blame Us—Yes Us, CSU Faculty

And the political reality (for those of you who have been paying attention) is that a certain political party who shall remain nameless—along with the 30+ think tanks this party has set up since the 1970’s—has managed to convince a significant portion of the American electorate that the greatest economic downturn since the Great Depression was not due to Wall Street bankers operating in an environment of complete deregulation, gaming the system with toxic assets such as bundled sub-prime mortgages, but instead was due to public employees and our pensions.

And being the rare-of-the-rare has consequences, because it leads to pension envy.

So instead of private sector workers saying, “I used to have what they still have; how do I regain it?” they’ve been propagandized to the point that too many of them say, “I don’t have what those public employees have so why do they deserve it?”

By not tying the problems of state deficits and pension funds to the illegal and corrupt actions of mortgage companies and investment banks, unions and public employees become the displaced target of popular resentments.

It is important to understand a few important points in regard to public workers:

1) BEST OFF TO HAVE JUST A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA:

The Berkeley Public Policy Institute published a report 3 years back that compared total compensation between private and public sector workers. Total compensation includes wages and benefits while working plus pension/retirement income and benefits while retired. This study discovered one type of worker who is better off in the public sector than in the private sector—those whose highest degree is a high school diploma.

By matching educational background for every degree above high school—a 2-year AA, a BA/BS, and MA/MS and a PhD—this study found that private sector workers receive a higher total compensation than do public sector workers. But if you ask the average person on the street, you will discover that the myth of public sector workers living high on the hog is alive and well.

2) MORE EDUCATED WORKERS:

There is a higher percentage of highly educated workers in public sector jobs than in the private sector.

3) OLDER:

Both the average and the median age of public sector workers are higher than those in the private sector, and more experienced workers in both sectors generally receive higher salaries.

4) TAXPAYERS PAY LESS THAN ONE-QUARTER:

65% of CalPERS funds stem from their market investments, 13% stem from employee contributions (Note: all other state employees not working in the CSU are contributing at least 8% of their gross income with some much higher), and only 22% stem from the employer and hence the taxpayer. But the myth that has been propagated is that 100% of our pensions are taxpayer-funded, which is simply not the case.

5) BENEFITS ARE MODEST:

The average CalPERS member receives 50% or less of his or her highest pay in retirement; the March 2016 average is $2,627 per month ($31,524/year), the median pension is only $18,000/year and 40% of CalPERS members receive Social Security.

6) EXECUTIVES GET THE MOST:

1% of CalPERS annuitants receive a pension of $100,000/year or more. But these are not rank-and-file workers; in the CSU context these are MPPs and Chancellor’s Office employees. 21%
CFA—we give every authority to understand that neither the California Department of Human Resources determines which are the 4 highest-paid CalPERS members for the coming year. This is an important step toward understanding the premium cost of medical plans in the state. This is an important step toward understanding the premium cost of medical plans in the state.

For instance, in 2019, the California Department of Human Resources determined which are the 4 highest-paid CalPERS members for the coming year. This is an important step toward understanding the premium cost of medical plans in the state. This is an important step toward understanding the premium cost of medical plans in the state.

When you consider that we faculty began our professional employment at a much lower age than most other workers, due to the years of higher education required, you can understand why the average CSU faculty member retires from CalPERS with only 20 years of service, and at the end of their employment, they receive $36,000 to $100,000 per year and an annual pension of $36,000 or less. The average member receives $1,500 per year.

Most state workers have their monthly medical premiums subsidized at 80% of the 4-plan weighted average for themselves, and at 90% of the 4-plan weighted average for their dependents (100/90 plan). While some state workers, including CSU faculty, have premiums subsidized at 100% of the 4-plan weighted average (80/80 plan), while some have their dependents' premiums also subsidized at 70% of the 4-plan weighted average for themselves. Some bargaining units have medical premiums subsidized at 80% of the 4-plan weighted average for their dependents and increasingly in defending those benefits.

You can understand why the average CSU faculty member retires from CalPERS with only 20 years of service, and at the end of their employment, they receive $36,000 to $100,000 per year and an annual pension of $36,000 or less. The average member receives $1,500 per year. The 50% of CalPERS retirees receive less than $18,000 per year. Public employees and our DB pensioners are not responsible for the Great Recession.
Financing the CSU’s needs

CSU executives say faculty salaries must compete for dollars with the university’s infrastructure needs. But buildings, modernization and much more can—and should—be funded in ways that do not interfere with support for quality instruction. We are talking bonds. Read on…

By Steven Filling
President, CFA Stanislaus Chapter
Business, CSU Stanislaus

John Griffin
President, CFA Channel Islands Chapter
Business, CSU Channel Islands

Every Spring considerable attention is given to the negotiations in Sacramento over the next California State Budget since a large portion of the funding for the California State University 23-campus system is determined through that process.

Our California Faculty Association Government Relations Team works hard year-round to inform legislators and policy makers of our good work so that the CSU’s needs are given due consideration in the process.

The stakes are high for our students, whose education depends a great deal on that funding, and for us because our CFA Bargaining Team so often is told that faculty raises are constrained by the funding that is determined by the Legislature and the Governor.

That line of argument is accompanied by laundry lists of competing needs for funds. Perennial items include deferred maintenance, critical infrastructure needs and information technology programs.

What is missing in the arguments that “the CSU can’t afford compensation increases for faculty” is the reality that there are other sources of funds available to the CSU.

ANOTHER SOURCE OF FUNDS

This article describes one of those sources—debt. Most of us would never be able to purchase a home or car without the use of debt. Today, with interest rates at historic lows, organizations of all kinds are using debt to build and upgrade capital assets like buildings, equipment and infrastructure.

We are not proposing that the CSU’s management issue bonds to fund employee compensation; rather we suggest that CSU management use debt wisely, as other organizations do, to fund acquisition and maintenance of long-term assets.

In the recent 2016 June primary election, 46 California school districts (K-12 and Community College Districts) got voter approval to borrow over $6 billion.

By comparison, the entire 2016/17 CSU Budget is about $6.5 billion. More than double that amount in new school debt is likely to be approved by voters in the 2016 November General Election for schools. One measure alone up for a vote in November, Proposition 51, provides for the issuance of $9 billion in bonds to improve construction of school facilities for K-12 schools and community colleges.¹

Managing debt is the job of the Chief Financial Officer. Recently, the CSU Trustees approved the refinancing of about $1 billion in existing CSU debt resulting in savings of more than $300 million in interest payments over the next 10 years.

“The CSU’s financial prospectus document stands in stark contrast to the dire state of the CSU finances we are presented with on our campuses and at the bargaining table.”

These are real dollars that benefit the CSU’s general fund in the same way that a legislative funding increase does. How many of you have refinanced your home loan to realize savings on your monthly mortgage payments? This is no different.

BONDS CAN BE SOLD

When a business or non-profit organization like the CSU decides to borrow money, it typically sells bonds to the public rather than taking out a loan at a bank.²

Because the CSU is a public state agency and uses bond proceeds in pursuit of the public interest, it can borrow money at lower rates than corporate entities. The reason for those lower rates is that interest paid to investors on those bonds is usually tax free.

Another reason CSU bonds have lower rates is the CSU’s financial position.

Bonds are rated by external agencies that
review financial and operational information about bond issuers. CSU bonds are currently rated Aa2 by Moody’s Investors Service, a higher rating (meaning the bond is less risky to an investor) than the State of California itself [its bonds are rated A1, which indicates more risk].

This means that bond ratings firms see CSU bonds as high-quality investment-grade securities with very low credit risk. In other words, the bond ratings firms believe CSU to be in strong financial health.

Investors, like insurance companies and pension funds, buy bonds (lend the organization money) because bonds are less risky than other investments (stocks).

In order to attract those investors, the CSU publishes a document that describes its financial condition in glowing terms. The document, called a prospectus, shows the many CSU sources for revenue including student tuition, student housing fees, parking fees, and information monies earned by our campus auxiliaries.

It also states that even after issuing the $1.3 billion 2016 bonds, the CSU has the authority to issue $1.07 billion in bond funds that have not yet been issued. The CSU’s financial prospectus document stands in stark contrast to the dire state of the CSU finances we are presented with on our campuses and at the bargaining table.

As noted above, bonds are huge sources of funding that remain untapped and could be used to meet oft-mentioned CSU funding expenses for “critical infrastructure projects, deferred maintenance and information technology programs.”

As we approach the next round of contract negotiations, your CFA Bargaining Team will continue to remind the administration that faculty have expenses, too. There can be no justification for reducing long-constrained faculty salary increases in order to fund infrastructure and deferred maintenance projects. With interest rates at historic lows now is the time for the CSU to flex its financing muscle for infrastructure and maintenance projects.

Notes
1. For information about Prop 51 see: https://ballotpedia.org/California_Public_Education_Facilities_Bond_Initiative_Proposition_51_(2016)
2. For a short explanation of why organizations use bonds rather than bank loans, please see <CFA blog>.
3. For a short explanation of bond ratings and what “investment grade” means please see <CFA blog>.
4. See: https://www.calstate.edu/ft/sysrevbnds/Final-Official-Statement-2016A&B.pdf for the most recent prospectus distributed to investors for the 2016 refinancing deal.

Learn more about how CSU executives could address their problems from Economics Nobel Laureate Paul Krugman, in his New York Times article “Time to Borrow.”

SB1234 SECURE CHOICE
California leads the way to better retirements

“There are those who want to wreck our retirement with a race to the bottom that everyone loses,” says Jonathan Karpf, CFA Associate VP and CFA’s lead campaigner on retirement security.

“But,” he adds, “we need to wage this fight by raising everyone up. The Secure Choice retirement bill is an important step in doing that.”

Most working people have no employer-sponsored retirement savings plan at all. Even familiar plans like 401Ks—one that allow workers to deduct contributions from their paychecks before taxes are withheld—are not available to tens of millions of Americans, especially those who work for small businesses.

Enter SB1234, authored by California State Senate Pro Tem Kevin de Leon, to create a new type of payroll-deduction retirement plan for people working in the private sector.

Service Employees International Union, a CFA affiliate, has led the push for SB1234. Even the New York Times Editorial Board praised it: “California is taking on the mantle of leadership.”

Karpf points out that retirement security for all is very much in the interests of CFA members:

“CSU faculty have excellent retirement benefits, and CFA has worked hard to ensure we are protected. But we have our own family and friends, and so many working students who would be helped by this.

“This is a measure to provide a modicum of assistance for people with private sector jobs who otherwise would be completely on their own.”

If AB1234 becomes law, more than seven million workers in California would become eligible to participate. There would be minimal cost to employers, no cost to taxpayers, and the accounts would be portable as people change jobs, an important feature in today’s economy.

At California Faculty press time, Secure Choice had passed California’s Assembly and Senate. Gov. Brown has until September 30 to sign it.

Learn more at: Retirement Security for All: rsacalifornia.org
Details of SB1234:
www.treasurer.ca.gov/scib/index.asp
A Conversation about Faculty in the age of Two-Tier Hiring

Tearing down the walls

Whenever people who work for a living try to improve their income and work lives, they face a simple truth—there is strength in numbers. And that truth comes up against another common factor—there are so many ways people divide themselves from one another.

In the academic world, the most stark example is the need for tenured/tenure-track faculty and lecturer/adjunct faculty to find common cause.

In the California State University, tenure-line faculty and lecturers are united in the same bargaining unit; we are covered by the same contract. Years of experience have shown that we all get a better contract when we support one another through the California Faculty Association.

California Faculty magazine asked two CFA Officers to have a conversation about our two-tier system of faculty hiring.

Susan Green is CFA Treasurer and a tenured Associate Professor of History and Chicano Studies at CSU Chico.

Leslie Bryan is CFA Associate Vice President-Lecturers South and a lecturer in dance at CSU San Bernardino.

Q: You have a union contract that covers all faculty in the California State University system, tenure-track and lecturer. Does having that contract make a difference either way, better or worse?

Bryan: Having a common contract makes a difference for me. By covering all faculty in the same bargaining unit, as a lecturer, I have access to the same benefits, salary increases and retirement afforded tenure-track faculty.

Green: This two-tier hiring system, which is going on in universities all over the country, causes all kinds of unequal treatment, and problems for tenure-track faculty, too. With this contract, I can know that all faculty are treated with respect, and with a minimum of guarantees in salary, workload, course cancellation, evaluation, and so on. That is a very minimal expectation of professional treatment we can all expect from our contract, regardless of tenure status.

Bryan: I agree. Also, without a sound contract like ours, my working conditions would be entirely in the hands of administrators. I think we all know we can’t rely on administration to always have faculty interests or our student’s best interests in mind. My course load easily could be affected by administrative whim, leaving me without sufficient work to make a living wage.

Green: And let’s not kid ourselves over here on the tenure line. Whatever happens to lecturers will surely be visited upon tenured/tenure-track faculty at some point. Only a strong contract protecting everyone’s rights, like ours, makes a real difference.

Q: Does having one union for everyone show up in issues that matter?

Green: We are all in this together, including with our students, so having a shared contract is a very real advantage for all of us. If counseling faculty or library faculty, or lecturers, or some segment of the faculty bargaining unit suffers, everyone does because we are so tightly inter-connected. If there are fewer tenured librarians, students suffer in the classroom. If there is an insufficient number of tenured mental health counselors providing consistent continual care, students in our classrooms suffer. We cannot short-change one part of the bargaining unit without the rest of us feeling the impact.

Bryan: Academic freedom under our contract for all faculty is an example of something that matters. It allows me to cover course materials in the way deemed appropriate by another. It is my job to expand the minds of my students through theatre and dance without the worry of being reprimanded by administrators who do not know the work.

Green: Absolutely. The CSU is one place that defies gravity; crap rolls uphill. We cannot allow anyone’s academic freedom to be violated, ever, anywhere. Employment status is immaterial in the protection of this right.
Q: What should tenure-line faculty know about lecturers that will help us all get behind our contract? And vice-versa, what should lecturers know about faculty on the tenure-line?

Bryan: That is a question I have been wanting to answer. There is this gap that can be used to set us at each other, and we need to understand one another if we all want to do well.

Green: So here is my thought. Tenure-line faculty want more people to share in the work. We want people to serve on committees, to be involved in shared governance, to be available and be the best educators they can be for our students. The increasing use of lecturers means fewer colleagues to share in all these conversations and this work. It hurts lecturers more, but it also affects us on the tenure track.

Bryan: The amount of prep for a course, delivering course content and grading student’s work is the same for everyone. However, a big difference is that lecturers lack the job security that guarantees being able to teach the same course again, for the same salary and benefits. I hope more tenure-track faculty will appreciate how difficult and sometime threatening people find this lack of job security.

Green: That’s right. We on the tenure-line have a long-term road, and we have uncertainty when we are still probationary. At the same time we on the tenure-track have to remember that lecturers must get reappointed constantly.

Bryan: By the way, in the classrooms our students see us all as faculty; they don’t see a division between lecturers and tenure track.

Q: Why is it that in so many university and college systems there seems to be such a divide between tenure-line and lecturer faculty?

Bryan: Some faculty believe the union fights harder for one line of faculty more than the other or that one line of faculty is more deserving than the other.

Green: I have heard the complaint from some tenure-track faculty that we are always more concerned with lecturer issues than theirs.

Bryan: It cuts both ways. Some believe that to win a contractual gain for one member there must be a take-away from someone else. Of course, that is so short-sighted since we all suffer from this two-tier system, even if the impact on our respective lines is different in some ways.

Green: It often happens that there are those who are facing a particular wrinkle at a particular moment and we must deal with that specific problem. For example, when CFA managed to get CSU management to address salary compression, some faculty experiencing inversion felt shorted because that wasn’t solved. The fact is, we battle uphill for every gain. And if a person doesn’t face a certain problem right now, he or she sure could be facing it later. My point is, we have to view all the gains in any collective bargaining agreement holistically as a gain for everyone in Bargaining Unit 3: Faculty.

Bryan: The universities themselves sometimes create this divide between faculty to diminish the power of the union.

Green: The administration does everything it can to divide segments of the bargaining unit and play them off each other. We don’t need to do it to ourselves.

Q: Does this two-tier system of faculty hiring affect our students? How so?

Green: Absolutely. Consider the students who cannot find their instructors because they are lecturers teaching at multiple institutions simultaneously, or because the lecturers only get to teach semester to semester. Those students don’t have access to the kind of quality instruction and help that these educators could provide if they were supported properly.

Bryan: A two-tier system of faculty hiring devalues our work while it shortchanges students. One of the biggest ways this plays out is when lecturers, who are hired on a lower pay scale, become frequent flyers. They move from department to department or even campus to campus to earn a living wage. This leaves less time to meet with students individually, to mentor them, to advise them, even simply to get to know the students we are educating.

Green: Students mourn the loss of great lecturer faculty, and feel cheated when they are not available to them.

Q: If you had a magic wand and could change the hiring system or the relationships among the CSU faculty, what would you do?

Bryan: Wow, if I had that magic wand I would have each of us spend one academic year in the shoes of the other. Tenure-track people would struggle under the huge class load of lecturers teaching 150-plus students per class, up to four courses per quarter. And, lecturers would struggle with the research/publication/serve demands of tenure-track faculty often without university support. With this understanding of each other’s work, faculty can stand together for quality working conditions within the CSU.

Green: We need to convert long-term lecturers into tenure-line faculty. If someone has been good enough to teach in a department in our college and on our campus for 20 years, then that person is clearly worthy of equal pay and working conditions and permanent status. Imagine who these colleagues would have been if we had supported them properly and equally for the 20 years they have been on campus. How much better would our campus be? What might graduation and student success rates look like?

Q: So now, in 2016, how can tenure-line and lecturer faculty cooperate to achieve our goals?

Bryan: Most of us, I believe, already find common ground in higher education and the mission of the CSU for our students, our communities and the state of California. Shared governance, equal pay and benefits, academic freedom for all faculty and student-to-faculty ratios that benefit students, these are the things all faculty need to fight for as we go into bargaining for a successor contract.

Green: I’d say, fight side by side as one.

Bryan: We have to care enough to say we will stand united, and then, we cannot be divided!
It is time to make the CSU a truly public system of higher education again!

By Molly Talcott, CFA Secretary
Sociology, Cal State Los Angeles

During our historic #FightforFive campaign, faculty activists experienced the pleasure of working with student activists, especially those who organize within Students for Quality Education (SQE). We spent many days together at the Chancellor’s Office, speaking at Trustees meetings about our concerns during “public comment” sessions.

As CFA activists spoke routinely to the Trustees about our campaign to win fair salaries after a decade of stagnation, students communicated their dire struggles to afford an education in the CSU—and sometimes to afford food and shelter, too.

As the weeks wore on, it became clear that thousands of students were taking our stories to heart. They came to understand that paying faculty fairly generates better conditions and results for everyone—students, faculty, and our communities across California as a whole.

Thousands of students came to comprehend what we mean when we say that education is, or should be, a public good. We all benefit, as a society, when we invest in the creative labor that happens in university classrooms.

Because students understood this, they stood with us, insisting that the CSU’s administration do the right thing.

We, the faculty, also listened to students’ concerns as we inched toward the strike. And we must continue to listen openly and carefully to them.

They experience intimately what sociologists and economists know to be true: the USA has once again become an extraordinarily unequal society, to such a degree that public higher education (PHE) is unable to significantly remedy through mobility, especially as the “public” in public higher education has been eroded over the last several decades.

What makes the CSU a system of public higher education?

The very existence of “public education” is rooted in a political and moral idea of education as a public good, as a commons to which everyone is entitled, and as a human right people inherit by virtue of their birth—and without regard to ability to pay.

Students know that we need to put the P back in PHE in California. Nationally, they have pushed political candidates to acknowledge the merits of free, universal public higher education. It’s our turn, as faculty leaders, to join their efforts to win free, universal public higher education in California.

California is the wealthiest state in the nation and sixth largest economy in the entire world. With the moral imagination and political will, we can make the CSU a truly public system of higher education. It takes listening to our students, learning about their lives and concerns, and taking the risk to stand with them in a bold—but entirely achievable—vision.

So the next time you hear a campus “leader” remark that the 40/40/20 formula (40% state funding, 40% funding through tuition, 20% funding through private donations) is the “new normal” in the CSU, remember the wisdom and vision of CSU students.

We are the ones who collectively create our reality in the CSU. Yes, we can—through collective moral imagination and political action—stand together to demand a new normal on our campuses and in Sacramento. We can challenge the cynics who cannot imagine the revival of the Master Plan. Students are depending upon us to summon our energy, courage, and voices as faculty in defense of the public good.

Given the historic and odious levels of student debt, social inequality, and continuing trends of unequal pay by race and gender, what other position could we—faculty of conscience at the People’s University—possibly take?

“The very existence of “public education” is rooted in a political and moral idea of education as a public good...”
AGREEMENT HIGHLIGHTS
THREE-YEAR AGREEMENT THROUGH JUNE 30, 2018

5% raise on June 30, 2016
2% raise on July 1, 2016
3.5% raise on July 1, 2017

In 2017 on a faculty member’s anniversary date, a Service Salary Increase (SSI) will be paid to those who are under the SSI maximum for their rank or range.

A new minimum increase of 9% at the time of promotion for tenure-line faculty (up from 7.5%),

A binding commitment to remove the requirement that Lecturers be at the SSI maximum in order to range elevate.

Bargaining to occur ahead of the State Budget process to allow future salary agreements to be included in the CSU Trustees budgetary request to the state.

Know Your Faculty Rights!
Go to calfac.org and click on “Contract”
• Read our current contract
• Learn about your rights at work

Be Informed! Stay in the Loop!
Subscribe to CFA’s weekly email at www.calfac.org/CFA-Headlines
• See the latest on bargaining
• Get news affecting the CSU

Keep in touch!
Follow & friend CFA...
• On Facebook.com/CaliforniaFacultyAssociation
• On Twitter @CFA_News

CFA CHAPTER OFFICES
To find your campus CFA chapter web site and email, see: www.calfac.org/campus-cfa-chapters

Bakersfield (661) 654-2480
Channel Islands (805) 437-8498
Chico (530) 898-4788
Dominguez Hills (310) 243-2168
East Bay (510) 885-3232
Fresno (559) 278-4821
Fullerton (657) 278-2827
Humboldt (707) 826-3340
Long Beach (562) 985-5165
Los Angeles (323) 343-5310
Maritime (707) 654-1731
Monterey Bay (831) 582-3028
Northridge (818) 677-5919
Pomona (909) 869-4818
Sacramento (916) 278-6196
San Bernardino (909) 537-5025
San Diego (619) 594-2775
San Francisco (415) 338-6232
San Jose (408) 924-6501
San Luis Obispo (805) 756-2717
San Marcos (760) 750-4009
Sonoma (707) 664-2711
Stanislaus (209) 667-3629

CFA State Office
(916) 441-4848  |  cfa@calfac.org
Become a CFA member today. It's the smart thing to do.
www.calfac.org/member-benefits

Albert Einstein
Charter Member AFT Local 552
Princeton University