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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.
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All through the summer we fought for a fair contract until, finally, on July 27 we reached a tentative agreement. CFA’s officers and Bargaining Team members firmly believe it is the best possible agreement we could reach. CFA members agreed and ratified it with a resounding 91% yes vote early in September.

Even as we completed this monumental task, we began mapping out our plans for an election this fall that promises to determine our university’s future.

Our Strength

Years of experience show that every time we fight for our students, for our system and for each other, we get stronger as a union.

This has been especially true during these past two years. In greater numbers than ever before faculty participated in this important struggle to protect public higher education in the CSU.

Like veteran warriors, we are now savvier and better prepared than ever to move on to our next challenges—ensuring that our contract is implemented fairly, fighting against the profiteers and privatizers, and making clear to everyone that we will not accept budget-cutting priorities that make students, faculty and staff into sacrificial lambs.

No matter what the outcome of the November election, we must make sure that the university’s leaders make the right choices when determining how to spend the university’s scarce dollars.

New Chancellor

Most of you are aware that Chancellor Charles Reed announced his retirement late last spring.

I want to thank those of you who contributed your views in CFA’s survey of qualities the faculty are looking for in the next chancellor. No matter what characteristics people listed, without ex-
CSU Budget Hinges on November Revenue Measure

On June 27, Gov. Jerry Brown signed the state’s 2012/13 budget. Contained in the budget was the Legislature’s approval of Gov. Brown’s proposed “flat budget”—$2 billion in continued state support for the CSU.

However, if in the election this November voters reject the governor’s initiative, Proposition 30, to bring in more revenue, the CSU will suffer a $250 million “trigger” reduction.

The 2012/13 state budget adopted in June eliminates California’s structural budget deficit and creates a structural budget surplus that is expected to grow to more than $2.3 billion in 2015/16.

It is important to understand that the governor and state legislature balanced this budget with difficult ongoing cuts across the board, including significant changes to the state’s welfare program and low-income children’s health insurance as well as reductions in child-care coverage.

The budget assumes passage of the governor’s revenue initiative (Prop 30: The Schools and Public Safety Protection Act of 2012). A long list of cuts to schools, higher education and other important state services will be triggered automatically if voters reject the initiative.

In addition to these cuts, at least seven state employee unions, including those representing the correctional officers, CA Highway Patrol officers, and the large number of state workers represented by SEIU Local 1000, have agreed to accept furloughs amounting to a 5% reduction in pay this year.

“FROM THE PREZ” CONTINUED FROM PAGE 3

ception respondents stressed the importance of having an open search process.

Many recalled that the last two CSU chancellor searches took place behind closed doors with no input from the campus community. Without a doubt, this secretive process affected the relationship our most recent chancellor was able to establish with faculty, students and staff.

We are not alone in this assessment. News editorials have called for transparency and the state legislature expressed support for openness in this critically important hiring process when it adopted an Assembly resolution (ACR164-Pan) to that effect.

All of us look forward to a more collaborative relationship with the next chancellor.

Faculty in the state Capitol

This November is filled with opportunities that will allow us to use our strength to improve prospects for our university and for our state.

This November marks a historic first for CFA in a very tangible way — we will have the chance to elect more university faculty, and more specifically, CSU faculty to seats in the California State Legislature than ever before.

Many of you who have joined us lobbying in Sacramento know that it takes many conversations to educate elected leaders about the issues that are critical to providing quality, public higher education in California. Six- and eight-year term limits have not allowed us to develop enduring relationships with people who know our issues inside and out. This November, we have the unique opportunity to elect six faculty members (four from the CSU) who will bring a new depth
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Faculty in the state Capitol

This November is filled with opportunities that will allow us to use our strength to improve prospects for our university and for our state.

This November marks a historic first for CFA in a very tangible way — we will have the chance to elect more university faculty, and more specifically, CSU faculty to seats in the California State Legislature than ever before.

Many of you who have joined us lobbying in Sacramento know that it takes many conversations to educate elected leaders about the issues that are critical to providing quality, public higher education in California. Six- and eight-year term limits have not allowed us to develop enduring relationships with people who know our issues inside and out. This November, we have the unique opportunity to elect six faculty members (four from the CSU) who will bring a new depth
of understanding about public higher education to the Capitol.

Each of these faculty/legislators could serve as many as 12 years. We hope that many of them will join Dr. Richard Pan (a UC Davis faculty member in the state Assembly) and Assembly Speaker John Pérez as champions for public higher education.

If we are able to help these colleagues win on November 6, we increase the possibility that our voices and the needs of quality public higher education will get the attention they deserve.

**STUDENT FEE ROLLBACK POSSIBLE**

Also linked to the passage of Prop 30 is an opportunity to roll back student fees.

During the final days of state budget wrangling, Assembly Speaker John A. Pérez strongly advocated for a proposal to freeze UC and CSU tuition. For 2013/14, the budget adopted in June will appropriate $125 million each to UC and CSU, contingent on these conditions:

(a) The Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012 (Prop 30) is approved by the voters, and

(b) UC and CSU maintain the respective 2011/12 mandatory system-wide tuition and fee levels during the 2012/13 academic year. That means that in order to receive this appropriation, the CSU Board of Trustees would have to rescind the 9% tuition hike that it approved last November and that students are paying now for the fall term.

To avoid more painful cuts and give students a much needed breather from fee hikes, we all need to work for passage of Prop 30.

**Propositions 30 and 32**

Finally there is another urgent task at hand – to pass Proposition 30 and defeat Proposition 32. This magazine has extensive coverage of what these propositions mean for the CSU, good and bad. I urge you to read the material carefully, help people register to vote and work to make sure they show up on election day.

As you read through the California Faculty magazine you will find many reasons to care about this election. In many ways it will determine our future. Will we have the resources we need to provide quality public higher education? Or will we give up on our students, our system and our state? Will we have the resources to fight back against attempts to privatize the university? Or will we find ourselves silenced and cut out of the political process entirely?

I want to congratulate you for all you have done to achieve a fair contract, and invite you to continue this work along with all of our CFA colleagues. The challenges are great but working together we have always won for our students, our system, and for the people of California.
Passage of Prop 32 would be a fatal blow to the labor movement in California. Without the ability to advocate for/against ballot initiatives and candidates, CFA and the rest of labor will see relentless attacks on basic rights. As if the middle class (and public employees especially) weren’t suffering enough, now they’re coming after our most fundamental freedom — our voice in government.

What does Prop 32 do?

- Prohibits corporations and unions from using payroll deductions for politics. But of course, corporations don’t use payroll deduction for politics; they use their massive profits. Only unions would be affected by this ban.
- Exempts Corporate Super PACs and front groups allowing them to spend with NO limits!

Vote NO – Protect our voice

- Because it is a public university, every major aspect of the CSU is influenced by politics. From health benefits to education policy to our right to strike, everything is governed by the people we elect. If Prop 32 passes, we effectively lose our voice in those decisions.
- Prop 32 is part of a “one-two” punch: First they take away our power. Then they set their sights on our other rights and benefits—gut our pensions, eliminate tenure, and even strip us of collective bargaining rights.
- It would get even worse. Unions have won rights for all workers; with Prop 32, the minimum wage, health programs, the social safety net and more would be under attack.
- We’d have no ability to organize and fight back.

Vote NO on Special Exemptions

Here’s who is exempted from spending limits under Prop 32:

- Corporate Super PACs—No Limit
- Chamber of Commerce—No Limit
- Michelle Rhee’s PAC—No Limit
- Karl Rove’s PAC—No Limit
- Wal-Mart—No Limit
- Billionaires—No Limit

Vote NO to stop them

Here’s who’s funding Prop 32:

- Wealthy corporate interests
- Anti-union activists
- Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
- Lincoln Club of Orange County (backers of Citizens United case)

Learn more at:
www.stopspecialexemptions.org
PROPOSITION 30

It’s About Money

California needs more revenue. Years of expensive tax breaks have caught up with our state—there’s no more fat left to cut, only bone.

This November, we face a clear choice between raising more money for the state and our university or taking severe cuts to public education at all levels. At the CSU, we’ve seen the administration’s plans to slash the CSU.

They call it “shared sacrifice” which means that faculty, students and staff will be hurt through pay cuts, fee increases, program eliminations, and layoffs.

What does Prop 30 do?

- Increases the income tax for 7 years by:
  1% on income above $250,000 (single filers) or $500,000 (families)
  2% on income above $300,000 (single filers) or $600,000 (families)
  3% on income above $500,000 (single filers) or $1,000,000 (families)
- Increases the sales tax for 4 years by 1/4 percent
- Generates $8.5 billion in the first year (Budget Year 2012/13). Each year after, raises $5–7 billion
- Every dollar goes into the Education Protection Account to fund Prop. 98, a fund for K-12 and Community Colleges
- Frees up $5.6 billion in general fund dollars to be used on higher education and other vital programs
- Guarantees counties funding for critical public safety and service programs
- Begins to restore fiscal stability

Vote YES for the CSU and our students

If Prop 30 passes, students will receive a $498 tuition refund due to the student fee buyout adopted in the state budget. If it fails, the CSU will suffer an immediate cut of $250 million & the student fee buyout will be lost.

The CSU Trustees already are looking at a contingency plan that includes slashing enrollment, eliminating programs, and cutting pay to faculty.

Vote YES to save our wages & benefits

Our faculty contract includes contract reopeners for both fiscal years 2012/13, and 2013/14. We are protected from the Chancellor imposing his will in those reopeners. However, if Prop 30 fails and the CSU is cut $250 million, we’ll be faced with unfortunate choices.

If Prop 30 passes, we can work to improve our wages in future negotiations. While none of this is guaranteed, the passage of Prop 30 would greatly improve our position in contract reopeners, particularly during an economic recovery.

Vote YES for our future

Fee hikes. Growth of Cal State Online. Two- and three-tier tuition rates. Program elimination. All of these questionable initiatives share one thing in common — they’ve been launched under the banner of the “financial crisis” at the CSU. We need to fight the “for-profitization” of the CSU and we’ll have a better chance to do that when state funding is going up, not down.

While it is true that we often don’t agree with CSU management about how they spend the money they have, it is also true that ANOTHER $250 million dollar cut to the CSU budget is a serious matter. We will NOT stop holding them accountable for how they spend our resources; for now we must do everything we can to pass Prop 30 so that there are dollars to argue about.

Learn more at: www.yesonprop30.com
During the 2011/12 session, CFA took on an ambitious legislative program to democratize the California State University Board of Trustees, protect access to underserved students and increase transparency within the CSU.

In an era of reduced state funding for public higher education, mounting student debt and questionable executive compensation packages, CFA strives to preserve the ‘public’ in our public universities and ensure faculty, students, and all Californians have a voice in determining the future of the CSU.

CFA introduced five common sense bills to increase transparency, accountability, and oversight of the decision-making process in the California State University system.

These include two bills that would have reformed the composition of the CSU Board of Trustees to yield a more representative governing body and give students and ex-officio Trustees a greater voice.

Although every bill did not make it through the entire legislative process, this year’s legislative package gave CFA numerous opportunities to educate lawmakers about the issues important to our members, especially the status of our contract negotiations. Several true champions of public higher education tackled these issues too, including: Assembly Speaker John A. Pérez, Senators Ted Lieu, Darrell Steinberg and Leland Yee and Assemblymembers Felipe Fuentes, Richard Pan, Betsy Butler and Jose Solorio.

In addition to CFA’s aggressive legislative package, the union’s governmental relations team played a pivotal role in eliminating roadblocks put up by the Chancellor in contract talks and won the approval of a state audit to examine the controversial two-tier fee structure.

Success on Health Care Key to Contract Settlement

A key component in CFA’s efforts to secure a fair contract this summer was the union’s ability to fight the Chancellor’s attempt to increase faculty health care costs through the state budget process.

At the Chancellor’s request, the Governor’s May Revise (the revision of his January budget proposal) included language that would have made increased employee contributions for health benefits a near certainty. In effect, Chancellor Reed sought a legislative end-around to collectively bargaining employee healthcare costs directly with CFA.

The faculty would have faced an increased cost equivalent to as much as a 10% pay cut for some of our colleagues. For employees enrolled in the most popular plans, the increase would have been more than $2000...
per year to cover the employee plus one dependent.

After weeks of intensive lobbying, CFA was able to convince the Legislature to reject this proposal in the final budget bill adopted in July.

With this bargaining impediment cleared off the table, CFA’s Bargaining Team was able to reach a tentative contract agreement just a few short weeks later.

**Joint Legislative Audit Committee to examine CSU Extended Ed**

After a year of demonstrations and controversy over two-tiered fees, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee (JLAC) approved an audit of the CSU Extended Education program by a bipartisan vote on August 8.

The audit comes at the request of Assemblymember Betsy Butler, who authored CFA-sponsored Assembly Bill 2427 to increase oversight of CSU Extended Education.

Under the CSU’s two-tier plan, students are being forced to pay on average 50% more in Extended Education to take courses required for undergraduate degrees. Furthermore, the tuition freeze that was approved in the budget this year is not applicable to the CSU Extended Education program, which can continue to charge higher fees. These fees are set by local campus administrators with little statewide oversight.

This audit request asks for an examination of the policies, procedures, fee structures, revenues and reserve balances within the CSU Extended Education program and its adherence to existing system-wide policies and applicable state laws. The audit will also compare the policies and practices for the CSU state-support programs with those for the Extended Education programs, including student fees, enrollment, curriculum and revenue and assess the fiscal impact on students.

The state auditor will begin to conduct the audit soon; the results are expected sometime next year.

---

**LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Here are the final outcomes of CFA-sponsored bills for the 2012 legislative term.

**Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 164: Transparent Search for CSU Chancellor**

*Author: Richard Pan (D-Sacramento)*

Calls for the CSU Trustees to make the process to select a new CSU Chancellor more transparent to ensure that the Trustees’ final selection is based on the needs of students, faculty and other members of the higher education community.

**Status: Adopted**

**Assembly Bill 1723: Televised/Webcast Board of Trustees meetings**

*Author: Felipe Fuentes (D - San Fernando Valley)*

Would require the CSU Trustees to televise/webcast their meetings. This basic transparency measure would allow students, faculty and staff to see what and how decisions impacting them are made.

**Status: Signed into law**

**Assembly Bill 2497: CSU Early Start Program Oversight**

*Author: Jose Solorio (D-Santa Ana)*

Would require—beginning January 1, 2014, and every two years thereafter—that the Legislative Analyst’s Office, in coordination with the CSU, submit a report to the Legislature detailing the impact of the CSU Early Start Program on student mathematics and English proficiency. The bill would increase accountability and legislative oversight of the CSU to the students they serve and the outcomes of new programs.

**Status: Signed into law**

**Assembly Bill 2427: Extended Education**

*Author: Betsy Butler (D-Los Angeles)*

Would require the CSU to provide an annual report on CSU Extended Education courses on a system-wide and campus-by-campus basis, including, but not limited to, information on student demographics, fees, number of courses and types of courses.

**Status: Held in Senate Appropriations**

**Assembly Bill 1965: Ex-Officio Board of Trustee members**

*Author: Richard Pan (D-Sacramento)*

Would allow ex-officio members of the CSU Board of Trustees to send a designee to Trustee meetings and allow them to vote. Currently, if the ex-officio members are absent, they have no voice or vote at the meeting. CalPERS and CalSTRS use this practice, and both entities manage significantly more money than the CSU Trustees.

**Status: Held on Senate floor**

**Senate Bill 1515: CSU Board of Trustees Reform**

*Author: Senator Leland Yee (D-San Francisco)*

Would reform the composition of the CSU Board of Trustees to better reflect the community it governs. Some of the Trustee positions would be elected. It would increase the student, faculty and staff representation.

**Status: Held in Senate Appropriation**
When Faculty Run, Higher Ed Wins!

This fall, CFA has a unique opportunity to significantly increase the faculty voice at the state Capitol by electing seven current or former faculty members to the state legislature.

For years, our union has worked to expand the faculty’s political might by electing supportive candidates to public office. But, in 2012 CSU faculty can elect our own members to office.

“CFA has emphasized the theme ‘Building Power’ at our Assemblies over the years. We have an opportunity this November to build our political power immensely by getting our own members elected,” said Pete Kreysa, chair of CFA’s Political Action & Legislative Committee.

Charu Khopkar, CFA’s Political Director said, “By doing this work we increase our collective power: The power to bargain effectively; the power to increase baseline funding for the CSU; the power to address workload issues; the power to effectively educate the future of California; and the power to hold CSU executives and the Board of Trustees accountable.”

The higher ed candidates on the ballot include four current or former CFA members (Raul Bocanegra, Susan Eggman, Anthony Rendon and Shirley Weber), two University of California faculty members (Adam Gray and Richard Pan) and a former CSU dean (Marty Block).

The opportunity to elect seven strong voices for public higher ed to office in a single election is unprecedented.

Khopkar said, “In the past we have felt lucky to have one maybe two higher ed candidates in a given election. If we are successful in electing these men and women to office, faculty members will make up one of the largest voting blocs in the Assembly.”

Meet the Candidates
CFA Members running for Assembly.

Raul Bocanegra is a lecturer in Urban Studies and Planning at Cal State Northridge. He previously taught at Cal State Long Beach and is a local non-profit board member.

Susan Eggman is a Social Work professor at CSU Sacramento and a member of the Stockton City Council.

Shirley Weber is a past chair of the African American Studies department at San Diego State. Weber also taught at CSU Los Angeles and Los Angeles City College before coming to SDSU.

Other Higher Ed Supporters Running for office.

Marty Block is a former dean and retired professor from San Diego State University. He is the current chair of the Assembly Higher Ed committee. He is looking to move from the state Assembly to the state Senate.

Adam Gray manages a small public affairs and communications firm in Merced and serves as a course assistant/lecturer on the state legislature at UC Merced.

Richard Pan is a pediatrician in the Sacramento area and a member of the state Assembly. Prior to his election to the Assembly, Pan was an Associate Professor of Pediatrics at UC Davis.
From the classroom to the statehouse, on the campaign trail with our CFA members

ANTHONY RENDON
CSU Campus Affiliation: Fullerton
District: Assembly District 63. South Central Los Angeles including the communities of Maywood, Bell, Cudahy, Southgate, Lynwood, Lakewood, Paramount and Hawaiian Gardens.

On Higher Ed: “Before teaching as an adjunct professor at CSU Fullerton, I attended Cerritos College and earned my bachelors and masters degrees at Cal State Fullerton and a Ph.D at UC Riverside. I know the importance of an affordable quality education and believe that decreasing tuition fees and making higher education once again accessible to every student in California is essential for our economic recovery.”

www.rendon2012.com

SHIRLEY WEBER
CSU Campus Affiliation: San Diego
District: Assembly District 79. San Diego including the communities of La Mesa, Lemon Grove and Bonita.

On Higher Ed: “My commitment to public higher education is deep and personal. My parents were sharecroppers in Arkansas who came to California for greater opportunities for their eight children. I received three degrees from California’s public higher education system by the age of 26. For me, and generations of others, California’s public higher education is the American equalizer, creating a strong middle class that will sustain this state and nation. I am personally indebted to California’s public higher education system.”

www.drweber4assembly.com

RAUL BOCANEGRA
CSU Campus Affiliation: Northridge

On Higher Ed: “The future of our state and economy is dependent on a strong public higher education system. Our public colleges and universities are the engine that powers our economy, not only educating our state workforce, but spurring innovation, generating ideas, and creating opportunity for millions. Education is the smartest investment we can make for the future of California. In the Assembly, I will fight to end state education cuts and invest in our schools so we can create more opportunities for our children and communities.”

www.raulbocanegra.com

SUSAN EGGMAN
CSU Campus Affiliation: Sacramento
District: Assembly District 13. Western San Joaquin County including the communities of Stockton, Tracy, Lodi, Country Club, August and Garden Acres.

On Higher Ed: “As a product of the CSU system and current faculty member, I know firsthand the importance of a public university system. My classrooms reflect the incredible diversity of California. It is imperative that we maintain public higher education not only for the opportunity it affords students but also for the economic workforce of California’s future.”

www.susaneggman.com
Candidates Endorsed by the California Faculty Association

Candidates in bold are current or former CSU/UC faculty

ENDORSEMENTS FOR STATE ASSEMBLY BY DISTRICT
2 Wes Chesbro
3 Charles Rouse
4 Mariko Yamada
7 Roger Dickinson
8 Ken Cooley
9 Richard Pan
10 Michael Allen
11 Jim Frazier
13 Susan Eggman
14 Susan Bonilla
15 Nancy Skinner
19 Phil Ting
20 Jennifer Ong & Bill Quirk (Dual Endorsement)
21 Adam Gray
22 Kevin Mullin
24 Richard Gordon
25 Bob Wieckowski
28 Paul Fong
30 Luis Alejo
32 Rudy Salas
37 Das Williams
39 Raul Bocanegra
41 Chris Holden
43 Mike Gatto
45 Bob Blumenfield
46 Adrin Nazarian
49 Ed Chau
51 Jimmy Gomez
52 Norma Torres
53 John A. Pérez, Assembly Speaker
56 V. Manuel Perez
57 Rudy Bermudez
58 Cristina Garcia
59 Reggie Jones-Sawyer
61 Jose Medina
63 Anthony Rendon
65 Sharon Quirk-Silva
66 Al Muratsuchi
69 Julio Perez
79 Shirley Weber

ENDORSEMENTS FOR STATE SENATE BY DISTRICT
3 Lois Wolk
5 Cathleen Galgiani
7 Mark Desaulnier
9 Loni Hancock
15 Jim Beall
17 Bill Monning
19 Hannah-Beth Jackson
27 Fran Pavley
31 Richard Roth
35 Rod Wright
39 Marty Block

REGISTER TO VOTE
Find instructions and forms at RegisterToVote.ca.gov

FIND YOUR STATE ASSEMBLY & SENATE DISTRICT
www.calvoter.org/voter/maps/index.html

LEARN MORE ABOUT PROPOSITION 30
yesonprop30.com

LEARN MORE ABOUT PROPOSITION 32
www.stopspecialexemptions.org

CFA Recommendations on Propositions

- **Prop. 30 Support** Gov. Jerry Brown’s Revenue Measure
- **Prop. 31 Oppose** Two-Year Budget Cycle
- **Prop. 32 Oppose** Ban On Union Contributions to State & Local Candidates
- **Prop. 33 Oppose** Car Insurance Rates
- **Prop. 34 Support** Abolish the Death Penalty
- **Prop. 35 Support** Prohibition on Human Trafficking
- **Prop. 36 Support** Repeal of the “Three Strikes” Law
- **Prop. 38 Oppose** Molly Munger’s State Income Tax Increase
- **Prop. 40 Support** Redistricting Plan

*Propositions in bold are CFA priority recommendations*
Implementing the contract—lift it off the paper and apply it to our daily campus work life

By Andy Merrifield
CFA Bargaining Team Chair & CFA Associate VP-North
Political Science, Sonoma State

The new collective bargaining agreement is a good one in light of tough times. It is not a permanent solution to the CSU’s problems. We will have to continue to be strong at the bargaining table in the future, to deal with ongoing problems.

All of this is true and obvious to those of us on the CFA Bargaining Team.

We are the faculty members who took on the two-year-plus task to sit at tables across from the Chancellor’s labor relations representatives and hammer out the details of a contract. It was a long process that referred back to past negotiations and that sets up the conditions and the opening for future contracts.

While we were at the table, large numbers of you on the campuses were taking action that provided us with measurably more strength.

Now, just as we all were able to play a role in getting the contract, everyone can take steps to make sure the contract actually gets lifted off the paper and applied to our daily work lives.

In fact, every member of CFA needs to help us make sure the contract is enforced and protects our rights.

The first step is to know your rights. Look at the contract. It is on the CFA website and hard copies will be made available soon. You also can learn more by talking to your CFA leadership on campus.

The next step is to keep the Faculty Rights Representatives in your campus CFA chapter aware of what is happening to you and your colleagues. CFA reps cannot know what happens to every individual member if the member does not tell them. If you have concerns about how your rights under the contract are being implemented, step up and let us know. We can’t know without you!

What to watch for via this contract

Workload change opens the door to future improvements. Excessive workload on the faculty makes learning for our students untenable. So, when you help to enforce the contract on workload, you are doing a service for students too.

The gain on workload in this contract is both modest and a breakthrough.

THE TIMELINE TO A FAIR CONTRACT

Bargaining the latest agreement took more than two years.

SPRING 2010

More cuts to public funding for the California State University loomed. Thinking everyone should work together for the revenue the CSU needs, CFA proposed to extend the contract a year and use the time to campaign for public support. The Chancellor refused.
It is modest in the simple nature of the provision—a workload side letter to the contract calls for the formation of a joint faculty-administration committee to study the impact of exploding class sizes and other workload issues. The joint committee is charged to collect data and look at all aspects of Unit 3 work. The side letter is a breakthrough in that CSU management has officially acknowledged that the CSU even has a workload problem. This is the necessary important step to actually solve it after years in which denial has been the order of the day.

When he came to the CSU some 13 years ago, the outgoing chancellor actually claimed that we only work three days a week and a few hours a day. He had no idea and no respect for the overall teaching load and the other work faculty do in this public university. And while his public stance softened for a time under a great deal of pressure from faculty organizing, in the actual process of bargaining he never backed down from accusing us of goofing off—until now.

Keep the public university public. CFA scored an important victory for quality education by fighting off changes that would make it easier—and cheaper—to shift courses into Extended Education where students pay even higher fees.

It is modest in the simple nature of the provision—a workload side letter to the contract calls for the formation of a joint faculty-administration committee to study the impact of exploding class sizes and other workload issues. The joint committee is charged to collect data and look at all aspects of Unit 3 work.

The side letter is a breakthrough in that CSU management has officially acknowledged that the CSU even has a workload problem. This is the necessary important step to actually solve it after years in which denial has been the order of the day.

When he came to the CSU some 13 years ago, the outgoing chancellor actually claimed that we only work three days a week and a few hours a day. He had no idea and no respect for the overall teaching load and the other work faculty do in this public university. And while his public stance softened for a time under a great deal of pressure from faculty organizing, in the actual process of bargaining he never backed down from accusing us of goofing off—until now.

Keep the public university public. CFA scored an important victory for quality education by fighting off changes that would make it easier—and cheaper—to shift courses into Extended Education where students pay even higher fees.

Under the Chancellor’s earliest proposals, which were defeated in bargaining, all faculty who teach in extension would receive

Antonio Gallo, CSU Northridge
full pay only for state-supported courses. All other “for-profit” courses, i.e. extension classes, would have been paid at a significantly lower rate. There would have been other “take backs” in extension too, like loss of “preference for work.”

While we retained status quo on extension, we need to remain cautious and diligent in this area. The creation of Cal State Online must be watched closely. We need to ensure that the faculty for this work are in our unit and that their contractual rights are protected. Other attempts to move work to extension must also be monitored as well.

If it looks like your campus is moving our regular courses to extension, under any pretense, let CFA know!

Protect All Unit-3 members: The new contract provides important protections and hard-earned gains for many members of our bargaining unit including Lecturers, Coaches and Counselors.

LECTURERS. We preserved the basic protections in three-year contracts for long-term Lecturers. These protections were a huge gain won over decades of contract negotiations. These contracts give contingent faculty a measure of job stability for work in which they have proven themselves. All faculty benefit from having a consistent cohort of colleagues working with us in our departments. Students also benefit from having a faculty with the continuity to meet their needs.

Over the coming months, faculty need to monitor shared governance to be sure the evaluation process continues to be appropriate. The CFA Lecturers Council went to work as soon as the agreement was ratified to update the Lecturers Handbook, an essential guide to working conditions for Lecturers that all of us, including department chairs and hiring committees can use to make sure we are treating each other appropriately. You can find the handbook in the Lecturers Council section of the CFA website and get hard copies when they are ready from your campus CFA chapter.

We also need to monitor the appointment process on new and additional work to ensure that the clear language and intent is respected and followed, and that while quality education is our goal, the process cannot be misused as an excuse to weaken our rights.

COUNSELORS. Tenured counselors made an important gain in this contract that is both symbolic and practical—the right to the Faculty Early Retirement Program, something available to all other tenured faculty for a very long time. This gain signals that counselors are at last being regarded as equal and full members of the CSU faculty.

EARLY 2012
Mediation failed. CFA announced a strike vote would be conducted to decide whether to go on strike for the first time throughout the whole CSU system.

Check One Box

Yes, I authorize the CFA Board of Directors to initiate job actions, including a series of two-day rolling strikes if, at the conclusion of the

SPRING 2012
Faculty turned out in droves on the campuses to vote on the strike authorization.

The answer came back a resounding “Yes,” when CFA announced on May 2 that a powerful 95% of the voters agreed to initiate rolling walkouts if the CSU administration continued to demand concessions.

The Chancellor’s negotiators asked to return to the negotiating table.

Meantime, CFA chapters prepared to strike and CFA’s Bargaining Team prepared for the last step in the official bargaining process—fact-finding.
Also under this contract, management has to define the work assigned to any counselor and has to determine how the work fits their allotted work time. Managers have to manage; they can’t hold people responsible to do work that can’t be done. Counselors will be protected from supervisors adding work that cannot be performed within a normal 40-hour workweek.

The contract article covering professional development now allows for the campus to reimburse Counselors who are required to maintain licensing and training as conditions of employment, at the campus president’s discretion. Under the new terms, these Unit 3 members are entitled to reimbursement for licenses and credentials.

To make these gains real, counselors need to step up. Those interested in FERP must go to the campus benefits office to get it started. It’s a good idea to read Article 29 in the contract that explains the FERP program process. And keep in mind, you need to apply six months in advance of starting FERP.

All FERP faculty should be treated in certain ways, and there are rules on the assignments you get and many other aspects. If you have questions, call your CFA campus chapter.

COACHES: Coaches working on contingent contracts will have the same access to fee waiver as other temporary faculty unit employees. The eligibility for fee waiver for dependents is improved. And, coaches have to learn how it works and how to pursue it. Refer to Article 25 in the contract.

Also, coaches remain fully integrated into the entire contract rather than being separated into their own contract “article” as management demanded at the beginning of the bargaining process.

Maintained Salary and Benefits: Objectively, we know that other public employee unions are taking pay cuts, losing benefits, and enduring many other painful losses. While this agreement doesn’t solve everything that we believe is needed, we did fight off management’s attempt to impose pay and benefit cuts during the contract by means of last-minute legislative tactics.

Should state funding not improve or get worse, CSU management could reopen talks on our contract. This could happen either between October and November this year, or in January or February next year. In reopeners, contract changes occur only after mutual agreement of the parties. In the absence of mutual agreement during reopeners, the status quo remains in place.

Equity Pay: In our contract that was ratified in 2007, the CFA Bargaining Team took up the growing problems of inversion and compression in the faculty salary structure. At that time, newly hired faculty were getting jobs at higher pay than faculty who had been in the CSU for years.

In that contract, we won a two-year Equity Pay Program, which was an attempt to address these flaws in the pay scale. The first year of the program was implemented, helping thousands of faculty members but the chancellor de-funded the second year when state moneys declined in 2008.

This contract brings back the second year of the Equity Pay program, on a campus-by-campus basis. Please read the accompany-
ing article in this magazine to learn more about Equity Pay and how it might affect you.

More issues in the tentative agreement: Many other take-aways were defeated and low- or no-cost improvements to the contract have been made. A highlights fact sheet lays these out on the CFA web site at www.calfac.org/settlement2012

By becoming familiar even with what we defeated this time, we can be better prepared to hold them off if they reappear in future talks.

Implementation of a collective bargaining agreement is a dynamic process. It takes time to make sure that it is done correctly. CFA is working with CSU management to ensure that the spirit and the letter of the contract is followed. We will remain vigilant and, again, that is why it is so important that individual members of CFA take ownership of this process to keep our Faculty Rights

Equity Pay Program: A Move Towards a Fair Salary Structure for CSU Faculty

By Kevin Wehr, CFA Representation Committee Chair
Sociology, Sacramento State

The new faculty contract keeps alive the push to solve inequities in the faculty salary structure. This is a positive move after four years of state funding cuts and CSU management policies to shift the burden of those cuts onto the faculty and students.

BACKGROUND: In 2007, the contract for the first time took on inversion and compression in the faculty salary structure. Inversion referred to newly hired faculty getting jobs at higher pay than faculty who had been in the CSU for years. Compression was the term for long-time faculty being trapped at the top of a salary ladder that squeezed down on them more and more over time.

The two-year Equity Pay Program of 2007 tried to address these flaws in the pay scale. The first year of the program was implemented and it helped thousands of faculty members. The second year was stopped by the Chancellor after state funding for the CSU declined.

WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW: The second year of the Equity Pay Program is finally back but now it will be run on a campus-by-campus basis. If a campus president implements an equity program, the people who should have received salary adjustments in Equity Year 2 will have to be made whole.

After that is accomplished, a campus can implement a new equity program to address new problems that have arisen from the years of not implementing these adjustments in 2008. Under the contract, faculty through their campus CFA chapter will have the opportunity to be involved in the design of any new equity program.

Each campus needs to come up with its own budget for equity pay. We are all painfully aware that the new equity program will be implemented on a campus at the discretion of each campus president. There is no central statewide funding mechanism. That is different from how funding was handled in 2007/08.

IMPLEMENTATION: Some campuses already have begun to plan implementation of equity pay while other campus presidents, it appears, may need to be persuaded to do so.

CSU managers cannot afford to ignore these flaws in the pay structure. They are a serious morale concern that is driving away quality faculty. Although the data is anecdotal, I know of award-winning faculty members who have left my campus due to lack of acceptable pay, and I can only assume that this is happening across the system. We need this program to keep teachers teaching and students learning.

CFA’s officers, board of directors and bargaining team members will work with CFA campus chapters to help them convince campus presidents to do the right thing. Implementation teams are forming on the campuses. Please contact your CFA chapter to help out.
Pension Reform Needs to Be Done Right

Rushing to do it “right now” will not get us to a better place

The new rules signed into law in September on state workers pension plans—which do affect the CalPERS pension plan for the CSU faculty—come as a reaction to those who have loudly shouted that California needs pension “reform” now, now, now.

That demand to hurry up illustrates exactly what is wrong with the public debate on public employees’ retirements: critics scream for quick action and work to create hysteria but provide no tangible solutions.

Some of the provisions in the new law are reasonable changes that end actual abuses.

Some provisions establish better practices, like the one that requires consistent contributions in good times and bad, to smooth out the ups and downs in the plans’ investments over time.

Still, pension reform needs to be done right, not merely done fast.

That means taking the time to understand how to shape the state’s system so that it continues to work well for our workforce and for the overall economy.

The state Legislative Analyst’s Office agreed, saying in a report that:

“…with several thousand public employers and many different pension and retiree health packages offered to public employees, it is very difficult to fashion a workable, fair, sustainable set of legislative provisions …”

“We strongly urge the Legislature to take several months to fashion a pension plan in response to the Governor’s proposals.”

The plan we now have in place was done fast. And we will have to sort out the consequences of that over time.

What do real reforms look like?

Real change means tackling issues such as abuses of the system and pension-spiking, which public employee labor unions in more than 240 cities, counties, and local districts had already done at the bargaining table.

After all, the vast majority of state workers never spiked their pension benefits and did not have the influence to do it even if they wanted to. It was mainly done by people in the upper ranks who had special connections to get a steep salary hike from their management just before retiring. Many unions agreed to contract provisions to prevent that.

The governor’s plan, now law, ends spiking across the board. Pension benefits will be based on an average of an employee’s last three years of work.

Some issues solved in collective bargaining

Before the governor’s plan became law, firefighters, police officers, garbage truck drivers and more already had voted to increase their own contributions toward their pensions, forego raises, and take on increased workloads.

Concessions at the state level, reached within collective bargaining over the last few years, have saved taxpayers $600 million.

CalPERS outperforms 401Ks & IRAs

Another real reform would be to take an honest look at the long-term performance of the California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS) compared with 401(k), IRA, and other hybrid proposals.

Over the past 20 years, CalPERS has shown an 8.4 percent annual positive interest rate—an incredible rate of return in any economy, but especially this one.

The real retirement crisis is not in the public sector; it’s in the private sector. Over the past 20 years, CalPERS investments have consistently out-performed 401(k)s.

It would take a 401(k) account balance of $1 million to provide $40,000 annually over one’s lifetime. To achieve a $1 million account balance, one would need to contribute $1,000 a month, every month, for 30 years, and earn a 6% return rate after fees.

The average 401(k) balance today is just $71,500, according to Fidelity Investments. Americans, whose retirement security—if you can call it that—relies on Social Security supplemented by such small balances in 401(k)s, face falling into poverty in their retirement years, and states will need to figure out how they will provide welfare to those who do.
Meanwhile, the kind of 401(k)s and IRAs that Wall Street would like average Americans to rely on lost 32 percent of their value between 2007 and 2008. That is a loss of nearly $3 trillion.

Instead of setting off false alarm bells with short-term snapshots of a pension funds’ performance, lawmakers in California ought to follow the U.S. Congress’s example of allowing private corporations to calculate their pension contributions by using a 25-year average, rather than just two years.

Like any issue, pensions will not be properly addressed through hysteria and empty rhetoric.

Our public employees’ retirements are a complex and significant economic driver that require careful consideration and thoughtful solutions, not Chicken Little-style calls to “go all the way”—whatever that means.

Gov. Brown Signs Pension Rollback Law

In September, Gov. Jerry Brown signed Assembly Bill 340, which rolls back pension benefits for public employees, including CSU faculty.

AB 340 was passed on the last day of the legislative session with little opportunity for public input and over the objections of state employee groups.

While CFA supported some of the reforms in AB 340—discontinue abuses such as spiking, for one—the union opposed the bill along with a coalition of allies including SEIU and CSEA due to the regressive cuts in benefits for new employees.

“CFA has long advocated for reforms that ensure sustainable public pension plans. By eliminating the worst abuses in the current pension system, we can do a better job protecting the retirement of hard-working Californians who depend on a modest pension for their retirement years,” said CFA President Lillian Taiz, a professor of history at CSU Los Angeles.

She added, “But while we support common-sense changes to end spiking and abuses of the system, this package unfairly slashes pensions for middle-class, working families. Elements of this package address issues that should be negotiated at the bargaining table, not dictated through legislation.

“We believe the debate should not be focused on hardworking public employees like CSU faculty who have pensions, but rather on the retirement security crisis affecting millions of Americans,” Taiz said.

Q&A on AB 340

Question: What is Assembly Bill (AB) 340?
Answer: AB 340 (Furutani) and its companion bill AB 197 (Buchanan) were passed on the last day of the legislative session. It enacts significant changes to California public employee pensions. The Assembly passed the main provisions in AB 340 by a vote of 48-8 with many Republican members abstaining; the Senate passed the bill 36-1.

AB 340 makes changes to the pension benefits that may be offered to employees hired on or after January 1, 2013. These include a new maximum benefit and a lower-cost pension formula for newly hired employees with a requirement to work longer to reach full retirement age and a cap on the amount used to calculate an individual’s pension.

Q: What will be the impact of AB 340 on current CSU employees?
A: Most of AB 340 does not affect current state employees, except for a few provisions:

◆ Most state employees will be affected by the requirement that the employee and employer equally share normal costs of pension benefits (50/50 share of costs). However, current employees of the Cal-PERS system, this package unfairly slashes pensions of middle-class, working families. Elements of this package address issues that should be negotiated at the bargaining table, not dictated through legislation.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 20
A person who retires after January 1, 2013 is prohibited from returning to work as a retired annuitant for a period of 180 days. However, FERP eligible employees can continue to apply and, if approved, return to service even within that 180-day window.

Q: What is the impact of AB 340 on future CSU employees?

A: Anyone who becomes an employee on or after January 1, 2013 will be required to pay half of the normal costs of the pension benefit. Currently, normal costs are approximately 16 percent of gross salary; the employee would pay half.

AB 340 reduces the benefit formula and increases the retirement age. The new defined-benefit formula as of January 1, 2013 will be 2 percent at age 62, with an early retirement age of 52 and a maximum benefit factor of 2.5 percent at age 67.

Q: Will the legislation affect me if I’m retired?

A: The legislation limits retirees from working more than 960 hours or 120 days per year for any public employer in the same public retirement system from which the retiree receives benefits. It also requires a 180-day “sit-out” period before a retiree can return to work except under limited circumstances that are outlined in CalPERS analysis of the legislation.

Q: Will Lecturers who retire be subject to the 180-day (6-month) waiting period before being re-employed as a retired annuitant?

A: Yes.

Q: Now that it is signed into law by the governor, when will the legislation go into effect?

A: The bill will take effect on January 1, 2013.

Q: Does the 50/50 cost-sharing proposal affect CSU employees?

A: Current CSU employees are not impact-ed by the 50/50 cost sharing portion of the pension deal. However, all CSU employees hired after January 1, 2013 WILL be subject to 50/50 cost sharing.

Q: Will current employees have their final compensation calculated based on their highest 12 consecutive-month period or 36 consecutive-month period?

A: For current employees, the pension benefit will be based on their highest average annual final 12-consecutive months of compensation. For employees hired on or after January 1, 2013, the pension benefit will be based on their highest average annual final compensation during a consecutive 36-month period, subject to the cap of $110,000 pensionable salary for calculating the retirement benefit.

Q: Will FERP-eligible employees be subject to the 180-day delay for return-to-service?

A: No. FERP-eligible employees can continue to apply and, if approved, return to service even within that 180-day window.

Q: Does the provision mandating that pensionable salary will be capped at $110,100 for those in Social Security apply to current employees?

A: No. This provision only applies to those hired on or after January 1, 2013.

Q: How did the Governor and the Legislature come up with this proposal?

A: On October 27, 2011, Governor Brown proposed a 12-point plan to reform all public employee pension systems in California. Last fall, he submitted his pension reform plan to the Conference Committee on Public Employee Pensions. The committee held several hearings around the state, and legislative leaders held several meetings with the Governor’s Office before reaching an agreement on a final report.

The report, which was released as AB 340 on August 28, 2012, contains most of the governor’s 12 provisions but does not include a mandatory 401K hybrid plan for new employees. Instead, the bill caps pensionable salary at $110,100 for those in Social Security.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 22
Diversity in the Professoriate

By John Berteaux and Juanita Darling

In Roman mythology the god Janus is depicted as having two faces. Facing backward and forward, Janus presided over beginnings and endings of the days and of the year. It is our argument that the California State University system is in need of a Janus—someone to maintain a stable, strong appreciation for both the history of and current rationale for affirmative action among CSU faculty. While recognizing that considerable progress has been made to faculty diversity in the CSU system as a whole, we suggest that it is time to turn attention to diversity across the campus and within departments.

This is a crucial time to discuss this issue because while students of color are attending the CSU in greater number, the notion that the CSU system has already been transformed into a multicultural organization does not fit the facts. In the 21st century, the limited presence of faculty of color will become more apparent as the number of students of color on the system’s campuses increase. Hence, the CSU must be clear about where the system stands today and about its goals. It must also explore barriers to reaching its goals. And faculty must be clear about their obligations and those actions that are permissible as members of hiring committees. In addition, the negative impact of the state’s fiscal crisis has forced the CSU to furlough faculty, raise tuition, and trim services. It follows, then, the university must focus on and explore ways to maintain diversity among its faculty owing to increasing minority enrollment in spite of the current fiscal crisis.

We come to these concerns from two different fields of study where faculty of color are less represented, Philosophy and Mass Communication. In Philosophy, of the 10,000 North American Philosophers, Robin Wilson estimates that no more than 100 are African-American Philosophers. Charles Mills contends that the numbers are equally as dismal, if not worse, for Asian American, Latino, and Native American philosophers. Moreover, Wilson reports that there may be fewer than 20 female African American Philosophers in the United States. In Mass Communication, which includes Journalism, the scarcity of faculty of color reflects concerns about under-representation of people of color in newsrooms and media in general. Mass Communication programs must attract and retain students from a broad range of racial and ethnic groups if they are to effectively support news organizations in their attempts to diversify their staffs. The presence of faculty of color could be a factor in student retention. Learning from faculty who represent a broad range of experiences could also help all students understand media and news events from more perspectives.

Concerns about our own fields of study shape our approach to the issues of faculty diversity and affirmative action. We are sensitive to the historic reasons that led to affirmative action policies. However, we are also aware of the implications of an increasingly diverse professoriate for the future, particularly for students and the communities to which they contribute after graduation. These concerns inform the questions that we ask about faculty diversity.

While recognizing that gender and sexual orientation are also important elements of diversity, this study does not purport to offer insights into those issues. Nor does this study examine the relationship between race, ethnicity and status by comparing tenured and tenure-track faculty to lecturers. These are all important issues that merit consideration, but they are beyond the scope of this study.

What this study does attempt to accomplish is a Janus-like approach that will improve the understanding of affirmative action in the context of the CSU faculty. First, it looks backward in an analysis of the affirmative action literature. Then, it draws on state government and California Faculty Association documents for a clear picture of the current situation to provide grounding for exploring future courses of action.

“Success in recruiting diverse faculty should be recognized as a demonstration of leadership.”
Historically, affirmative action was implemented to resolve race-based domestic problems in the United States—correcting for the under representation (or over representation) of minority groups in particular sectors of society. Conventional wisdom was, if there is a legacy and continuing pattern of racial and sexual discrimination not only is that unjust, not only does it create social and racial division but it means that there are institutions (universities, businesses, fire departments, etc.) where various groups are underrepresented. And that has been understood as a major social and political problem. It is a problem not only because it is unjust but also because once the major institutions are formed by racial and sexual discrimination, then there can be an automatic reproduction of racism unintentionally without anyone willing it or designing it. As a result, the idea of adopting policies that get increasing numbers of non whites and women into jobs has been irresistible and powerful. But it is also an idea that has created tremendous resentment and disagreement.

Whereas conventional wisdom may have it that affirmative action is dead, the California State Auditor Report insists that affirmative action plans are valuable as a means of familiarizing search committees to the availability of women and minorities. In addition, the auditor stated that there is little consistency among the campuses in meeting federal regulations that require employers consider both internal and external factors when estimating the percentage of qualified women and minorities available for the job market.

Admittedly, the scarcity of candidates of color for faculty positions in many disciplines creates challenges for hiring committees and we acknowledge the negative impact of recent economic and budgetary developments across the CSU, yet we still maintain that many of the resources needed to proceed are already available. Besides uncovering inconsistencies, the State Bureau of Audits has discovered campuses and departments that have implemented successful practices for recruiting faculty of color. Their experiences should be shared throughout the system. Faculty members and administrators who have participated in several successful searches should be identified and encouraged to act as mentors and resources for other departments and campuses desiring to improve their recruitment of faculty of color. Success in recruiting diverse faculty should be recognized as a demonstration of leadership. Our hope is that our research will serve as a stimulus for collaborative research within the CSU for those seeking to meet the needs of people of color.

**WE NEED THE RESOURCES TO MAKE DIVERSITY POSSIBLE**

Comment from Cecil Canton, chair of the CFA Council for Affirmative Action

This article on faculty diversity by Berteaux and Darling addresses a fundamental dilemma facing the CSU today—in a time of diminishing/shrinking resources to the entire system, how can we sustain the effort to diversify our faculty?

The authors assert that we need a Janus-type leader who can lead that effort while appreciating the progress that has already been made. While I agree with that, I also believe that we must have leaders who not only appreciate the need for and the history of our efforts to diversify the faculty but who also are willing to fight for and provide new leadership to effect that change.

One thing is clear: If Proposition 30, The Schools & Local Public Safety Protection Act, championed by Gov. Brown and designed to increase revenue available to the CSU, does not garner the support required for success on the November ballot, all effort to diversify our faculty will suffer a significant setback—a setback from which even a leader of mythic proportions cannot deliver us.

---

**AB 340 CONTINUED FROM PAGE 20**

the bill on August 31 and Gov. Brown signed it on September 12, 2012.

**Q:** What does AB 340 NOT do?

**A:** Several regressive changes that would have affected CSU faculty adversely were negotiated out of the bill. These include proposals to:

- Increase vesting period and contributions for retiree health care
- Establish a hybrid 401k pension system

**Q:** Will this bill put an end to the attacks on public employee pensions?

**A:** It is CFA’s hope that enactment of AB 340 will stop the momentum of anti-pension zealots who have been mobilizing to qualify ballot initiatives to gut pensions and force public employees into 401K type plans.

**Q:** I still have a specific question about my retirement and individual circumstance.

**Who should I talk to?**

**A:** You should contact a CalPERS agent directly. Call toll-free 888 CalPERS (888-225-7377).

**PLEASE NOTE:** These comments are based on the union’s understanding of AB 340 at California Faculty magazine press time. New information could become available. These questions are not intended to address all issues that could arise from the bill. For more about your particular situation as a CSU faculty member, contact CalPERS toll-free 888-CalPERS (888-225-7377) or calpers.ca.gov
APC and Chancellor Reach Tentative Agreement on Negotiations

The Academic Professional of California—CSU Bargaining Unit 4—reached a tentative agreement on a new contract with CSU management August 28.

At press time, a ratification vote was being worked out; details of the deal are forthcoming.

Learn more at: www.apc1002.org

CFHE think-tank report documents impact of “contingency faculty hiring”

In August, the Center for the Future of Higher Education, a think tank associated with the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education, released a new report highlighting some major challenges in the way of providing students access to an affordable and quality higher education.

View the report and its supporting documents at: www.futureofhighered.org

The new report—“Who is Professor ‘Staff,’ and how can this person teach so many classes?”—offers an in-depth analysis of a nationwide survey of “contingent” faculty—teachers hired strictly on temporary contracts. The survey was developed and administered by the New Faculty Majority Foundation.

The report focuses on the working conditions imposed on contingent faculty and the impact of those conditions on students and the quality of the education they receive.

Students hold hunger strike, demand fee-hike moratorium

CSU students from six campuses waged a hunger strike in May to protest tuition hikes, enrollment caps and cuts of services and programs.

The 13 students, who began the action May 2, called on the CSU Trustees to freeze tuition for five years, administrative pay cuts, expand free speech rights on campuses, and eliminate free housing and car allowances for the system’s 23 presidents.

Fullerton graduate student David Inga, 22, said he participated in the hunger strike because the CSU’s leaders ignored previous marches, sit-ins and other student protests.

“Our backs are against the wall. That’s why we need to take such a drastic measure,” he said. “Since I started as a freshman at Fullerton, I’ve seen outrageous increases in student fees. Trustees are extremely disconnected from the reality that students are now facing.”

The nine-day fast ended when Chancellor Charles Reed and Trustees Chair Robert Linscheid agreed to meet with the students to hear their demands.

The hunger strike drew hundreds of news reports from outlets around the country including the New York Times.
CFA Recommendations on Propositions

- **Prop. 30 Support** Gov. Jerry Brown’s Revenue Measure
- Prop. 31 Oppose Two-Year Budget Cycle
- **Prop. 32 Oppose** Ban On Union Contributions to State & Local Candidates
- Prop. 33 Oppose Car Insurance Rates
- Prop. 34 Support Abolish the Death Penalty
- Prop. 35 Support Prohibition on Human Trafficking
- Prop. 36 Support Repeal of the “Three Strikes” Law
- Prop. 38 Oppose Molly Munger’s State Income Tax Increase
- Prop. 40 Support Redistricting Plan

*Propositions in bold are CFA priority recommendations*

REGISTER TO VOTE
Find instructions and forms at RegisterToVote.ca.gov

LEARN MORE ABOUT PROPOSITION 30
yesonprop30.com

FIND YOUR STATE ASSEMBLY & SENATE DISTRICT
www.calvoter.org/voter/maps/index.html

LEARN MORE ABOUT PROPOSITION 32
www.stopspecialexemptions.org