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WHAT’S INSIDE
The California Faculty Association is in the process of negotiating a new Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), known simply as our contract, with the management of the California State University. Our current CBA expires this year on June 30 and CFA has committed itself to doing what it can to see that we have a new agreement in place before that date.

Since we have never been able to have a new agreement in place before the then-current agreement expired—in part because we have always had trouble getting the CSU management to begin bargaining early enough to accomplish this—this is a departure from the past.

CFA leaders went through a long process of consultation with our members before we embarked on this plan. We based it on a few important ideas and principles: during difficult times for California, we had sacrificed by giving up money, forgoing raises and increasing our workloads in all major areas.

Now, however, the economy is getting better and the strain placed on faculty and students is no longer sustainable. Thus we need a new CBA that reflects these realities and the sooner we get it in place, the better it will be for our faculty, our students, our families and the State of California.

The CFA leadership at both the campus and statewide levels began planning for the new round of bargaining last spring and sought and received the approval of the semi-annual CFA Delegates Assembly in April 2013 to proceed on a fast track bargaining schedule.

Taking this directive, the CFA Bargaining Team began preparing in the summer. The chapter presidents’ retreat last June and the Contract Development & Bargaining
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Strategy Committee (CDBS) met separately in midsummer, both committing to working on campuses as they opened in the fall. The individual chapters created a buzz about what was going on and what needed to be done. The CDBS created a general membership survey to guide our Bargaining Team in putting together proposals for the new CBA.

Members Completed Bargaining Surveys

A kickoff meeting of leaders at the beginning of the fall term helped to generate a huge turnout of members responding to the survey with excellent results. Thousands of members weighed in on both the quantitative and qualitative sections of the survey. Every qualitative suggestion was tallied and studied. The Bargaining Team then assembled “sunshine proposals” that let CSU management know the issues on which CFA intended to negotiate in the new round of bargaining.

CFA sent the proposals to management at the earliest possible dates and proposed that instead of waiting to bargain in the spring, as had been the past practice, that we begin bargaining as soon as legally possible.

CFA proposed dates beginning in December 2013 and negotiations began on December 12.

Top Issues In The Talks

While CFA has many areas of concern in our current work, and in the current CBA, three areas stood out with our members and became the basis of our sunshine proposals and our issues at the bargaining table.

First, following up on the sacrifices our faculty made by taking a furlough year and by accepting a contract with no compensation increases in 2012, our members called for relief and progress in this area. Going without cost-of-living adjustments didn’t lead to stagnation but to decay against the real cost of living.

So we need General Salary Increases (GSI) for all members. Also, failing to receive step increases in the current contract meant that our newer and lower paid members did not make the progress they expected and deserve. The solution to this is annual Salary Step Increases (SSI).

Finally, we realize that we have ongoing salary problems of compression and inversion, which were made worse because of lack of hiring of tenure-track faculty and lack of SSI. These problems, too, must be addressed. A key to quality education is excellent faculty that remains consistent. The lack of adequate compensation drives faculty away.

Workloads for our faculty have gone up with larger classes, more service demands on the remaining tenured/tenure-track faculty and ongoing demands of scholarship without adequate resources. These problems all have negative consequences for our students and our faculty.

“The Bargaining Team is making a cohesive and compelling argument at the table but we know that the support of our members is vital to the effort.... Logic, evidence and resolve are fundamental to a quick and fair contract.”

Top: José Cintrón teaches bilingual and multicultural education at Sacramento State and serves as co-chair of the CFA Capitol Chapter’s Council for Affirmative Action. He has a strong union message for you. Bottom left: Stephanie Seedy, in history at Sacramento State, makes the connection between students’ education and faculty working conditions.
Connect the Dots: Better state funding for the CSU and a better faculty contract

By Lillian Taiz
President, California Faculty Association
History, Cal State Los Angeles

Bargaining a contract is always difficult, and this round of negotiations is no different. As we all know, the issues we need to address this year are large and complex.

From the start of our planning, we have recognized the importance of getting to the table as early as possible and beginning to discuss issues and proposals with the administration.

That is one reason why the “100-Day Contract Countdown” to the date our contract expires on June 30 was incorporated into our contract campaign plan. It has been an important way not only to make visible our collective concern but also to move bargaining along more expeditiously than in the past.

We are pleased that at this point we have had more meetings and have more issues on the table than ever before at this point in the process.

While we do not have any agreements yet, we are getting a much better and earlier sense of where they are coming from; likewise they are getting a much clearer sense of what our priorities are and what has to be in place in order to get an agreement.

While we hope to reach an agreement with the administration by June 30, we are of course preparing to move forward if we do not. We will be ready if, as in years past, we must up the action to show our university management that we are serious about getting a #FairContractCFA—as we say on Twitter.

You can learn more about the Countdown on the CFA web site at calfac.org

CSU Funding

Improving funding for the CSU is an important piece of our contract campaign and of our efforts to rebuild our campuses.

The immediate next hurdle in the long, difficult battle for real funding for our public higher ed system is completing the 2014/15 state budget with a rational, meaningful increase in the dollars that go to the CSU.

State tax revenues are strong and all eyes are on the governor’s revised budget proposal, known as the “May Revise,” expected around May 10.

Gov. Brown has proposed a 5 percent increase in state funding to the CSU, the CSU Trustees want more than that, and we know that neither proposal would get the CSU back to where it was before the recession.

In our visits to members of the state Assembly and Senate, we find a great deal of support for a bigger increase.

It will take continued pressure, though, to move that to fruition and that is why campus CFA chapters are emailing, tweeting and conducting local visits to our legislators. We hope you will join in.
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Excessive classroom size reduces faculty availability for individual students.

Excessive service demands can also reduce faculty availability for students and lead to less time for curriculum development, community outreach and faculty governance.

All of these are an integral part of being a faculty in a university. Scholarly activity is not an additional hurdle for faculty working their way up in the university structure, it is a fundamental part of what it means to be a professor.

While it is required for tenure-track and tenured faculty it also must be recognized for its value. Instead, it has become a burden for many, not because it is demanded, but because there is no time left to get it done. All of these issues are being addressed in this struggle.

While salary and workload are fundamentals that impact all of our faculty, there are many other parts of the CBA to insure that capable faculty are recruited, properly evaluated, treated fairly and retained.

This involves issues like Lecturer stability; fair treatment of coaches, counselors, and librarians; fair retention, tenure and promotion processes; adequate sabbaticals and a faculty early retirement program (FERP) represent some examples of these concerns. These all help provide continuity and excellence so that our students as well as our faculty benefit from a healthy, fair workplace.

Finally in this list, though not in importance, is the realization that changing technology, and creativity by our faculty offer concerns as well as positive benefits.

CFA members have embraced innovative approaches that impact our work force; fairness for faculty teaching, research and service; stability of capable faculty are recruited, properly evaluated, treated fairly and retained.

The lack of any increases for those at the top of the pay scale means that wages have eroded.

Others find that without regular Salary Step Increases (SSIs), the salaries of newly hired tenure-track faculty outpace their own. This creates an inequity we call the “experience penalty.”

A shameful number of Lecturers have been hired or rehired at shockingly low wages—Lecturer L and A pay scales—leaving them earning less than the $30,000 for which fast-food workers are fighting. That combined with the lack of regular Service Salary Increases has left too many Lecturers financially stranded and ineligible for range elevations.

Our Faculty Contract

With or without a larger increase to the CSU budget than the governor has proposed, however, we are committed to a fair contract for faculty in the CSU.

Years without salary increases have created a whole host of problems for the CSU as well as for our families, including significant inequities in our salary structure.

The lack of any increases for those at the top of the pay scale means that wages have eroded.

Others find that without regular Salary Step Increases (SSIs), the salaries of newly hired tenure-track faculty outpace their own. This creates an inequity we call the “experience penalty.”

A shameful number of Lecturers have been hired or rehired at shockingly low wages—Lecturer L and A pay scales—leaving them earning less than the $30,000 for which fast-food workers are fighting. That combined with the lack of regular Service Salary Increases has left too many Lecturers financially stranded and ineligible for range elevations.

Second only to salary, all of us have experienced increased and excessive demands in our work—from research and teaching to service. The growth in the numbers of students in our classrooms, labs, studios and lecture halls is phenomenal across departments and disciplines.

The CFA Bargaining Team has shaped vital proposals that are “on the table.” These cover salary; increased work demands in teaching, research and service; stability of our work force; fairness for faculty teaching in Extended Education; and discrimination. Likewise, CSU management has brought up changes it would like in appointments and evaluations.

By the time you are reading this magazine, we hope that all proposals from both sides will be on the table. Further, we hope we are able to report real progress toward getting a contract done by the end of June. We will see.

Connect the dots

As we keep up the action this spring and into the next academic year, it is very important that we “connect the dots”—a better budget helps us get a better contract so we MUST be part of the effort to get more resources into our system.

At the same time, no matter what happens to the budget, we will fight like hell for a fair contract!

Please stay in close contact with your campus CFA chapter about how you can play a part as we all move forward together.

“The immediate next hurdle in the long, difficult battle for real funding for our public higher ed system is completing the 2014/15 state budget with a rational, meaningful increase in the dollars that go to the CSU.”
curriculum when it is created by the faculty to better serve the learning needs of our students.

Online education has been a part of our curriculum and developed successfully for years. CFA thinks this teaching method, like so many others, must always be part of our evolving push for better education. However, it is neither a panacea nor a way to save money from top-down ill-conceived programs.

Technology changes raise questions about the ownership of and fair use of the products created by our faculty. Faculty’s intellectual property must be protected and those who create innovation should be the ones who benefit from it, along with the students.

Be Ready

In developing the proposals that we want incorporated in the successor CBA, CFA is addressing all of these issues. We on the Bargaining Team already have discussed most of them with management.

Members deserve improvements in salary, relief in the work we do for students, and a university in which we are treated fairly, openly and with respect.

The CFA Bargaining Team is engaged in this process to help the faculty get what we all deserve in a timely manner. The Team has spent many hours and ask that CFA members help to get this contract completed.

Please be ready to participate in getting out the word, and by recruiting new members.

The Bargaining Team is making a cohesive and compelling argument at the table but we know that the support of our members is vital to the effort.

Logic, evidence and resolve are fundamental to a quick and fair contract.

Above: D.D. Wills, chair of the CFA Chapter at Pomona and CFA Field Rep Jackie Teepen “table” for a #FairContractCFA
Top Left: Faculty at the California Maritime Academy
Bottom Left: The CFA Chapter at San Luis Obispo mark the 100-Day Contract Countdown. Left to right: Jere Ramsey, CFA Lecturer Rep, teaches business; David Kann, CFA Chapter Secretary in English; Helene Finger in Engineering; and Glen Thorncroft in mechanical engineering is president of the CFA SLO Chapter.
A record number of faculty gathered in Los Angeles in March searching for better connections with people seeking a more accessible and equitable CSU for all students, faculty and staff.

It was the 7th CFA Equity Conference hosted by the CFA Council for Affirmative Action. The program was jammed with workshops and speeches and the halls were filled with people sharing experiences with others who know what it’s like.

The keynote speaker was Jackson Potter, staff coordinator for the Chicago Teachers Union. And, Assemblymember Shirley Weber, a longtime faculty member at San Diego State, addressed a packed workshop by the African American Caucus on what is happening to ethnic studies in the very system that started teaching it first.

In a fascinating discussion of the Chicago teachers’ strike, the first strike of city teachers in 25 years, Potter said that students and their families were behind the teachers because social justice issues were so central to the fight.

“We got to go beyond bread and butter and engage members and the broader public in critical discussions and debates about racial and economic justice,” he said.

CFA President Lillian Taiz noted that CFA has grappled with issues of equity within the union and within the CSU. The union has taken up national education initiatives, challenging efforts to privatize the university and attempts to push forms of online higher ed that don’t actually work for students.

“This is a journey that is unlikely to end any time soon,” she said. “We as a union have many challenges ahead of us. And, as I remind myself all the time, we must be brave enough to keep moving and changing.”

CFA stood in solidarity with Ethnic Studies faculty throughout the state when campus administrators moved to merge or eliminate programs, supported legislation requiring reporting of the Early Start Program’s outcomes, and continues to push for wage equity in the contract and highlight the cultural taxation many faculty of color face.

In the workshop hosted by CFA’s African American Caucus, Weber said reducing or eliminating such programs should not be allowed.

“When you want to conquer a people, you destroy their knowledge of self,” she said.

The Equity Conference advanced knowledge of self as well as our university system.
In 2011, the California State University successfully hired 453 new tenure-line faculty. This was the first year since the recession in which the number of faculty hires grew from one year to the next. Hiring-wise, the CSU was at long last a path to recovery.

As we take steps to recover, it also is incumbent upon us to track the important changes in the gender, racial and ethnic composition of our workforce.

This year, we reached a milestone: for the first time the overall gender composition faculty is evenly split 50/50 male and female.

The data also shows that faculty of color represent 34 percent of the instructional faculty workforce. That is a historical improvement from our first CFA Equity Conference in 2003 when this level hovered at just 25 percent.

Statistically, the CSU continues to edge its way towards a more inclusive, diverse and heterogeneous workplace.

While statistics and compositional changes are important elements of our story, they are only partial observations of what is going on at the campus or even department level.

To enrich our statistical understanding of equity and diversity, the CFA Researcher Kenny Sims and CFA Communications Specialist Nisha Gates developed profiles of four faculty members that explore their experiences.

These personal profiles give a human context to the statistical data and offer a provocative, and sometimes counterintuitive, insight into gender, race, and ethnic equality in academia.

We hope this research proves informative and instructional, and are grateful for your ongoing efforts to help make the CSU a more inclusive, accepting and diverse community.

“The maritime industry is heavily male-dominated, regardless of rank” McGowan said. “In the last several years, increasing numbers of women have entered the industry, not only aboard ships but shore-side as well. From a diversification standpoint, CMA is not on par with other campuses due to the industry we serve and the slow changes in trends within it.”

In percentage, the number of female faculty members far outpaces that of female students, which was 13.3 percent in 2012 (the most recent data available). McGowan said she doesn’t view the low gender diversity as a negative but does believe there should be diversity in all departments.

And while there might be a lack of diversity, it doesn’t affect her workload. “I teach the same classes as the male faculty. I don’t think there is any favoritism regarding a larger (or smaller) workload due to my gender. I have to get down and dirty just like the men do, and it’s not an issue for me.”

The more diverse the campus, the better it is for students. But, McGowan cautioned, diversity on campus doesn’t necessarily exist...
in the commercial shipping business.

“Diversity is a great thing, but it doesn’t represent the industry as it truly exists. You have to be adaptable to working with and around men, sometimes in very close quarters, if you want to be successful in the business.”

**PERSPECTIVES ON DIVERSITY**

**Camille O’Bryant**
**Cal Poly San Luis Obispo**

For Camille O’Bryant, the path to teaching was paved with lessons in diverse cultures—and in certain instances, a lack thereof.

She rowed crew in college but when it came time to serve as coach, she began to be verbally harassed by her peers. The experience prompted an interest in studying sociology, specifically race and ethnicity in sports. Now, O’Bryant is a kinesiology professor at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo teaching courses in the sociology and psychology of sports and exercise.

While O’Bryant’s courses on subjects like sports and gender spark awareness among students about cultural diversity and inclusiveness, a glance at Cal Poly’s diversity on campus might not.

Students, faculty and staff lag well below state and national averages for representation across different ethnic groups, with less than 1 percent of the student population being black compared to 4.6 percent systemwide. Ethnic diversity among the SLO faculty also is problematic—1.6 percent are black; and only 19.6 percent are faculty of color.

“I’m the only African American in my college and have been since 1999,” O’Bryant said.

And while she has noticed a rise in the number of female faculty in her college—the College of Science and Mathematics—of the 19 candidates going up for promotion or to tenure this academic year, only three were women, she said.

The impact of those disparities cause a range of effects, from overextending oneself on committees needing people of color or women to fewer role models for students.

The new provost and president are investing resources into programs and projects to deal with the campus climate, but that type of response is needed system wide if comprehensive change is to happen.

“This is something we value so we should put as many resources as we can behind it,” O’Bryant said.

**Molly Talcott**
**Cal State Los Angeles**

Cal State Los Angeles is the most diverse campus in the CSU system. Close to 90 percent of students report that they are students of color. The campus’ faculty diversity is the highest in the system as well—53 percent are faculty of color.

Yet there are challenges despite those seemingly laudable figures, said Molly Talcott, associate professor of sociology and president of CFA’s Los Angeles chapter.

“One of them is that even if we’re the so-called most diverse faculty, it doesn’t mean we actually reflect the communities we serve,” she said.

“We have a long way to go in terms of carefully and thoughtfully recruiting faculty of color who have long-standing, organic connections to CSULA’s surrounding communities.”

Another challenge is the concept of being “diverse enough.” Because diversity appears to be in place, efforts to further attract people of varying backgrounds and ethnicities wanes. A case in point is the sharp decline on campus of Black faculty. There may be multiple reasons, such as attrition, Talcott posits, but the relatively few number of Black faculty...
on campus is alarming.
Failure to reflect diversity in the faculty can have a direct impact on students. “Our students are really in need of faculty who look like them and who have experiences similar to their own,” she said. “Although I do feel that our students are satisfied with their education, I want them to be able to look at their professors and feel that they have the agency to become professors, too, if they want to.”
CSU administration needs to be conscious about writing job announcements that will attract a diverse group of people, be it women or people of color (and especially women of color), and sharing them with professional associations that have diverse memberships. It is critical to look within Cal State LA’s excellent Lecturer pool for candidates to promote to the tenure-track.
“We have a long way to go. I’m glad we’re doing relatively well, but I think there’s a lot of room for improvement.”

PERSPECTIVES ON DIVERSITY

Vince Ornelas
CSU Chico

Chico State is clearly on the lower end of the diversity spectrum. With white students making up 52 percent of students (compared to 29% systemwide), and 78 percent of faculty white compared to 66 percent systemwide, it’s apparent that on-campus diversity bears improvement.
And while the campus has taken steps in that direction, in Vince Ornelas’ opinion, efforts to expand diversity are flawed and impact the student experience.
For the past 10 summers, Ornelas has worked with incoming freshman who are first generation college students, and overwhelmingly, students of color. “What ends up happening is that they look around and see all these people who look like them, dress like them (during the summer). Then they move into the dorms and they think ‘Wow, there’s not a lot of people who look like me.”
Ornelas has witnessed students of color not being called upon when raising their hands in GE courses but when Ornelas has highlighted this to other faculty, some bear attitudes that are disappointing at best.
“I’ve had colleagues say it doesn’t matter, that knowledge is knowledge and they don’t have to think about those things. To me, that’s the very definition of white privilege…. For the majority of the faculty, the world is great because it looks and feels like them. That’s why we have a problem.”
The lack of on-campus diversity has an impact on Ornelas himself, from the way he incorporates stories from his own life into his teaching to student responses in class. For some students, it helps them to feel at home because it’s something they can relate to. For others, it can be off-putting enough to cause some white male students to leave class, as was the case during a discussion of how the poverty rate bears a heavier impact on some ethnicities.
But for Ornelas, having impactful discussions that touch on diversity is a critical piece of the learning experience, and a must if CSU Chico is to evolve into a more diverse campus.

Learn more about the CFA Equity Conference

CFA research on equity and diversity in the CSU

Photo gallery of CFA’s Equity Conference
www.calfac.org/photo-gallery/cfa-equity-conference-2014

Council for Affirmative Action
www.calfac.org/council-affirmative-action

Comparison of Color/White Race/Ethnicity for Students and Faculty at CSU Chico and Systemwide, Fall 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>March 23</th>
<th>March 24</th>
<th>March 25</th>
<th>March 26</th>
<th>March 27</th>
<th>March 28</th>
<th>March 29</th>
<th>March 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Get Involved!

#FairContractCFA  www.calfac.org
## Contract Countdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>MAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The current faculty contract expires June 30**
Winning a Strong Contract means Fighting for a Strong Budget

By Kevin Wehr
CSU Sacramento, Sociology
Chair, CFA Political Action/Legislation Committee
President, CFA Sacramento State Chapter

Proper funding for the California State University via the California state budget process has a big impact on the quality of the education we can deliver and the terms on which we all work. A strong budget means money for class sections and for a fair contract, among many other things.

That is why we follow the budget process so closely and why we try to improve CSU funding when we can.

The budget under debate right now would cover the 2014/15 fiscal year, starting this July 1.

The Governor’s proposal
In January, Gov. Jerry Brown proposed a 2014/15 budget for California that includes a $142 million—5 percent—increase in funding for the California State University.

Several of the elements in last year’s budget proposal are conspicuously missing this year. It does not link the budget to performance metrics such as four-year graduation rates. It does not dedicate a pool of money for online course development.

Performance metrics are back, but only as an emphasis—not with purse strings attached.

On the other hand, this year’s proposal does include a shift in capital outlay financing that will cost the CSU over time due to the folding of debt payments into our general operating budget.

Overall, this proposed budget is inadequate to meet the enrollment needs of our students and the compensation and workload needs of our faculty.

The state can afford it
The state’s revenues are up by 5.9 percent and $4.2 billion are a surplus. Economists expect continued strong growth in tax revenues into next year and beyond. In fact, the growth is so robust that the fiscally conservative Legislative Analyst’s Office expects revenues and the surplus to go still higher.

In light of this, the Chancellor’s Office has advocated for an additional $95.4 million above what the governor has proposed; that would be a total increase in state funding of $237 million. Speaker of the Assembly John A. Pérez goes even further with his

CONTINUED ON PAGE 16

Kevin Wehr, chair of CFA’s Political Action and Legislative Committee

CSU faculty and students testified about public higher ed funding at a public session of the state Assembly Budget Sub-Committee on Education Finance. Center front: Diana Wright Guerin, chair of the CSU Academic Senate.

Watch a replay of the hearing at http://calchannel.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=7&clip_id=1828
The California State University system can issue debt—meaning sell bonds—in its own name. Typically, the CSU issues debt to pay for capital expenditures like constructing buildings, purchasing real estate, buying major equipment, or developing various forms of infrastructure.

The CSU is well liked by credit rating agencies, so the cost of that debt—meaning how much the CSU pays in interest to investors who buy the bonds—is not as high as the interest paid by many other bond sellers.

In fact, Gov. Brown has noted repeatedly in his commentary about his plan for CSU funding in the 2014/15 fiscal year that the CSU has a higher bond rating than does the State of California, so the CSU’s interest cost should be a little lower than the state’s.

In previous budget years, the CSU has been allocated a budget from the state—which in the financial statements is labeled “State Appropriations, Noncapital,” and which we often refer to as the “General Fund”—to operate the universities.

And, the legislature also has allocated funds in another category to cover debt service, meaning to pay the interest to investors on the bonds the CSU has sold. The funds in this other category that cover debt service are labeled “State Appropriations, Capital” in the CSU’s financial statements.

So, this means that, at the moment, debt service is not a component of the money the state provides to run the universities—the “State Appropriations, Noncapital.”

And, that means that whenever the amount of debt service increased in the past, the state funded those increases separately rather than by reducing resources available to operate the CSU under “State Appropriations, Noncapital.”

Stepping back and looking at the whole picture till now, the total state funding of the CSU—that is, “State Appropriations, Noncapital” to run the universities plus “State Appropriations, Capital” to pay for the bonds—increased as debt service increased.

Gov. Brown’s proposal for this coming fiscal year’s budget would change all that.

He would change how the state treats “capital outlay financing”—the debt service on bonds.

Rather than keeping bonds a separate legislatively reviewed appropriation, the governor proposes to end the practice of giving the CSU a separate “State Appropriations, Capital” allocation.

Instead, he proposes to add $300 million to the CSU budget. This is pretty much a zero sum game in terms of total CSU appropriations at the moment since that is about what the CSU needs to pay for debt service right now.

This proposal presumes that as debt is paid off, the debt service expense would go down. In turn, that would allow the CSU to borrow (sell bonds) for new capital projects and use the “savings” ($300 million minus the reduced debt service cost) to service the new debt.

That might sound like an okay thing to do, given that as debt is paid off we can use the “savings” to cover the cost of “new” debt for capital expenditures that we need to have classrooms, heating systems, laboratories, all the capital-infrastructure stuff used by a university.

However, it’s not really such a good deal.

At the CSU Trustees meeting in January, there was mention of $1.8 billion in capital, infrastructure replacement and maintenance needs, let alone planned new capital expenditures for new buildings and equipment.

This suggests that the governor’s proposal would apply a ceiling on state support for capital outlays after a rather long period of putting off the CSU’s needs, presumably because of the recession and funding cuts during the recent past. That sets the ceiling rather low.

Gov. Brown refers to this as “letting the CSU manage its budget” and keeps remarking that the “CSU can come out ahead if they manage well.” But that’s not really much of a possibility at this moment.

Some of us who have been watching closely note that, if this change in state funding is approved, the next impact will be to force the CSU to cover yet more shortfalls in state appropriations. And that will be money that comes out of the budget for actually delivering education to our students.

(See chart page 16).
The governor proposes to change the way the state funds “capital outlay” projects for the CSU.

Instead of simply funding them as needed, the new plan would give the CSU a flat amount to pay the debt on the projects. The red line in the chart above shows that flat amount.

The blue line shows the change over time the CSU will have to spend to pay for capital projects already underway. In 2016, just two budget years from now, that cost will be $40 million more than what the governor wants to provide.

That extra money above the governor’s red line would have to come from somewhere else within the CSU.

But that’s not all. This chart assumes no new debt. It is a “status quo” story.

Unfortunately, we have already heard the Trustees’s budget people report that the CSU has $1.8 billion in deferred maintenance—and $700 million of that are immediate needs. They predict it will take about $70 million in debt service (interest payments to investors) to manage those immediate needs.

The governor’s plan would not fund any of that at all.

So, the blue line—the CSU’s debt service payments in coming years—will have to leap above the governor’s red line for a long time if the CSU will meet all that deferred maintenance. And that means money coming out of, well, “other things” to be determined.

It’s another, somewhat more hidden, consequence of the long-term underfunding combined with drastic funding cuts to our state university.

Budget Blueprint, calling for an augmentation greater than what the Chancellor’s Office wants.

This increased budget would fund enrollment increases, reinvest in programs, and increase and improve Cal Grants.

The CSU system has been cut wildly over the last six years, starving tenure-line hires, making small programs suffer, and stuffing more students into ever-larger classrooms while faculty pay stagnated.

An adequate budget would help us bounce back from this involuntary belt-tightening as well as mark an investment in the future of California. Numerous studies have estimated the need for a million more college graduates in the workforce by 2025.

The CSU will play a key role for the future of California’s educated workforce.

What you can do

Faculty must join the Speaker and the Chancellor in advocating for an expanded budget augmentation.

A strong budget will help us negotiate a strong contract that will tackle tough issues such as compensation—which must be addressed if we are to recruit and retain faculty. And it would help to address excessive workload to put a stop to rapidly growing class sizes and restore the time and resources we need to advise and work with our students.

The time is now to re-fund the CSU.

Join your CFA Budget Action Team on your campus to help us fight for adequate funding for our students and for the future of California.

Contact your representatives in their district offices to let them know the importance of re-investing in the CSU.
AB 2153 (Grey): Establish the definition of “Supplant”

Preserve California students’ access to degrees through public higher ed

This bill would help to ensure that classes that CSU and California Community College students must take to complete their degrees cannot be moved out of regular state-funded higher ed programs and moved into auxiliary-sponsored programs like extended education where the state does not provide funding, students must pay much more to take the classes, and the faculty get paid less to teach them.

Usually, these courses are offered during summer and winter intersession and allow students to accelerate degree progress. But, and this became more common in recent years as state funding was cut and class offerings were reduced, many students resort to extended ed to complete classes they must take but in which they could not land a spot during the regular session.

It’s important to note that, per state law, these self-supporting courses shall not “supplant” regular course offerings available on a non-self-supporting basis during the regular academic year.

In 2012, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee approved an audit of the CSU Extended Education program. Last December, the California State Auditor’s Office found it is unclear whether supplanting of state-supported classes has occurred. The Auditor’s office recommended that the Legislature clarify the language in the Education Code by defining the term supplant and describing how the CSU should measure whether supplanting is occurring.

The clarifying language also should require each CSU campus to take reasonable steps to ensure that when it makes decisions about courses or program offerings, those decisions do not force students attempting to earn a degree to take courses that are required as a condition of degree completion through extended education.

AB 2153 does that by providing a clarifying definition of the term supplant and requiring annual measures by the CSU and Community Colleges to ensure state-sponsored course offerings are not supplanted or replaced by these added-cost courses. The Assembly Education Committee approved AB 2153 by a 10-0 vote.

Learn more about “supplanting” on page 18.

AB 46 (Pan): Student Data, Private Vendors & the CSU

Prevent profiteers from hiding and selling “big data” on students

This bill would ensure the CSU receives all student data collected by third-party private vendors involved in instruction. It also would protect students and faculty members by not allowing private vendors to sell information on students or courses.

Disturbing issues associated with data collection has been exacerbated by the increased experimentation with technology as education segments sought ways to save money.

In January 2013, San Jose State University and Massive Open Online Course provider Udacity entered into a contract to teach six online course sections of three classes as a pilot project. They were offered to 50 matriculated San Jose State students and 50 community college and high school students. The curriculum and teaching was prepared by San Jose faculty working with Udacity.

Within six months of the launch, the results were leaked of a massive failure rate among students taking the courses. Shortly after the information was leaked, San Jose State announced it had suspended the collaboration with Udacity.

Before the pilot began, the CSU Academic Senate was told it would have access to all data collected by Udacity. However when Senate members asked to see that student data, they were told “the data isn’t quite ready,” then “it isn’t quite complete,” and then “the data belongs to SJSU.” Finally, the Senate was told “the data belongs to Udacity.” After filing a public records request, the Senate got some but not all of the data collected.

Even with the failure of the Udacity pilot project, there remain companies pushing online education that would use state money without the requisite levels of transparency and accountability.

If the state invests money and resources into a for-profit company to provide education to CSU students, then the data and information that pertains to the students’ progress should be available to educators. Further, vendors should not be allowed to manipulate and profit from the distribution of student and/or faculty data to other parties. And, our students and faculty must be protected by restricting the ability of private vendors to sell student and course information for which a CSU campus paid.
“Supplanting” State-funded Courses: What’s in a Name?

The increasing trend to move classes from “state-support” to “self-support” means higher tuition for students, lower pay and fewer benefits for faculty.

by Susan Meisenhelder
English, San Bernardino
Former CFA President

What’s in a name? A lot, it turns out.

But you have to wade through a ton of opaque technical language to figure that out when it comes to something as dense-sounding as “supplanting.”

Here’s why it’s worth the effort:

It makes a huge difference to students and to faculty whether a course is offered as a regular “stateside,” publicly funded course or as a “self-support” course offered as a “Special Session” through Extended Education.

For students, courses offered in Extended Education aren’t supported by state funding and are paid for solely through student fees. That means students pay much more for these courses than they do for regular, state-supported ones. Furthermore, they get a double-whammy when they take courses through Extended Education because not all forms of financial aid are available to them there.

Faculty members teaching in Extended Education take a huge hit too.

A person teaching Freshman English in Extended Education, for instance, gets paid much less than if she/he were teaching that exact same course as a regular, state-funded course. Faculty members teaching in Extended Education also have many fewer contractual protections and virtually no benefits.

In “the old days,” this distinction didn’t make such a huge difference for most students or faculty. For many years of its history, Extended Education was a true add-on in the Cal State system. A wide variety of courses—special interest non-credit courses, specialized professional training programs, and a smattering of courses for degrees—were the staple of Extended Education programs. The vast majority of regularly enrolled students never took classes there at all.

That all changed in a new era of decreased funding for higher education in California and a broader national move toward privatizing public higher education.

The new era

In 2010, the CSU Board of Trustees enthusiastically endorsed a report calling for massive expansion of Extended Education as a provider of courses for degree credit (CSU Board of Trustees Agenda, Committee on Educational Policy, Item 5. Opportunities to Expand the Role of Extended Education, September 21-22, 2010.)

Past-Chancellor Charles Reed and the Trustees’ “dream” was clearly to vastly expand Extended Education offerings of courses for degree credit and even to offer whole degree programs through Extended Education. There was talk of moving what they called “remedial” and “bottleneck” courses (General Education, for instance) as well as online courses into Extended Education.

The union’s goal is to prevent the CSU from becoming a privatized institution with plentiful course offerings in Extended Education for those who can afford the high prices.

Despite the rhetoric about expanding “access,” the goal was clearly to generate a lot of money along the way. Regularly matriculated students, who traditionally had been able to count on state-supported tuition rates, were in the crosshairs.

As the 2010 report indicated, one of the obstacles to this expansion is a provision in the California Education Code that prohibits the practice of supplanting
That language has, for most of CSU history, been an important protection for students to prevent them from having to pay essentially private-college tuition for a public university degree.

The Ed Code also restricts how money generated by fees in Extended Education can be spent, thus preventing campuses from using Extended Education students as cash cows for questionable projects. For many years these California Ed Code provisions meant Extended Education operations played a truly supportive and ancillary role in the CSU.

Other plans

Clearly by 2010, Reed and the CSU Trustees had other plans.

CFA and others were immediately concerned about the new policy direction and the CSU maneuvering to remove a variety of “obstacles” to Extended Education expansion that began almost immediately.

The union produced a white paper, titled *For-Profit Higher Education and the California State University: A Cautionary Tale for the CSU*, to inform faculty, students, legislators, and the public about the implications of several CSU policies, including expansion of Extended Education for-credit course offerings. (See the full report at http://www.calfac.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/forprofit_csu_final_032612.pdf)

CFA also addressed this issue in the legislature and at the bargaining table in the last round of negotiations.

The CSU, however, resisted all efforts to put any limits on expansion of Extended Education. In fact, they even argued in a 2010 lawsuit that “supplanting” only applied to those circumstances in which an entire program was moved—lock, stock, and barrel—into Extended Education.

By their logic, as long as there was one single section of a program left as state-supported, all other sections could be moved to Extended Education “without obstacle.” Students would just have to pay higher fees to get the courses they needed, and faculty would have to accept drastically reduced pay and loss of benefits if they wanted to work at all.

In response to concerns of legislators, the California State Auditor was asked to investigate CSU Extended Education operations.

In December 2013, the State Auditor released a report that provided important insight into what has been happening in Extended Education on three campuses that were chosen for the audit.

That report (found at https://www.bsa.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2012-113.pdf) is well worth reading.

While the report emphasizes that the meaning of the word “supplanting” is vague, the Auditor goes on to detail three key findings:

1) By two different definitions, “supplanting” has occurred in the CSU.

2) Just as disturbing, they found that revenues in Extended Education were greater than their expenses. This means that students were being charged more than it cost to offer their courses.

3) And lastly, campuses were, in a number of cases, unable to provide reasonable justification for what they did with the students’ money.

The report concluded with a call for the legislature to define “supplanting” in statute as a necessary step to prevent future problems.

Where are we now?

CFA is in the thick of the “supplanting” language deliberations in the legislature.

The union’s goal is to prevent the CSU from becoming a privatized institution with plentiful course offerings in Extended Education for those who can afford the high prices.

We are also working at the bargaining table to prevent the CSU administration from being able to slash faculty salary and benefits with the stroke of a pen by moving courses to Extended Education.

For CFA, the idea that the CSU should be an affordable, accessible and high-quality public university is more than a string of words. “Supplanting” may seem like a merely technical and insignificant word, but how its definition plays out will make an enormous difference for the future of students and faculty and for the mission of the CSU.
When student fees get growing, the debt collectors get going

Higher college costs are driving more students to loans, defaults and a lifetime of financial problems. Now, a federal agency has sued one for-profit ed-business for predatory lending and higher ed supporters have launched campaigns for laws to protect students.

California famously reports that it faces a shortfall of almost a million college-educated workers by 2025 if it is to keep its economy moving.

Furthermore, an almost universally accepted meme in our society holds that a college degree is a prerequisite to personal and professional success.

As a result, high schools across the nation work assiduously to encourage students to plan for and apply to post-secondary educational institutions, as do a wide variety of not-for-profit and business organizations.

Sadly, we have yet to deal with the reality that paying for college education is increasingly beyond the reach of our students.

A recent study provides evidence that cost is now a significant influence on choice of college: 43 percent of freshmen in 2013 were not at their first choice college although most were offered admission at that school. (That compares to 2003 when that number was 24 percent).

Of those students not at their first choice college, 60 percent indicated that financial aid at the institution in which they enrolled was very important.

Financial “aid” in the form of debt is increasing

Obviously one way students deal with increased cost to get a college degree is financial aid. And, a growing part of that financial aid is borrowing.

As student loan debt increases, the charac-

Students for Quality Education was at the CSU Trustees meeting to oppose rising student debt as fees keep going up. A student summit in April planned next steps. More and more reports find student debt is putting downward pressure on home sales and the economy in general.
teristics of that debt become more and more important to students and to society in general.

In 1972, Congress created the Student Loan Marketing Association (most of us know it as Sallie Mae) to increase the availability of loans to students. Since Sallie Mae-backed loans carried federal guarantees and hence very little risk, that debt was very attractive to banks and other lenders. Like the mortgage market in the first decade of this century, that meant lenders had very lax qualification standards for student loans.

This marked a shift toward debt as a primary mechanism for students to pay tuition and fees.

The strength of that shift may be seen in the fact that by 2011 there were nearly 39 million borrowers carrying more than $1 trillion in federal student loan debt.

And what grows along with debt? Debt collection.

Debt collectors flocking to student loans

Mark Russell is a business services consultant who specializes in companies that offer debt purchasing and collection. On a debt collection industry web site he wrote “…the student loan market is a $1 trillion opportunity for the ARM (debt collection) industry that is not going to decline anytime soon.”

In other words, as more and more students have faced drastically rising college costs, student loan debt has soared. Higher debt and a stagnant economy with fewer and fewer well-paying jobs have resulted in a significant increase in student loan delinquency and default.

And with that, troubling to many of us, is a strong increase in the number of companies seeking to profit from the misery of those with student loan debt.

The profitability of debt collection/processing is only enhanced by the reality that under current bankruptcy law, student loan debt is very difficult to discharge when an individual declares bankruptcy.

Like tax debt, the liability continues through bankruptcy and can negatively impact students’ lives for years, even impacting their
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Students oppose “success” fees;

Protest at CSU Trustees meeting

Some 60 students raised their voices against student fee hikes at the CSU Trustees meeting in March to protest the latest rash of fee hikes—this time in the form of campus “success” fees.

In the days just prior to the protest, CSU Fullerton was the latest to get chancellor approval for this type of fee hike. Student groups said they would hold a summit on the topic this spring.

Intense student protests over system-wide tuition and fee hikes in recent years led to disagreement among the Trustees and ultimately to pledges by the new CSU chancellor and the governor to stop increasing them.

But local administrations at the 23 CSU campuses turned to raising campus-based fees. In the past, these fees primarily existed to cover student services and campus life and were adopted through votes of the respective campus student bodies.

The CSU Academic Senate has been seeking clear information on how these latest campus fees will be used with limited success. However, information so far indicates they will be used, at least in part, to offer classes, hire faculty, maintain labs and other instructional spaces.

Furthermore, these campus fees are being adopted through a so-called “alternative consultation process” rather than by campus-wide votes by students.

The increases are then recommended by campus presidents to the system-wide chancellor to okay them.

After faculty and students at Sonoma State launched an online petition and gained broad campus support against the fee, the administration there, after consulting with the chancellor, withdrew the hike.

The push for higher campus fees caught attention this year from the Los Angeles Times and other news media. Editorials against the campus fees have appeared in the Times as well as the Sacramento Bee and others.

But other campuses had already raised these fees. And as this magazine went to print, the next campus administration campaigning for higher fees was at CSU Dominguez Hills. There faculty members also launched an online petition against them and called on the campus president to allow a student vote on the issue, a proposal the campus president rejected.
employment prospects.

**CFPB prosecutes company for predatory lending**

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was established by Congress in 2010, and in January 2012, after very contentious debate, President Obama appointed Richard Cordray as the bureau’s first director.

The primary mission of the CFPB is to protect consumers by enforcing federal consumer financial protection laws. The CFPB has taken up the issue of student debt and collection practice and has initiated several investigations of various players in the industry.

The CFPB also has ongoing investigations focusing on Sallie Mae. In September 2013, the agency highlighted results from surveys of borrowers, schools and federal personnel that rated Sallie Mae as the least satisfactory of the four “preferred” student loan servicing companies.

On February 26 of this year, the CFPB upped the ante when it filed a suit against ITT Educational Services accusing the company of engaging in predatory lending.

As reported by CFPB

“Most of ITT’s students borrow large sums to pay the high tuition costs and the majority of this money is borrowed from federal student loan programs. But private student loans also provide critical revenue for ITT. Because most ITT students’ federal aid does not cover the full cost of an ITT program, most students face a ‘tuition gap’ requiring them to find other sources of funding.”

CFPB charges that ITT provided “temporary credit” loans at zero percent to students facing that “tuition gap,” and then pushed students to repay those “temporary credit” loans by use of high-cost private student loan programs.

CFPB notes that ITT pressured students into those expensive loan programs, that the course credits students received from ITT were typically not transferrable to local community colleges or most public higher education institutions, that ITT misrepresented future job prospects to students, and most importantly for this story, that ITT knew that most of its students would default on those loans.

ITT projected a default rate of 64 percent. Since the loans aren’t discharged in bankruptcy, students who end up in bankruptcy find their credit ratings and [sometimes] job prospects are negatively affected, which means that students will have to keep trying to pay that debt off. In other words, it is unlikely that the company would have to expend resources to get student debtors to pay, and the amounts debtors do pay are allocated toward processing and penalty fees rather than reducing amounts owed.

ITT is one example of a trend. Over the last decade, a number of for-profit education businesses have vastly extended their use of federal funds and student loans in pursuit of maximizing their profits. Many have done so at the expense of students, inducing students to take on massive quantities of debt at onerous interest rates, often with onerous fees attached.

**Higher Ed Not Debt Campaign**

It is vitally important that our students be provided with affordable higher education, both for themselves and for the welfare of our society.

A wide variety of education-interested organizations, including the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association and the United States Student Association, launched the Higher Ed Not Debt campaign on 6 March at an event co-hosted by Senator Elizabeth Warren, who was the original proponent of the CFPB.

More information on the Higher Ed Not Debt and Degrees Not Debt campaigns may be found the links below.

---

**What can you do? Here are just a few ideas.**

- **Join the “Degrees not Debt” campaign.** Groups already involved include the U.S. Student Association, NEA and AFT

  **HIGHER ED NOT DEBT**
  [http://higherednotdebt.org/](http://higherednotdebt.org/)

  **DEGREES NOT DEBT PETITION**

  **NEA DEGREES NOT DEBT**
  [http://www.nea.org/home/55604.htm](http://www.nea.org/home/55604.htm)

- **Write or call your congresspersons.** Ask them to support the work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

  **CONTACT CONGRESS**

- **Include a bit of financial literacy about student loan debt in your student advising.**

  **GUIDE TO PAYING FOR COLLEGE**
Campaign for the Future of Higher Education

6th Gathering in NYC keeps up the national momentum

Chris Cox, above, was one of the CFA members at the 6th Gathering of the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education in New York City in January.

Faculty representing unions and associations in many states were there to explore our common challenges, among them state and federal funding and the ways to use and not use online teaching tools.

Host organization the Progressive Staff Congress in the City University of New York along with United University Professions in the State University of New York described the fight back underway there against deep funding cuts to public higher education.

The next big issue on the docket was the arrival of performance standards applied to the college and university level.

The next CFHE Gathering in Albany, New York in May will include invited allied students and civil rights organizations. The goal is to reach out beyond the academy to build the broad coalitions necessary to save higher education in the U.S.

In conjunction with this meeting, CFHE will release a video about online learning companies and their failure to deliver expanded access to quality higher education. The video will be shared among CFHE’s member organizations and their allies as well as through social media. Check it out on the CFHE website in mid-May.

Check CFHE out at:

On the Web: FutureofHigherEd.org
On FB: Facebook.com/FutureofHigherEd
On Twitter: #FutureofHigherEd

Find links to Huffington Post blogs about CFHE papers, news coverage of the issues facing faculty nationwide and more.
There’s an App for that!

Welcome to the CFA app — connecting you with the information you need on your phone.

- **News & Headlines**
- **The faculty contract**
- **Your CFA campus chapter**

**How to get it on your phone…**

1. Open the web browser on your smartphone
2. Type in www.calfac.org/m (Be sure to include the www). The mobile version of the site will automatically appear on your screen.
3. Add the CFA app button to your homescreen: With the app open, tap the export box on the bottom of the screen. Then tap “Add to homescreen.”

Join CFA! calfac.org/membership