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In January, Gov. Jerry Brown introduced his state budget proposal for the 2013/14 fiscal year. While the governor emphasized that this budget will ask the state to “live-within-our-means,” it does provide much-needed funding boosts for public higher education.

Election victory sets stage for budget restoration

While funding increase helps, some policy changes raise concerns

By Peter Kreysa
Chair, CFA Political Action & Legislative Committee
Family and Consumer Sciences, Long Beach

The plan would provide the CSU with a funding increase of $125.1 million.
CFA praised the governor's approach.

“This budget proposal is the first step in restoring a prosperous future for California,” says CFA President Lillian Taiz, a professor of history at CSU Los Angeles. “We appreciate the governor’s commitment to public higher education and, in particular, to keeping the CSU affordable for our students.”

The governor also proposed to step up future funding for the CSU by 5 percent in academic year 2014/15 and 4 percent in each of the subsequent two years.

Budget Proposes Problematic Policy Changes

While the funding portions of the budget plan are a positive for the CSU, the governor proposed some policy changes that raise concerns for CSU faculty.

The governor would direct $10 million of the $125.1 million increase to experiment with online education aimed at so-called “bottleneck courses.”

For the second year in a row, the governor has proposed changing the law concerning CSU contributions to pay for faculty health insurance. Currently, government code specifies that CSU management pay for health insurance for employees and for 90 percent of the weighted average cost for faculty dependents.¹

The governor’s change would give CSU management leverage to impose higher

Erma Jean Sims (Elementary Education, Sonoma) participated in a ‘Yes on 30, No on 32’ phone bank with fellow educators. The work done by faculty to help pass Proposition 30 last fall was critical in winning much-needed funding for the CSU.
costs on CSU employees increasing the cost of our healthcare contributions significantly as a result.

CFA strongly opposes this change and is working to have it removed from the budget proposal. These issues should be addressed at the bargaining table.

Gov. Brown would have each higher ed system cap the number of classes students can take at 150 percent of what is necessary to complete most degrees—270 quarterly units at UC and 180 semester units at CSU. That cap would shrink further after two years. Students could continue taking classes but would have to pay full price rather than the in-state-supported fees. The governor believes this will force more students to finish on time and free up resources for new students.

These proposals have far-reaching implications for CFA members and our students. Union leaders emphasize that the initial budget developments represent just the opening salvo in a months-long debate on the state budget.

“While we have concerns about some of the policy proposals in the budget, there is sufficient time to have a thorough discussion to address these policies,” says CFA President Taiz.

Election Victory Key to Funding
The Governor’s budget unveiling followed the November election in which voters spoke unequivocally in favor of protecting education at all levels. Not only did they enthusiastically endorse Proposition 30 but they also elected a record seven current or former CSU or UC faculty members to the state legislature to serve as stalwarts of public higher ed.

Perhaps most importantly, the passage of Prop 30 not only prevented a mid-year cut to the state university in 2012 but it rolled back tuition/student fees. The governor provides for this in his 2013 budget by back-filling $125 million in CSU resources that the system refunded to students and their families as a result of the tuition rollback last fall.

“In the hope that we can stop the harm caused by years of funding cuts,” says Taiz. “Now we are beginning to see the fruit of that hard work.”

More Work to Do
While January’s budget news is a welcome change of direction for the CSU, this state budget plan will not correct for all the deep cuts to the CSU system over the past decade.

As budget cuts grew to the hundreds of millions of dollars, student fees rose dramatically, faculty salaries flat-lined, and educational opportunity faded. The reduced investment resulted in fewer faculty, larger class sizes, fewer class offerings, burgeoning student debt, fewer admissions, and longer matriculation rates.

Taiz says, “We look forward to working with CSU Chancellor Timothy White in a constructive way to continue to publicly advocate for the resources our university needs to turn around a decade of disinvestment.”

Plenty of work remains to be done,” she said.

1. Government Code says the employer pays 100 percent of the weighted average premium of the four top health plans for the employee and 90 percent of same for employee dependents.
The first few months of 2013 have brought CSU faculty the first real positive change we have experienced for quite a long time.

I'm certainly not claiming all our problems are solved—far from it. We have many more hurdles to jump just to get our work and our university back to where we were just a few years ago, much less advancing into the future.

And new challenges—concerns about healthcare costs and legislative proposals to mandate curriculum, just to name two—arise almost daily.

But a few developments are worth a look as we continue our work to turn the CSU in a new direction.

**Funding For The CSU**

We have fought a decade-long war to preserve public funding for our public university. In most years the best we could do was mitigate the size of the cuts.

But just five months ago in the November 2012 election, voters approved Proposition 30, a moment that turned the trend toward restored funding at last.

When we began the campaign for 30, the outcome was uncertain; in fact, many predicted that Californians simply would not support tax increases in any form.

But people who want a better future for California banded together and labored mightily against a well-funded opposition. Hundreds of our own faculty members walked precincts, made phone calls and organized public events. Young voters registered in record numbers (registration of young voters was actually up 27 percent over 2010) and they went to the polls.

On Election Day, the vote on Proposition 30 wasn’t even close.

Its passage brings some welcome relief to the CSU. If adopted, Gov. Jerry Brown’s state budget plan for 2013/14 will improve the CSU budget by $125.1 million. His plan includes another $125 million to refund the latest hike in CSU student fees and $10 million to explore ways to conduct online education. He also has proposed 5 percent more in fiscal year 2014/15 and 4 percent more in years 2015/16 and 2016/17.

Admittedly, we are just beginning to dig the CSU out of a deep funding pit, but we are a long way from the day when a previous governor thought California already spent too much on students.

**New CSU Chancellor**

Everyone reading this column certainly knows about the departure of former chancellor Charles B. Reed.

The really exciting news is that we start 2013 with a chancellor who knows California’s public higher ed system well—he is a product of all three segments—and who has actually spent years as a faculty member himself.

Chancellor Timothy White has readily met with faculty leaders, including the Academic Senate chair and myself. He is personable,
articulate and does not think that we all knock off work at 3 pm four days a week. Naturally there will be areas of disagreement and concern. Nevertheless, we look forward to working closely with the chancellor in areas where we agree. And we hope those areas will be many.

So far, Chancellor White has made symbolic gestures to show that he cares about the people who work and learn in the CSU.

For example, over the strong objections of some Trustees, he took a 10 percent cut in his starting pay. Make no mistake—he is still earning big money! But this action showed an appreciation for public service that stands in sharp contrast to the consistent whining in the past about how much more money top executives need to earn to be motivated to do their jobs.

He has also taken some actions in respect to the Senate’s participation in Board of Trustees’ meetings that suggest greater respect for the faculty’s voice in deliberations about the CSU’s future.

Perhaps the starkest change so far relates to equity pay. (See page 8 for a report.) Over the past two years, our CFA Bargaining Team had to fight tooth and nail to keep Equity Pay Year 2 in our contract. In February, at Chancellor White’s urging, CSU labor relations announced that equity pay will be implemented on all campuses, assuming the funding increase in Gov. Brown’s state budget plan is adopted. Implementing the program to which all parties agreed is definitely a new way of responding to inequities in faculty salary.

More That’s New

Here in the first part of 2013, we now have five Trustees appointed by Gov. Brown to the board that is responsible to protect and defend the CSU. CFA is setting up face-to-face meetings to get to know them and, just as important, for them to get to know us.

Some of them are asking the tough questions that Trustees ought to ask about policies and proposals, especially when those decisions have a huge impact on those of us in the classrooms carrying out the mission of the CSU.

As a result of many changes, Board of Trustees meetings are getting “livelier.” Will that result in a changed policy direction? It remains to be seen.

One final example of change in the CSU is, I think, extremely important. CFA, the
“Our best efforts now can mean the difference between a few ‘flash in the pan’ positive events and a real, sustained move in a better direction.”

Academic Senate of the CSU, and the faculty Trustee have embarked on a new era of close communication and cooperation. We have, for instance, made joint presentations at a meeting of the American Association of University Professors and participated in a joint meeting with the governor. I believe this close working relationship will be good for faculty, students, and the CSU—and I am excited about making it even stronger.

We Still Have Miles to Cross

Of course, even where there is positive change, negatives go lurking.

Alongside his funding proposals, the governor’s plan contains policy ideas that raise concern for us. For example, he would fold payment for the CSU’s bond debt and for employee retirements into the regular university budget. And, he would cap degree programs at 180 units to “expedite graduation rates.” These and other policies need to be debated and CFA will follow developments very closely.

And need I say, many of Reed’s policy goals live on.

Ill-thought-out, even chaotic restructuring continues on some campuses, particularly East Bay, Dominguez Hills, Sacramento and Pomona. The shift of course offerings out of the regular university and into high-priced extended education persists.

The long-standing push to privatize elements of the public university using online education may even intensify in the midst of sorting out the best, most effective use of online teaching tools.

Even if our new chancellor proves interested in a genuinely new direction, the legacy of Charles Reed will linger for some time in nooks and crannies all over the CSU.

Online on the Agenda

One of the thorniest issues facing us this year is determining the best uses of online education tools to give our students greater access to quality education at tuition they can afford. There are a great many issues here to unpack.

Regarding good pedagogy, we must separate the gold rush mentality of those hoping to get rich through one online scheme or another from the thoughtful research needed to uncover what online tools and methods work best for students.

After all, if a teaching tool doesn’t actually work for our students, it doesn’t matter how cheap it is. It’s worthless.

To ensure that the three public ed segments carefully examine what does and does not work and for whom, CFA will be sponsoring a bill, currently in development—AB 895 authored by Assemblymember Anthony Rendon, a former CSU faculty member. We hope this bill can play a role in helping California take a deliberative, research-based approach to online higher education. As we discuss this bill in Sacramento, we will also need to work with legislators to improve other bills related to curriculum and teaching that, although well-intentioned, would have unintended consequences for quality and access.

As these examples of work to be done suggest and as I am sure all of you know, now is not the time for our union to sit back and just hope that change is coming.

Even though we have seen some breaks in the clouds, our best efforts now can mean the difference between a few “flash in the pan” positive events and a real, sustained move in a better direction.

Please join in the work this spring that is necessary to ensure the latter and to bring about truly better days for the CSU.
Equity program to provide much-needed salary relief for 3,000 CSU faculty

In mid-February, CFA received notice from the CSU Chancellor’s Office that new Chancellor Timothy White intends to fully implement year two of the Equity Salary Program provided in the faculty contract.

This act will provide much-needed salary relief to nearly 3,000 CSU faculty members who were affected by inversion and compression.

Inversion refers to newly hired faculty getting jobs at higher pay than faculty who had been in the CSU for years. Compression is 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 salary relief provided to this small group of faculty is much-needed, there are still tens of thousands of faculty and staff who have not received across-the-board increases (GSI) and step increments (SSI) for many years.”

The decision to implement this contract provision—which was announced via a letter to CFA from Gail Brooks, CSU Vice Chancellor for Human Resources—indicated that the CSU administration intends to fund $5 million in equity raises negotiated in our previous contract but not funded in 2008/09.

Implementation of this program is contingent upon the legislature’s approval of the $125 million CSU funding increase proposed by the governor in January.

“We appreciate the chancellor taking this step to address a long-standing problem and look forward to working with him on solving the other pressing issues confronting the faculty who have made considerable personal sacrifices to bring the university through tough times,” said CFA President Lilian Taiz.

She continued, “While the salary relief provided to this small group of faculty is much-needed, there are still tens of thousands of faculty and staff who have not received across-the-board increases (GSI) and step increments (SSI) for many years.”

Background

In the faculty contract that was ratified in 2007, the CFA Bargaining Team took up the growing problems of inversion and compression in the faculty salary structure.

In that contract, CFA 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 and it helped thousands of faculty members. But, then-Chancellor Charles Reed refused to fund the second year citing the requirement to meet and confer if the contract wasn’t fully funded. He took this action despite a recommendation by a neutral fact-finder who said the university could and should fund the program.

The new collective bargaining agreement between CFA and CSU management (ratified last summer) brought back the second year of the Equity Pay Program on a campus-by-campus basis and at the discretion of each campus president.

In recognition of the fact that new salary inversion problems have surfaced over these many years without salary increases, the current contract also provides that, once Equity Year 2 is fulfilled, at the president’s discretion, campuses may develop a third equity program to address these new problems. The design of such new equity programs would involve the participation of the CFA chapter on campus.

Further Reading & Eligibility Criteria

View the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), Equity Increases section, which begins with Article 31.10.

See Appendix G, “Equity Oversight Committee Framework for the Equity Program for Associate and Full Professors and Equivalent Librarian, Counselor, and Coach Ranks,” starting on page 167 of the CBA.

See article by Kevin Wehr in CFA Fall 2012 magazine at calfac.org.
Online education is the latest frenzy sweeping through public higher education systems nationwide as well as here in the CSU. Since “online education” means so many different things to different people, the ideas are arriving in all kinds of packages, big and small.

The question before educators and policy makers is not “online education, for or against.” The question is “what does and does not work to serve students and California well.”

The articles presented here are another step in CFA’s attempt to answer that key question. As the articles (pp. 11-13) by Jennifer Eagan and Jeff Kolnick show, the faculty in the CSU and other states have been exploring the best pedagogical methods to use online tools in the service of their subject matter and the students who take the class.

They assume the aims of any good public education program, whether online, in a classroom, or through a combination of both, are to:

- Enhance the success of all students including underserved populations
- Provide quality higher education (think: good teaching)
- Give students the ability to think critically and innovate to be strong citizens and get good jobs

Kolnick and Eagan each identify pitfalls that can undermine the whole idea and they warn of what has not worked, what is unlikely
to work in the future, and what should be avoided in favor of better approaches.

The news report (p. 15) on a test using MOOC-like classes, now underway at San Jose State, lays out how at least one campus is trying a necessary experiment. One of the key outcomes will be determining whether the methods are in place to provide remedial education online.

While a lot of uncertainty persists, some things are not new. We do know this:

- It has always been a bad idea to launch programs without testing to be sure they work
- Academics have good methods to develop, evaluate and approve new courses, curriculum and teaching methods; try short cuts around that at one’s peril
- There is no one model or one “magic bullet” to meet our needs
- There can be unintended consequences from ideas that look good on paper but don’t work in the real world
- An innovative and fair society cannot afford to ration access to public education based on ability to pay

Some accuse the faculty at universities across the U.S. of going too slow. These critics ignore the fact that faculty are incorporating new tools into their teaching all the time.

The truth is that well-thought-out change makes improvements happen faster and less expensively because we avoid having to fix ugly mistakes or replace programs that didn’t work.

We save money by doing it right the first time.

Even more importantly, we owe it to every student to get this right.

WHAT TO DO NEXT

1 - FUND PUBLIC HIGHER ED. We know that our public education system works. Its problem is inadequate funding. Support the funding increases in Gov. Brown’s budget plan.

2 - SUPPORT AB 895 (D-Rendon). Join with former CSU faculty member Anthony Rendon in making sure that online classes are well vetted.

3 - CAREFULLY EVALUATE BILLS BEFORE THE LEGISLATURE. We must be certain that even well-intentioned and creative ideas actually will work for student success.

4 - CONSULT TO SHARE YOUR EXPERIENCE. Faculty have done a lot of work with online education. We can leverage our expertise to help policymakers sort the good from the bad and make evidence-based decisions.

Things To Keep In Mind

These are only some considerations about online education including the for-profit model, based on what faculty around the country have encountered so far.

SUCCESS

Completion rates typically are much lower for online classes than in-person classes.

A teaching method that doesn’t work costs our students their futures. And if a tool/method/program doesn’t work, it is not cheap. It’s worthless.

Online classes with the most student success require rigorous faculty engagement with students including frequent appearances in discussion forums, daily postings, well-designed assignments, careful evaluation of written work and time for one-on-one communication via videoconference, webchat or e-mail.

WHO IS SERVED

Students with experience in education who have learned study discipline are the best-served by online classes. Also, online may be the only access to higher education for some students.

Online is particularly ill-suited to entry-level classes and remedial level work. It disproportionately disadvantages the very first-generation and at-risk populations the CSU historically has served.

Students with access to computers and an internet connection at home will be able to take these classes; those without will have to surmount high hurdles to get access to the tools for the amount of time they need to spend online in a class.

Students with money for expensive tuition or for-profit level fees will get teachers in person when they want them; other students are likely to be sitting in front of computers.

COST

The shortage of on-campus classes is a direct result of state funding cuts to public higher education since 2002. The fastest, most efficient solution to access to higher education is adequate state funding.

The education the CSU offers is a public good; it should remain publicly funded. Buying services from for-profit businesses will starve our public university system even more.

Some online education ideas, for instance Cal State Online, would not be able to go to college get a chance at a college degree.
It’s not magic, but it can be fun

By Jennifer Eagan
CFA Chapter President, East Bay
Philosophy/Public Affairs & Administration

As a professor, let me weigh in on the debate about online learning. I’ve taught online within the Minnesota State University system every year since 2004. I am not opposed to online education nor am I afraid of it.

At a recent online panel discussion focused on best practices, there was a general consensus that with proper class size control and good pedagogy, students write more in online classes. This can help improve written communication skills, especially when faculty are vigilant about making developmental comments and providing opportunities for revision.

The online approach can widen opportunities for shy students to get involved in class discussion more easily than in face-to-face classes. It also cuts geographic barriers, which is better than no access at all.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 13
that online teaching and learning has certain benefits both for me and for students—and it has some costs. It’s not magic but it can be a lot of fun.

The biggest advantage of online learning, particularly in the humanities, is that students write a lot.

Practically all of their communication is written so they can be “forced” to participate and engage in interactive activities in a way that is difficult to do in an on-ground classroom without being mean or creating anxiety.

However, this advantage is lost in online classes where student tasks are automated and the specific feedback from the professor is paltry.

Online classes open up opportunities for “non-traditional” students who are working (particularly shift work), parenting, caretaking, etc. One student taking my online Feminist Philosophy class always posted in the very early morning hours and, at one point, shared with me that her husband said that she could go to school as long as it didn’t affect her duties to him or to their children. I guess that’s why she took Feminist Philosophy. I was very glad that she had the opportunity to take the class and flattered that she apparently thought that the class was more important than sleep.

However, online classes are not for everyone.

They have high attrition rates and require discipline on the part of both the students and the instructors. Regular assignments and reasons to check into the class keep everyone engaged but are also demanding on students’ time.

To the good of online learning, the technology keeps getting better and the number of open-source materials available on the web keep getting better.

However, teaching an online class is more work and less personally rewarding to the instructor and often for students as well. I have found that everyone misses the stimulation of real face-to-face interaction. To help combat this con, experimenting with new technologies can keep things exciting and fun, and using live chat and very active discussion boards can help keep both the instructor and students engaged.

Online classes can cultivate independent and active learning by putting the onus of finding and analyzing material on the student. Done right, online teaching can be a good way to mentor students on meaningful projects and for students to get peer feedback on their work.

However, based on my experience and discussions with colleagues who teach online, the more inexperienced, underprepared and vulnerable the student, the less successful she or he is likely to be online.

Some administrators are pushing for remediation online; this seems like a terrible idea.

Online learning for more experienced students can be really exciting and foster constructive independence from their instructors. I find that Philosophy majors do pretty well online because they are already interested in the material.

The lecture and testing model of higher education kind of stinks, and online teaching done well encourages us to get away from the non-interactive lecture. Yet, online education can easily degenerate into the “faculty member as information delivery system” just as much as a course that features all in-class lectures.

There is a culture of distaste for traditional teaching and learning (and teachers) that fuels the hope that online courses and MOOCs can revolutionize education. Teaching and learning are basically the same everywhere and some of the rush to online fails to take into account the importance of already prepared students and qualified professors who are experts in their fields.

Online teaching done well can be a vehicle for quality student writing, innovation, independent thinking, and creative projects. It also can encourage pedagogical innovation and access for students who can’t take face-to-face courses.

Online teaching and learning is not magic. Courses are courses, and the general rules for quality teaching (being present, interacting with students, and providing personal feedback) remain the same regardless of platform.

Online education is certainly not a panacea for the problems of access, equity, and cost. If done poorly, online higher education could exacerbate some of these problems.

For example, many students get lost in anonymous online environments. Sometimes, administrators wrongly think that “online course” means that the demand alone should determine the number of students in the class.

Also, some students do not have access to adequate computers and high-speed internet connections.

The drive to dismantle public higher education could ruin what’s good about online teaching and make it into a corporately packaged, low quality, banking system for bits of information.

Faculty-controlled online courses and programs can resist this trend; students know quality when they experience it. ■
Simply put, the upside depends on well-designed and rigorous courses with regular faculty involvement. This means frequent appearances in discussion forums and daily postings of one kind or another on top of careful evaluation of written work and time for one-on-one communication via e-mail when requested.

The downsides of online are many. Super-high attrition rates are almost universal. Faculty have a hard time getting to know students, which limits mentorship opportunities and makes writing letters of recommendation difficult.

Pressure to increase class size leads to limited rigor and less writing, thus weakening the best part of online education.

Online is particularly ill-suited to entry-level classes and remedial level work. Sadly, that is where it is being pushed the hardest by its advocates in government and in the business world.

Recently, MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) have become a major topic of discussion in my state after the University of Minnesota announced plans to offer them. Generally, these classes are free (except for a nominal fee), open to anyone regardless of status at the school, and don’t actually count toward graduation.

However, the eventual aim is to use MOOCs at schools nationally to bring low-cost higher education to the masses while generating a profit for the businesses that deliver the courses. Policymakers across the country are falling over themselves, each eager to lead the MOOC charge.

So here’s one concern: How would this impact those at community colleges and less selective universities when online teachers suggest that small online classes and frequent faculty contact is essential for student success?

Duke University released a thorough study examining one of its MOOCs. Among the findings are the following:

**COSTS**—Huge investment of time (600 total hours, 420 by the faculty member).

**SUCCESS**—Over 11,000 enrolled and only 313 successfully completed the course.

**WHO**—Two thirds of the students who enrolled had a BA or advanced degree.

Here are some questions faculty members, students, university management and even lawmakers should ask before fully embarking on this major investment of time and money:

- Will MOOCs create a two-tiered system of education with wealthy people still sending their children to elite colleges and MOOCs for everyone else?
- What is the success rate of students by different demographic groups for MOOCs?
- What is the difference between transferring information and getting an education?
- What are the demonstrated student learning outcomes for MOOCs?
- What is the return on investment for a given university using a “business model” with limited revenue flow?
- What have we learned? As we move forward with online education, it would be wise for policy makers to take advantage of, in our case, the hundreds of Minnesota faculty who have been doing it successfully for many years.

- What are the attrition rates, the success of existing online courses at achieving learning outcomes, and the success of online education among different demographic groups?

Like any pedagogical tool, online education can be used effectively or ineffectively.

Before we jump into the brave new world of MOOCs, we should study and understand them.

In the meantime, let’s reinvest in what we know works—affordable public higher education.

A version of this article appeared in *The Minnesota 2020 Blog*, March 13, 2013.

---

**CFHE papers explore new ways to fund higher education**

The Campaign for the Future of Higher Education (CFHE) has begun a drive to involve our nation’s college and university faculty in the search for solutions to the seemingly unending cycle of funding cuts, privatization, soaring tuition and academic shut-downs.

In February, CFHE introduced three working papers with ideas on ways to fund higher education in America.

The CFHE working papers reject the common assumption that funding higher education through public means rather than through skyrocketing tuition is simply impossible.

The three papers explore new ways to provide public support for colleges and universities:

- One paper explores the notion of free higher education, examines what the actual cost to provide such an ideal would be, and shows how it could be done using money already spent by government on higher education now.
- Another paper, using the state of California as a test case, looks at the real magnitude of returning to recent, more adequate levels of state funding for higher education.
- The third paper explores a currently unused tax revenue source—a very small tax on financial transactions—that could be tapped if there were the political will to provide adequate public funding for higher education.

View the working papers and share your comments at: [www.futureofhighered.org](http://www.futureofhighered.org)
Asynchronous Learning—Communication exchanges which occur in elapsed time between two or more people. Examples are email, online discussion forums, message boards, blogs, podcasts, etc.

Blended learning—Blended learning is any time a student learns at least in part at a supervised brick-and-mortar location away from home and at least in part online with some element of student control over time, place, path, and/or pace; often used synonymously with Hybrid Learning.

One example of blended learning is a “flipped classroom.” The basic idea is that the lecture or conveying of material is moved outside of the classroom and homework moves into the classroom. Technology can facilitate this process by allowing for viewing videos online at home. This can free up time for more interaction with the instructor and peers while doing homework assignments in class.

Distance education—General term for any educational activity in which the participants are at a distance from each other—in other words, are separated in space. They may or may not be separated in time (asynchronous vs. synchronous).

Home-grown content—Content developed by a teacher, school, or district for use in instruction, as compared to content developed by outside companies or other vendors.

Hybrid course—Some but not all face-to-face classroom time is displaced by online technology.

Learning Management System (LMS)—The technology platform through which students access online courses. A LMS generally includes software for creating and editing course content, communication tools, assessment tools and other features for managing the course. Often used interchangeably with “Course Management System.”

The leader in the market is Blackboard. It is seeing growing competition from Desire2Learn as well as Moodle, an open-source LMS, and Sakai, another open-source LMS deployed primarily in research universities.

Cal State Online is a centralized system that assists with the delivery, via technology, of programs taught by CSU faculty. All programs offered through Cal State Online are required to use Pearson’s LearningStudio LMS (Learning Management System).

MOOC—An acronym for “massive open online course.” It currently refers to a web-based class designed to support a large number of participants. The initial MOOCs were network-based courses designed so that a “learning environment” could develop from the participants’ interactions.

edX, a nonprofit MOOC provider formed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.

Coursera, a for-profit MOOC provider founded by two Stanford University computer professors and funded by venture capital investments.

Udacity, co-founded by Stanford professor, Sebastian Thrun, a for-profit provider with funding from venture capitalists. The advisory board includes Bill Bennett, Secretary of Education under Pres. Ronald Reagan.

The non-profit Khan Academy, is a MOOC-like website founded by Salman Khan. It offers free video lessons mostly in math, science, and test prep. The Gates Foundation is its biggest funder. The videos feature Khan, a former hedge fund manager.

Online course—One in which all or most of the instruction and student-instructor interaction is performed online.

On-Ground Class—A course conducted in person, in a physical classroom.

Online learning—Education in which instruction and content are delivered primarily over the internet. The U.S. Department of Education distinguishes it from printed-based correspondence education, broadcast TV or radio, videocassettes, and stand-alone educational software programs that do not have a significant Internet-based instructional component. Used interchangeably with Virtual learning, Cyber learning, e-learning.

Synchronous learning—Online learning in which the participants interact at the same time and in the same space.

Web-enhanced course—The course is enhanced by online technology, but no seat time is displaced.

*Definitions draw upon The Online Learning Definitions Project put together by iNACOL.*
The CSU is going online in a much bigger way than ever before.

In January, Chancellor Timothy White joined Gov. Jerry Brown and Sebastian Thrun, head of Silicon Valley start-up Udacity, to roll out a first-of-its-kind pilot program for online teaching at San Jose State.

The program called San Jose State Plus aims to harness principles of massive open online courses (MOOCs) and apply them to three courses in mathematics that are so-called ‘bottlenecks’ for students seeking degrees at San Jose—a remedial algebra course, a college-level algebra course and introductory statistics.

Citing long waiting lists and high failure rates in remedial courses, Gov. Brown pushed aggressively for the program noting at a launch event that the state’s public higher education systems must find a way to help people succeed and to buoy its aging workforce.

“This may be not the [whole] solution but a key part of the solution,” Brown said.

The CSUs deal with Udacity—which CFA engaged in impact bargaining over before it was announced—is also the first time that professors at a public university have collaborated with a provider of a MOOC to create for-credit courses in which students watch videos, take interactive quizzes and receive support from online mentors.

For the pilot project, however, each course is limited to 100 students—one section of matriculated San Jose State students and a section of non-matriculated students. The courses are run through San Jose’s extension program. The cost of each three-unit course is $150, significantly less than regular San Jose extension fees. A foundation grant is paying the fee for some students.

The San Jose State University Foundation received a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant to study the completion rates of the courses they are offering online through SJSU Plus, specifically how different models of interaction and mentoring improve outcomes.

Each of the five faculty members participating in the program will be compensated for both developing and teaching the pilot courses. They also will retain the intellectual-property rights to the course materials.

In the deal between Udacity and SJSU, the university will keep 51 percent of any profit after costs are covered and Udacity will keep 49 percent, Mohammad Qayoumi, San Jose State president, said at the launch.

President Qayoumi is pushing aggressively to expand into online education—San Jose is also working on another MOOC pilot with nonprofit provider EdV, which is led by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.

In his remarks at the news conference...
announcing San Jose State Plus, White emphasized that this project is still very much an experiment.

“This is an R&D [research and development] project for us right now to figure out what are the moving parts,” White said. “What is the role of faculty and the human contact? What can be done with technology? How do they interface? Do students learn? Do they advance?”

He continued, “Then the next question is a business question. Can it be scaled up? And how do you scale it up and still maintain the learning environment that the students of today need to be successful?”

“And if we can’t do that last piece, well then, we have to start again,” White concluded.

CFA President Lillian Taiz agreed on the importance of asking questions about student success.

She said in a statement released the day of the program’s launch that “It’s good the CSU is actually testing out these methods and starting on a small scale. We must find out which online tools work well (or not), for what kinds of students, and for what kinds of subject matter. There is a lot to unpack in the pedagogy.”

“You can’t have quality learning conditions for students—online or in a classroom,” she added, “without professional working conditions for the faculty. Our contract is an important piece of making sure we have fairness, equity, and quality in all aspects of CSU teaching.”

On March 19, CFA released the following statement regarding the wave of online higher education bills that are percolating in the state legislature.

Several bills related to online education in California’s public colleges and universities have been introduced in the state legislature this year.

While these bills are still in the initial stages, CFA is very concerned about the impact on students, faculty and quality education and the unintended consequences of one-size-fits-all legislation.

While CFA believes that online education can be a successful mode of instruction for some students and while we wholeheartedly support expanding access to higher education in California, we have deep concerns about some proposed legislative solutions that mandate online instruction or call for blanket standardization of curriculum across a variety of institutions.

CFA also fundamentally rejects the belief that after years of deep cuts in state support for the CSU, the solution to restoring the greatness of the system lies in throwing open the doors to private vendors and privatizing operations.

We believe that it is a strength of our system that the 23 campuses of the CSU (and the campuses of the UC and CC systems as well) each offer rich and unique educational experiences that are shaped by the needs of students on that particular campus and by the needs of the community surrounding the campus.

Legislation that seeks to create curricular uniformity across all campuses puts the current educational diversity that reflects our social diversity at risk. Such legislation would also make it more difficult for campuses to foster student success by tailoring curriculum (sequences of courses, for instance) to the educational backgrounds of students on that campus.

We also firmly believe that affordability and quality are critical to any meaningful notion of access. Students in public higher education institutions should not be required to pay additional costs to take a course (whether online or in-person) that is required to graduate.

For so many Californians, our public colleges and universities are still the largest and most consistent providers of quality courses (in a variety of formats), rich opportunities for academic success, and relatively affordable prices.

We believe that providing Californians with meaningful access to higher education requires that we provide adequate public investment in our university system.

Simply increasing online offerings (on the questionable assumption that it is cheaper) or handing off education to private vendors will not serve California well in the long run.

Legislators’ well-intentioned efforts to increase access for students ignore a proven solution that we know will increase access: investing resources into more class sections. Legislation that promotes too good-to-be-true alternatives to reinvesting in our public colleges and universities will not solve the state’s needs for an educated citizenry.

CFA continues to monitor and is negotiating with legislators with legislation impacting higher education and will keep you updated on the latest developments.
A Journey Into Change

“Together, we are powerful!” is the guiding light of the CFA Council for Affirmative Action

By Cecil E. Canton
CFA Associate Vice President, Affirmative Action
Criminal Justice, Sacramento

Last December, an intrepid band of CFA activists met as a task force to share their ideas about making that mantra—Together We Are Powerful—a more visible and vibrant part of our work.

The task force conversation revisited the original intent of CFA’s Council for Affirmative Action and examined the work the CAA has done to diversify and further democratize CFA.

After all, making CFA a more inclusive and democratic union is critical to achieving the Council’s mission.

The task force decided to develop something big and bold, something not tried before in the history of the CAA or CFA. They decided to develop CAA-based diversity training workshops that would take our work to the campuses using the same successful delivery system used by the CFA Lecturers Council’s Nuts & Bolts and Pension & Benefits workshops.

These workshops would be focused on the disempowering force of hidden or unconscious bias, also known as implicit social cognition. The goal is to create workshops that could be used at every CSU campus to help faculty members become aware of their own unconscious biases and preferences and, through that awareness, to transform the hiring, evaluation and retention process for all the faculty in the CSU.

Additionally, workshop participants who successfully complete the workshops may, as written in the Anti-Racist Cookbook, “Build a shared vision of how to create a truly inclusive and respectful sense of community with other persons, especially those whose backgrounds are different from their own.”

There was unanimous agreement that something of this scope is needed on our campuses. But were the task force members all on the same page with the definition?

What is hidden bias? How could they actually uncover it, much less develop a training module to address it?

Their work was informed by research conducted by the American Values Institute and the Equal Justice Society. Those groups describe hidden (or unconscious or implicit) bias as that which we carry without awareness or conscious direction.

Everyone has unconscious biases and preferences. Unconscious biases or preferences are hidden prejudices that we all have operating on a subconscious level. This could be related to race, gender, disability, religion, etc.

Take the IAT at implicit.harvard.edu
• Click on ‘Demonstration’ link
• Click on ‘Go to the Demonstration Tests’
• After reading the preliminary info., click on ‘I wish to proceed’
• Select a test and follow the instructions for how to take it
• At least 1 test should focus on race
• At least 1 test should focus on gender
• Choose the remaining tests from 2 other categories such as age, politics, religion, etc.
The hope is that through uncovering each of our unconscious biases and preferences we will become more aware of (and change for the better) the way we behave in the workplace and increase the effectiveness of our interactions with others, especially those who may be different from us.

This is especially relevant to RTP committees and/or hiring/search committees. The idea is to foster an environment wherein we can recruit and retain a more diverse faculty workforce and decrease incidences of workplace hostility.

Helping Our Conscious Values Prevail

Advances in neuroscience and other social sciences have helped us to understand that people can consciously believe in equality while simultaneously acting on subconscious prejudices they are not aware they harbor.

By looking at the complexity of how our brains work, this research has given us a way to understand better how decision making happens in our minds. This understanding provides the foundation to disrupt the impact of hidden biases so that our consciously held values can prevail.

Implicit Social Cognition, also known as Hidden Bias or Unconscious Bias or Implicit Bias, arose as a way to explain why discrimination persists, even though polling and other research clearly shows that people oppose it.

Initially, some researchers conjectured that people sought to hide their bias from pollsters and simply lied about their views for fear of appearing prejudiced.

Neuroscience and the study of implicit bias allows us a glimpse into the human brain and an opportunity to unravel the mysteries of why we treat each other with cruelty or with care, and what ultimately leads us to create policies designed to help or to hurt.

The CAA task force decided early on that this was not to be your typical diversity workshop. This was meant to make the participant aware of the subconscious, hidden or previously unknown biases and preferences that exist in all of us.

This workshop would involve real and personal effort. This would mean sharing on a deeply personal level and going deep!

The process would allow participants to gain insight and understanding as to how their personal cultural lens impacts daily decision making.

A workshop that is both engaging and creative was created. Participants will be required to take a few online tests that were developed using academic research methods to uncover each of our unconscious biases or preferences.

The tests, called Implicit Association Tests (or IAT’s), are short, easy and even fun. The IAT was invented by Anthony Greenwald and colleagues in the mid 1990s. Project Implicit®, which allows individuals to take these tests online, is maintained by Greenwald (Washington), Mahzarin Banaji (Harvard), and Brian Nosek (Virginia).

The workshop is designed to allow discussion about the IAT test, an illustration of bias and exercises to uncover how bias has shaped participants’ individual lives as well as the organizations in which they work.

With this awareness, the workshop moves to a discussion methodology that guides participants through their past, present and future and helps them set goals for personal change while serving as facilitators of institutional change.

Initial feedback about this new workshop, gathered by formative evaluation has been very positive and shows exciting promise.

The CAA seeks to introduce this yet to be named workshop, at CFA’s Delegates Assembly in April.

Ask your local CFA staff and leaders about scheduling a workshop at your campus soon.

(Endnotes)
2 http://www.americanvaluesinstitute.org
3 http://writers.unconsciousbias.org
4 http://writers.unconsciousbias.org
5 http://www.equaljusticesociety.org
6 https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit
CFA Board passes resolution to support comprehensive immigration reform

The resolution reads:

Whereas, in 2010 CFA passed a resolution in support of comprehensive immigration reform and the Dream Act, siding with those who seek a more equitable, humane policy for all immigrants, and

Whereas, CFA has, historically and traditionally, championed equity, access and affordability in higher education and has passionately defended the rights of immigrant students and faculty,

Whereas, CFA has consistently worked with organized labor and community organizations and recognizes that the treatment of new immigrants is a reflection of the democratic values that define us,

Whereas, CFA supports a viable and humane roadmap to citizenship that would improve wages and labor standards for all workers by giving them a voice in the workplace and halting employers who take advantage of our failed immigration policies to pursue a race to the bottom,

Be it further resolved that, CFA supports a carefully constructed path to citizenship for our students and their families, and

Be it further resolved that, CFA reaffirms our support for fair comprehensive immigration reform now,

Be it further resolved that, the California Faculty Association will work with organized labor and community organizations and, wherever possible, will actively engage in voter registration campaigns and mobilization efforts on a local, state and national level directed at securing rights for immigrant students and their families.

Approved by the CFA Board of Directors, February 2013
California Faculty

The Humboldt State University political science professor and president of the California Faculty Association during some of the most contentious years in the California State University system, John Turner Travis, died February 6 after a battle with cancer. He was 68.

"With his calm demeanor and big heart, he somehow managed to keep us focused and united," recalls Susan Meisenhelder, a CSU San Bernardino English professor who preceded him as CFA president. "When he started a meeting—as he invariably did—with that booming call to his 'colleagues,' we all knew it was time to get to work."

Travis led CFA through years of deep funding cuts. Those cuts led to loss of jobs and pay for the faculty while students were turned away or slammed with soaring tuition. Throughout Travis argued and organized to save the public university system and to defend the people who worked and learned in it.

Travis helped the faculty navigate the way to contract settlements over more than a decade, first as bargaining chair and then as president. In the 2006/2007 academic year, the union came within a few days of its first system-wide strike.

John Travis, 1944-2013

CFA leader helped make the union a strong advocate for public higher education through tough economic times

By Alice Sunshine
Editor

At 5'11” tall, John Travis used to say he was not so large as people seemed to think. But those who met the former college football player and California labor leader knew he was a big man—in intellect, in abilities and at the union bargaining table.

The Humboldt State University political science professor and president of the California Faculty Association during some of the most contentious years in the California State University system, John Turner Travis, died February 6 after a battle with cancer. He was 68.
Along with a strong team of faculty leaders that included current CFA president Lillian Taiz, Travis led the organizing for university-wide protests that called for tuition rollbacks for students, fair pay for the faculty and other employees, and an end to rapidly rising university executive perks and pay.

“John was all about justice,” says Taiz. “He was incensed when people working with the former chancellor tried to take advantage of us by not bargaining fairly on our contract. And, he strongly believed it was not enough to be angry; we had to do something about it.”

Travis remained active in CFA as its political action committee chair until his illness intervened. “Just in the last few months, he was encouraged that he lived to see the beginnings of a positive change,” adds Taiz, referring to leadership and policy changes now underway in the CSU.

Travis was born June 2, 1944 and raised in Independence, Oregon, a small farm town that even today has only one stop light. As a child he was an altar boy at the local Episcopal Church.

His sister Jan Stapleton recalls that even in high school, “John was always a great one to have discussions, to challenge your mind all the time. He was adventurous. We were always into something and it was usually his idea.”

His father Guy, who died when John was 11, was a baker in the military during World War II and later became a local postman. His mother Marie worked for the telephone company.

“Education was John’s ticket in his life,” says his wife Beth Amen. “He never forgot that.”

Travis was a star offensive lineman on his high school football team that took the Oregon state championship in the 1960/61 school year. He won a football scholarship to Willamette University in Salem, Oregon where he studied political science.

“He took it all the way to Ph.D,” says Amen. “He always wanted to go to college. It was clear he would be an academic.”

Travis was a dedicated advocate for students. He wrote recommendations for dozens of students to get internships at the California state Capitol. When walking with him in the building, it was commonplace to hear aides greet him with “Hi Professor Travis.”

And he knew students had their own causes. During the 1990s one of his students became an old-growth redwood “tree-sitter” to protest logging of ancient trees.

“There was a big advocacy to stop clear cut by Maxxam Corp, the old Pacific Lumber,” recalls Chris Haynes, a friend and colleague at Humboldt State. “John hoisted a student’s exam up the tree because if the student had come down, he would have lost the tree. John took a lot of flack from the lumber company about why is a professor giving a test in a tree.”

Travis' dedication to public service went beyond higher education. For many years he served on the Area One Board on Developmental Disabilities for northern California. He and Beth participated in dog rescue and adopted a number of dogs, especially boxers.

“We were lousy foster parents for the dogs because we ended up keeping them,” says Amen.

Travis loved catch-and-release fly fishing and he brought to the sport that same talent and focus as in his other endeavors. His favorite spots were Hat Creek in California, Henry’s Fork of the Snake River and Silver Creek in Idaho.
“He tied the flies, studied the area’s insects, and he caught some pretty big fish,” remembers Haynes. “The sport is catching the trout and like a lot of fishermen he also advocated for preservation of trout habitat.”

Amen, who went on many of the month-long fishing expeditions, recalls, “Fly fishing appealed to his intellect. He learned to make his own flies. When he cast it was beautiful, so graceful, it could bring tears to your eyes.”

On February 28, Assemblymember Wes Chesbro, a longtime friend of Travis, took to the floor of the California Assembly, spoke movingly about Travis’ life and career and adjourned the legislative day in his memory. His CFA colleagues at Humboldt State University hosted a memorial in Arcata on the same day. CFA will host a statewide memorial for him at its Delegate’s Assembly in April.

In addition to Beth Amen, John Travis is survived by his stepson Mark, sisters Jan Stapleton of Salem, Oregon; Judy Schroeder of Independence, Oregon; his brother Jim Travis of Boise, Idaho; and thousands of colleagues, students and friends who have benefitted from his endeavors.

Read remembrances of John Travis at www.calfac.org/post/tribute-john-travis

The family asks that in lieu of flowers or other gifts, contributions be made in John Travis’ name to the American Cancer Society. The web address for donations is www.cancer.org/involved/donate
CFA Welcomes New Staff

CFA is proud to welcome two new staff members to the union: General Manager Kristin Eldridge and Research Specialist Nancy Wiefek.

Eldridge started her career as a field organizer in electoral politics but quickly moved to the house of labor where she worked as a field organizer for SEIU, as Collective Bargaining Director at SEIU Local 721 and as Nursing Home Director/Interim External Organizing Director for SEIU-ULTCW.

Wiefek brings a wealth of experience in labor having worked for and with unions during most of her career. Her background includes a decade of experience conducting policy and survey research on the issues that affect the daily lives of CFA members including healthcare, pensions and education. She holds a Ph.D. in political science and her dissertation and book focuses on economic anxiety.

“We are very happy to have Kristin and Nancy join CFA,” says CFA President Lillian Taiz. “They both bring a strong knowledge of the labor community and valuable experience the issues that most impact our members.”

A Children’s Book for the 99%

Looking for a book for your child to explain what a union activist is? “A is for Activist” is an ABC board book for the next generation of progressives—families that want their kids to grow up unapologetic about activism, environmental justice, civil rights, LGBTQ rights and so on.

The book is written and illustrated by Innosanto Nagara who has beautified CFA’s magazines and promotional materials for years with his graphic design work.

Naomi Klein, author of the Shock Doctrine, called the book “full of wit, beauty, and fun!”

Learn more and find locations where you can buy the book at www.aisforactivist.com
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In January, Gov. Jerry Brown introduced his state budget proposal for the 2013/14 fiscal year. While the governor emphasized that this budget will ask the state to “live-within-our-means,” it does provide much-needed funding boosts for public higher education.

Election victory sets stage for budget restoration

While funding increase helps, some policy changes raise concerns

By Peter Kreysa
Chair, CFA Political Action & Legislative Committee
Family and Consumer Sciences, Long Beach

The plan would provide the CSU with a funding increase of $125.1 million.

CFA praised the governor’s approach.

“This budget proposal is the first step in restoring a prosperous future for California,” says CFA President Lillian Taiz, a professor of history at CSU Los Angeles. “We appreciate the governor’s commitment to public higher education and, in particular, to keeping the CSU affordable for our students.”

The governor also proposed to step up future funding for the CSU by 5 percent in academic year 2014/15 and 4 percent in each of the subsequent two years.

Budget Proposes Problematic Policy Changes

While the funding portions of the budget plan are a positive for the CSU, the governor proposed some policy changes that raise concerns for CSU faculty.

The governor would direct $10 million of the $125.1 million increase to experiment with online education aimed at so-called “bottleneck courses.”

For the second year in a row, the governor has proposed changing the law concerning CSU contributions to pay for faculty health insurance. Currently, government code specifies that CSU management pay for health insurance for employees and for 90 percent of the weighted average cost for faculty dependents.1

The governor’s change would give CSU management leverage to impose higher

Erma Jean Sims (Elementary Education, Sonoma) participated in a ‘Yes on 30, No on 32’ phone bank with fellow educators. The work done by faculty to help pass Proposition 30 last fall was critical in winning much-needed funding for the CSU.
costs on CSU employees increasing the cost of our healthcare contributions significantly as a result.

CFA strongly opposes this change and is working to have it removed from the budget proposal. These issues should be addressed at the bargaining table.

Gov. Brown would have each higher ed system cap the number of classes students can take at 150 percent of what is necessary to complete most degrees—270 quarterly units at UC and 180 semester units at CSU. That cap would shrink further after two years. Students could continue taking classes but would have to pay full price rather than the in-state-supported fees. The governor believes this will force more students to finish on time and free up resources for new students.

These proposals have far-reaching implications for CFA members and our students. Union leaders emphasize that the initial budget developments represent just the opening salvo in a months-long debate on the state budget.

“While we have concerns about some of the policy proposals in the budget, there is sufficient time to have a thorough discussion to address these policies,” says CFA President Taiz.

Election Victory Key to Funding
The Governor’s budget unveiling followed the November election in which voters spoke unequivocally in favor of protecting education at all levels. Not only did they enthusiastically endorse Proposition 30 but they also elected a record seven current or former CSU or UC faculty members to the state legislature to serve as stalwarts of public higher ed.

Perhaps most importantly, the passage of Prop 30 not only prevented a mid-year cut to the state university in 2012 but it rolled back tuition/student fees. The governor provides for this in his 2013 budget by back-filling $125 million in CSU resources that the system refunded to students and their families as a result of the tuition rollback last fall.

“CFA members worked tirelessly for Prop. 30 in the hope that we can stop the harm caused by years of funding cuts,” says Taiz. “Now we are beginning to see the fruit of that hard work.”

More Work to Do
While January’s budget news is a welcome change of direction for the CSU, this state budget plan will not correct for all the deep cuts to the CSU system over the past decade. As budget cuts grew to the hundreds of millions of dollars, student fees rose dramatically, faculty salaries flat-lined, and educational opportunity faded. The reduced investment resulted in fewer faculty, larger class sizes, fewer class offerings, burgeoning student debt, fewer admissions, and longer matriculation rates.

Taiz says, “We look forward to working with CSU Chancellor Timothy White in a constructive way to continue to publicly advocate for the resources our university needs to turn around a decade of disinvestment.”

Plenty of work remains to be done,” she said.

1. Government Code says the employer pays 100 percent of the weighted average premium of the four top health plans for the employee and 90 percent of same for employee dependents.

---

**180-Unit Proposal Would Cap Student Access**

As part of his budget plan, Gov. Jerry Brown proposes greater restrictions on the total number of units students can take without paying higher tuition.

The proposal would set a cap of 150 percent of the number of units a student needs to complete most degrees, and would charge students out-of-state rates for all units taken beyond that cap.

The governor believes this will force more students to finish on time and free up university resources.

**For CSU Students this means:**

**Starting in Fall 2013**

Students will be capped at 180 semester or 270 quarter units.

**Starting in Fall 2015**

Students will be capped at 150 semester or 225 quarter units.

(Equal to five years of education)

Waivers may be granted but the CSU would have to foot the bill, meaning there would be little financial incentive to do so.
The first few months of 2013 have brought CSU faculty the first real positive change we have experienced for quite a long time.

I’m certainly not claiming all our problems are solved—far from it. We have many more hurdles to jump just to get our work and our university back to where we were just a few years ago, much less advancing into the future.

And new challenges—concerns about healthcare costs and legislative proposals to mandate curriculum, just to name two—arise almost daily.

But a few developments are worth a look as we continue our work to turn the CSU in a new direction.

Funding For The CSU

We have fought a decade-long war to preserve public funding for our public university. In most years the best we could do was mitigate the size of the cuts.

But just five months ago in the November 2012 election, voters approved Proposition 30, a moment that turned the trend toward restored funding at last.

When we began the campaign for 30, the outcome was uncertain; in fact, many predicted that Californians simply would not support tax increases in any form.

But people who want a better future for California banded together and labored mightily against a well-funded opposition. Hundreds of our own faculty members walked precincts, made phone calls and organized public events. Young voters registered in record numbers (registration of young voters was actually up 27 percent over 2010) and they went to the polls.

On Election Day, the vote on Proposition 30 wasn’t even close.

Its passage brings some welcome relief to the CSU. If adopted, Gov. Jerry Brown’s state budget plan for 2013/14 will improve the CSU budget by $125.1 million. His plan includes another $125 million to refund the latest hike in CSU student fees and $10 million to explore ways to conduct online education. He also has proposed 5 percent more in fiscal year 2014/15 and 4 percent more in years 2015/16 and 2016/17.

Admittedly, we are just beginning to dig the CSU out of a deep funding pit, but we are a long way from the day when a previous governor thought California already spent too much on students.

New CSU Chancellor

Everyone reading this column certainly knows about the departure of former chancellor Charles B. Reed.

The really exciting news is that we start 2013 with a chancellor who knows California’s public higher ed system well—he is a product of all three segments—and who has actually spent years as a faculty member himself.

Chancellor Timothy White has readily met with faculty leaders, including the Academic Senate chair and myself. He is personable,
articulate and does not think that we all knock off work at 3 pm four days a week. Naturally there will be areas of disagreement and concern. Nevertheless, we look forward to working closely with the chancellor in areas where we agree. And we hope those areas will be many.

So far, Chancellor White has made symbolic gestures to show that he cares about the people who work and learn in the CSU.

For example, over the strong objections of some Trustees, he took a 10 percent cut in his starting pay. Make no mistake—he is still earning big money! But this action showed an appreciation for public service that stands in sharp contrast to the consistent whining in the past about how much more money top executives need to earn to be motivated to do their jobs.

He has also taken some actions in respect to the Senate’s participation in Board of Trustees’ meetings that suggest greater respect for the faculty’s voice in deliberations about the CSU’s future.

Perhaps the starkest change so far relates to equity pay. (See page 8 for a report.) Over the past two years, our CFA Bargaining Team had to fight tooth and nail to keep Equity Pay Year 2 in our contract. In February, at Chancellor White’s urging, CSU labor relations announced that equity pay will be implemented on all campuses, assuming the funding increase in Gov. Brown’s state budget plan is adopted. Implementing the program to which all parties agreed is definitely a new way of responding to inequities in faculty salary.

More That’s New

Here in the first part of 2013, we now have five Trustees appointed by Gov. Brown to the board that is responsible to protect and defend the CSU. CFA is setting up face-to-face meetings to get to know them and, just as important, for them to get to know us.

Some of them are asking the tough questions that Trustees ought to ask about policies and proposals, especially when those decisions have a huge impact on those of us in the classrooms carrying out the mission of the CSU.

As a result of many changes, Board of Trustees meetings are getting “livelier.” Will that result in a changed policy direction? It remains to be seen.

One final example of change in the CSU is, I think, extremely important. CFA, the
“Our best efforts now can mean the difference between a few ‘flash in the pan’ positive events and a real, sustained move in a better direction.”

Academic Senate of the CSU, and the faculty Trustee have embarked on a new era of close communication and cooperation. We have, for instance, made joint presentations at a meeting of the American Association of University Professors and participated in a joint meeting with the governor. I believe this close working relationship will be good for faculty, students, and the CSU—and I am excited about making it even stronger.

We Still Have Miles to Cross

Of course, even where there is positive change, negatives go lurking.

Alongside his funding proposals, the governor’s plan contains policy ideas that raise concern for us. For example, he would fold payment for the CSU’s bond debt and for employee retirements into the regular university budget. And, he would cap degree programs at 180 units to “expedite graduation rates.” These and other policies need to be debated and CFA will follow developments very closely.

And need I say, many of Reed’s policy goals live on.

Ill-thought-out, even chaotic restructuring continues on some campuses, particularly East Bay, Dominguez Hills, Sacramento and Pomona. The shift of course offerings out of the regular university and into high-priced extended education persists.

The long-standing push to privatize elements of the public university using online education may even intensify in the midst of sorting out the best, most effective use of online teaching tools.

Even if our new chancellor proves interested in a genuinely new direction, the legacy of Charles Reed will linger for some time in nooks and crannies all over the CSU.

On Tap This Spring

We all hope change will bring brighter days to the CSU and to our state. It is work, however, and not just hope at this pivotal moment, that will make that happen.

Now through June and possibly beyond, CFA and all CSU faculty will need to support adoption of more CSU funding in the state budget. We have done it before but our chances of success are greater.

We will continue to press for justice for those faculty enduring salary inversion and compression by ensuring that the Equity Year 2 Program is implemented fairly and smoothly.

Nationally, we will keep up our work with partners from some 22 states and national organizations through the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education. CFHE has issued a range of papers getting good public attention, most recently three proposals for fully funding public higher education in the U.S. Each debunks the austerity argument that there is no money. There is money. The failure is political will. (See FutureofHigherEd.org to learn more about this work.)

Also, CFA will seek opportunities to support passage of immigration reform. We strongly believe that many of our colleagues, our students, and their families need this legislation to progress in their lives and to make their contributions to America.

Online on the Agenda

One of the thorniest issues facing us this year is determining the best uses of online education tools to give our students greater access to quality education at tuition they can afford. There are a great many issues here to unpack.

Regarding good pedagogy, we must separate the gold rush mentality of those hoping to get rich through one online scheme or another from the thoughtful research needed to uncover what online tools and methods work best for students.

After all, if a teaching tool doesn’t actually work for our students, it doesn’t matter how cheap it is. It’s worthless.

To ensure that the three public ed segments carefully examine what does and does not work and for whom, CFA will be sponsoring a bill, currently in development—AB 895 authored by Assemblymember Anthony Rendon, a former CSU faculty member.

We hope this bill can play a role in helping California take a deliberative, research-based approach to online higher education.

As we discuss this bill in Sacramento, we will also need to work with legislators to improve other bills related to curriculum and teaching that, although well-intentioned, would have unintended consequences for quality and access.

As these examples of work to be done suggest and as I am sure all of you know, now is not the time for our union to sit back and just hope that change is coming.

Even though we have seen some breaks in the clouds, our best efforts now can mean the difference between a few “flash in the pan” positive events and a real, sustained move in a better direction.

Please join in the work this spring that is necessary to ensure the latter and to bring about truly better days for the CSU.
In mid-February, CFA received notice from the CSU Chancellor’s Office that new Chancellor Timothy White intends to fully implement year two of the Equity Salary Program provided in the faculty contract.

This act will provide much-needed salary relief to nearly 3,000 CSU faculty members who were affected by inversion and compression.

Inversion refers to newly hired faculty getting jobs at higher pay than faculty who had been in the CSU for years. Compression is 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.

“While the salary relief provided to this small group of faculty is much-needed, there are still tens of thousands of faculty and staff who have not received across-the-board increases (GSI) and step increments (SSI) for many years.”

The decision to implement this contract provision—which was announced via a letter to CFA from Gail Brooks, CSU Vice Chancellor for Human Resources—indicated that the CSU administration intends to fund $5 million in equity raises negotiated in our previous contract but not funded in 2008/09.

Implementation of this program is contingent upon the legislature’s approval of the $125 million CSU funding increase proposed by the governor in January.

“We appreciate the chancellor taking this step to address a long-standing problem and look forward to working with him on solving the other pressing issues confronting the faculty who have made considerable personal sacrifices to bring the university through tough times,” said CFA President Lillian Taiz.

She continued, “While the salary relief provided to this small group of faculty is much-needed, there are still tens of thousands of faculty and staff who have not received across-the-board increases (GSI) and step increments (SSI) for many years.”

The new collective bargaining agreement between CFA and CSU management (ratified last summer) brought back the second year of the Equity Pay Program on a campus-by-campus basis and at the discretion of each campus president.

In recognition of the fact that new salary inversion problems have surfaced over these many years without salary increases, the current contract also provides that, once Equity Year 2 is fulfilled, at the president’s discretion, campuses may develop a third equity program to address these new problems.

The design of such new equity programs would involve the participation of the CFA chapter on campus.

Further Reading & Eligibility Criteria

View the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), Equity Increases section, which begins with Article 31.10

See Appendix G, “Equity Oversight Committee Framework for the Equity Program for Associate and Full Professors and Equivalent Librarian, Counselor, and Coach Ranks,” starting on page 167 of the CBA.

See article by Kevin Wehr in CFA Fall 2012 magazine at calfac.org
Online education is the latest frenzy sweeping through public higher education systems nationwide as well as here in the CSU. Since “online education” means so many different things to different people, the ideas are arriving in all kinds of packages, big and small.

The question before educators and policy makers is not “online education, for or against.” The question is “what does and does not work to serve students and California well.”

The articles presented here are another step in CFA’s attempt to answer that key question.

As the articles (pp. 11-13) by Jennifer Eagan and Jeff Kolnick show, the faculty in the CSU and other states have been exploring the best pedagogical methods to use online tools in the service of their subject matter and the students who take the class.

They assume the aims of any good public education program, whether online, in a classroom, or through a combination of both, are to:

- Enhance the success of all students including underserved populations
- Provide quality higher education (think: good teaching)
- Give students the ability to think critically and innovate to be strong citizens and get good jobs

Kolnick and Eagan each identify pitfalls that can undermine the whole idea and they warn of what has not worked, what is unlikely
to work in the future, and what should be avoided in favor of better approaches.

The news report (p. 15) on a test using MOOC-like classes, now underway at San Jose State, lays out how at least one campus is trying a necessary experiment. One of the key outcomes will be determining whether the methods are in place to provide remedial education online.

While a lot of uncertainty persists, some things are not new. We do know this:

- It has always been a bad idea to launch programs without testing to be sure they work
- Academics have good methods to develop, evaluate and approve new courses, curriculum and teaching methods; try short cuts around that at one’s peril
- There is no one model or one “magic bullet” to meet our needs
- There can be unintended consequences from ideas that look good on paper but don’t work in the real world
- An innovative and fair society cannot afford to ration access to public education based on ability to pay

Some accuse the faculty at universities across the U.S. of going too slow. These critics ignore the fact that faculty are incorporating new tools into their teaching all the time.

The truth is that well-thought-out change makes improvements happen faster and less expensively because we avoid having to fix ugly mistakes or replace programs that didn’t work.

We save money by doing it right the first time.

Even more importantly, we owe it to every student to get this right.

These are only some considerations about online education including the for-profit model, based on what faculty around the country have encountered so far.

SUCCESS

Completion rates typically are much lower for online classes than in-person classes.

A teaching method that doesn’t work costs our students their futures. And if a tool/method/program doesn’t work, it is not cheap. It’s worthless.

Online classes with the most student success require rigorous faculty engagement with students including frequent appearances in discussion forums, daily postings, well-designed assignments, careful evaluation of written work and time for one-on-one communication via videoconference, webchat or e-mail.

WHO IS SERVED

Students with experience in education who have learned study discipline are the best-served by online classes. Also, online may be the only access to higher education for some students.

Online is particularly ill-suited to entry-level classes and remedial level work. It disproportionately disadvantages the very first-generation and at-risk populations the CSU historically has served.

Students with access to computers and an internet connection at home will be able to take these classes; those without will have to surmount high hurdles to get access to the tools for the amount of time they need to spend online in a class.

COST

The shortage of on-campus classes is a direct result of state funding cuts to public higher education since 2002. The fastest, most efficient solution to access to higher education is adequate state funding.

The education the CSU offers is a public good; it should remain publicly funded. Buying services from for-profit businesses will starve our public university system even more.

Some online education ideas, for instance Cal State Online, would simply shift cost from the state onto students. This undermines the purpose of a public university—to make sure students who otherwise would not be able to go to college get a chance at a college degree.
A Teacher’s Take on Online Education

By Jeff Kolnick
Member, Campaign for the Future of Higher Ed
History, Southwest Minnesota State University

As a professor, let me weigh in on the debate about online learning. I’ve taught online within the Minnesota State University system every year since 2004. I am not opposed to online education nor am I afraid of it.

At a recent online panel discussion focused on best practices, there was a general consensus that with proper class size control and good pedagogy, students write more in online classes. This can help improve written communication skills, especially when faculty are vigilant about making developmental comments and providing opportunities for revision.

The online approach can widen opportunities for shy students to get involved in class discussion more easily than in face-to-face classes. It also cuts geographic barriers, which is better than no access at all.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 13
that online teaching and learning has certain benefits both for me and for students—and it has some costs. It’s not magic but it can be a lot of fun.

The biggest advantage of online learning, particularly in the humanities, is that students write a lot. Practically all of their communication is written so they can be “forced” to participate and engage in interactive activities in a way that is difficult to do in an on-ground classroom without being mean or creating anxiety.

However, this advantage is lost in online classes where student tasks are automated and the specific feedback from the professor is paltry.

Online classes open up opportunities for “non-traditional” students who are working (particularly shift work), parenting, caretaking, etc. One student taking my online Feminist Philosophy class always posted in the early morning hours and, at one point, shared with me that her husband said that she could go to school as long as it didn’t affect her duties to him or to their children. I guess that’s why she took Feminist Philosophy. I was very glad that she had the opportunity to take the class and flattered that she apparently thought that the class was more important than sleep.

However, online classes are not for everyone.

They have high attrition rates and require discipline on the part of both the students and the instructors. Regular assignments and reasons to check into the class keep everyone engaged but are also demanding on students’ time.

To the good of online learning, the technology keeps getting better and the number of open-source materials available on the web keep getting better.

However, teaching an online class is more work and less personally rewarding to the instructor and often for students as well. I have found that everyone misses the stimulation of real face-to-face interaction. To help combat this con, experimenting with new technologies can keep things exciting and fun, and using live chat and very active discussion boards can help keep both the instructor and students engaged.

Online classes can cultivate independent and active learning by putting the onus of finding and analyzing material on the student. Done right, online teaching can be a good way to mentor students on meaningful projects and for students to get peer feedback on their work.

However, based on my experience and discussions with colleagues who teach online, the more inexperienced, underprepared and vulnerable the student, the less successful she or he is likely to be online.

Some administrators are pushing for remediation online; this seems like a terrible idea.

Online learning for more experienced students can be really exciting and foster constructive independence from their instructors. I find that Philosophy majors do pretty well online because they are already interested in the material.

The lecture and testing model of higher education kind of stinks, and online teaching done well encourages us to get away from the non-interactive lecture. Yet, online education can easily degenerate into the “faculty member as information delivery system” just as much as a course that features all in-class lectures.

There is a culture of distaste for traditional teaching and learning (and teachers) that fuels the hope that online courses and MOOCs can revolutionize education. Teaching and learning are basically the same everywhere and some of the rush to online fails to take into account the importance of already prepared students and qualified professors who are experts in their fields.

Online teaching done well can be a vehicle for quality student writing, innovation, independent thinking, and creative projects. It also can encourage pedagogical innovation and access for students who can’t take face-to-face courses.

Online teaching and learning is not magic. Courses are courses, and the general rules for quality teaching (being present, interacting with students, and providing personal feedback) remain the same regardless of platform.

Online education is certainly not a panacea for the problems of access, equity, and cost. If done poorly, online higher education could exacerbate some of these problems.

For example, many students get lost in anonymous online environments. Sometimes, administrators wrongly think that “online course” means that the demand alone should determine the number of students in the class.

Also, some students do not have access to adequate computers and high-speed internet connections.

The drive to dismantle public higher education could ruin what’s good about online teaching and make it into a corporately packaged, low quality, banking system for bits of information.

Faculty-controlled online courses and programs can resist this trend; students know quality when they experience it.
Simply put, the upside depends on well-designed and rigorous courses with regular faculty involvement. This means frequent appearances in discussion forums and daily postings of one kind or another on top of careful evaluation of written work and time for one-on-one communication via e-mail when requested.

The downsides of online are many.

Super-high attrition rates are almost universal. Faculty have a hard time getting to know students, which limits mentorship opportunities and makes writing letters of recommendation difficult.

Pressure to increase class size leads to limited rigor and less writing, thus weakening the best part of online education.

Online is particularly ill-suited to entry-level classes and remedial level work. Sadly, that is where it is being pushed the hardest by its advocates in government and in the business world.

Recently, MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) have become a major topic of discussion in my state after the University of Minnesota announced plans to offer them. Generally, these classes are free (except for a nominal fee), open to anyone regardless of status at the school, and don't actually count toward graduation.

However, the eventual aim is to use MOOCs at schools nationally to bring low-cost higher education to the masses while generating a profit for the businesses that deliver the courses. Policymakers across the country are falling over themselves, each eager to lead the MOOC charge.

So here's one concern: How would this impact those at community colleges and less selective universities when online teachers suggest that small online classes and frequent faculty contact is essential for student success?

Duke University released a thorough study examining one of its MOOCs. Among the findings are the following:

**COSTS**—Huge investment of time (600 total hours, 420 by the faculty member).

**SUCCESS**—Over 11,000 enrolled and only 313 successfully completed the course.

**WHO**—Two thirds of the students who enrolled had a BA or advanced degree.

Here are some questions faculty members, students, university management and even lawmakers should ask before fully embarking on this major investment of time and money:

- Will MOOCs create a two-tiered system of education with wealthy people still sending their children to elite colleges and MOOCs for everyone else?
- What is the success rate of students by different demographic groups for MOOCs?
- What is the difference between transferring information and getting an education?
- What are the demonstrated student learning outcomes for MOOCs?
- What is the return on investment for a given university using a “business model” with limited revenue flow?
- What have we learned? As we move forward with online education, it would be wise for policy makers to take advantage of, in our case, the hundreds of Minnesota faculty who have been doing it successfully for many years.
- What are the attrition rates, the success of existing online courses at achieving learning outcomes, and the success of online education among different demographic groups?

Like any pedagogical tool, online education can be used effectively or ineffectively.

Before we jump into the brave new world of MOOCs, we should study and understand them.

In the meantime, let's reinvest in what we know works—affordable public higher education.

A version of this article appeared in The Minnesota 2020 Blog, March 13, 2013.
The whirlwind of new technology entering the world of higher ed has brought with it an entirely new lexicon. CFA Research Specialist Nancy Wiefek prepared this glossary of key terms used in the discussion about online education.

**Asynchronous Learning**—Communication exchanges which occur in elapsed time between two or more people. Examples are email, online discussion forums, message boards, blogs, podcasts, etc.

**Blended learning**—Blended learning is any time a student learns at least in part at a supervised brick-and-mortar location away from home and at least in part online with some element of student control over time, place, path, and/or pace; often used synonymously with Hybrid Learning.

One example of blended learning is a "flipped classroom." The basic idea is that the lecture or conveying of material is moved outside of the classroom and homework moves into the classroom. Technology can facilitate this process by allowing for viewing videos online at home. This can free up time for more interaction with the instructor and peers while doing homework assignments in class.

**Distance education**—General term for any educational activity in which the participants are at a distance from each other—in other words, are separated in space. They may or may not be separated in time (asynchronous vs. synchronous).

**Home-grown content**—Content developed by a teacher, school, or district for use in instruction, as compared to content developed by outside companies or other vendors.

**Hybrid course**—Some but not all face-to-face classroom time is displaced by online technology.

**Learning Management System (LMS)**—The technology platform through which students access online courses. A LMS generally includes software for creating and editing course content, communication tools, assessment tools and other features for managing the course. Often used interchangeably with "Course Management System."

The leader in the market is Blackboard. It is seeing growing competition from Desire2Learn as well as Moodle, an open-source LMS, and Sakai, another open-source LMS deployed primarily in research universities.

Cal State Online is a centralized system that assists with the delivery, via technology, of programs taught by CSU faculty. All programs offered through Cal State Online are required to use Pearson’s Learning Studio LMS (Learning Management System).

**MOOC**—An acronym for “massive open online course.” It currently refers to a web-based class designed to support a large number of participants. The initial MOOCs were network-based courses designed so that a “learning environment” could develop from the participants’ interactions.

edX, a nonprofit MOOC provider formed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.

Coursera, a for-profit MOOC provider founded by two Stanford University computer professors and funded by venture capital investments.

Udacity, co-founded by Stanford professor, Sebastian Thrun, a for-profit provider with funding from venture capitalists. The advisory board includes Bill Bennett, Secretary of Education under Pres. Ronald Reagan.

The non-profit Khan Academy is a MOOC-like website founded by Salman Khan. It offers free video lessons mostly in math, science, and test prep. The Gates Foundation is its biggest funder. The videos feature Khan, a former hedge fund manager.

**Online course**—One in which all or most of the instruction and student-instructor interaction is performed online.

**On-Ground Class**—A course conducted in person, in a physical classroom.

**Online learning**—Education in which instruction and content are delivered primarily over the internet. The U.S. Department of Education distinguishes it from printed-based correspondence education, broadcast TV or radio, videocassettes, and stand-alone educational software programs that do not have a significant Internet-based instructional component. Used interchangeably with Virtual learning, Cyber learning, e-learning.

**Synchronous learning**—Online learning in which the participants interact at the same time and in the same space.

**Web-enhanced course**—The course is enhanced by online technology, but no seat time is displaced.

*Definitions draw upon The Online Learning Definitions Project put together by iNACOL.*
The CSU is going online in a much bigger way than ever before.

In January, Chancellor Timothy White joined Gov. Jerry Brown and Sebastian Thrun, head of Silicon Valley start-up Udacity, to roll out a first-of-its-kind pilot program for online teaching at San Jose State. The program called San Jose State Plus aims to harness principles of massive open online courses (MOOCs) and apply them to three courses in mathematics that are so-called ‘bottlenecks’ for students seeking degrees at San Jose—a remedial algebra course, a college-level algebra course and introductory statistics.

Citing long waiting lists and high failure rates in remedial courses, Gov. Brown pushed aggressively for the program noting at a launch event that the state’s public higher education systems must find a way to help people succeed and to buoy its aging workforce.

“This may be not the [whole] solution but a key part of the solution,” Brown said.

The CSU’s deal with Udacity—which CFA engaged in impact bargaining over before it was announced—is also the first time that professors at a public university have collaborated with a provider of a MOOC to create for-credit courses in which students watch videos, take interactive quizzes and receive support from online mentors. For the pilot project, however, each course is limited to 100 students—one section of matriculated San Jose State students and a section of non-matriculated students. The courses are run through San Jose’s extension program. The cost of each three-unit course is $150, significantly less than regular San Jose extension fees. A foundation grant is paying the fee for some students.

The San Jose State University Foundation received a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant to study the completion rates of the courses they are offering online through SJSU Plus, specifically how different models of interaction and mentoring improve outcomes.

Each of the five faculty members participating in the program will be compensated for both developing and teaching the pilot courses. They also will retain the intellectual-property rights to the course materials.

In the deal between Udacity and SJSU, the university will keep 51 percent of any profit after costs are covered and Udacity will keep 49 percent, Mohammad Qayoumi, San Jose State president, said at the launch.

President Qayoumi is pushing aggressively to expand into online education—San Jose is also working on another MOOC pilot with nonprofit provider EdV, which is led by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.

In his remarks at the news conference
On March 19, CFA released the following statement regarding the wave of online higher education bills that are percolating in the state legislature.

Several bills related to online education in California’s public colleges and universities have been introduced in the state legislature this year.

While these bills are still in the initial stages, CFA is very concerned about the impact on students, faculty and quality education and the unintended consequences of one-size-fits-all legislation.

While CFA believes that online education can be a successful mode of instruction for some students and while we wholeheartedly support expanding access to higher education in California, we have deep concerns about some proposed legislative solutions that mandate online instruction or call for blanket standardization of curriculum across a variety of institutions.

CFA also fundamentally rejects the belief that after years of deep cuts in state support for the CSU, the solution to restoring the greatness of the system lies in throwing open the doors to private vendors and privatizing operations.

We believe that it is a strength of our system that the 23 campuses of the CSU (and the campuses of the UC and CC systems as well) each offer rich and unique educational experiences that are shaped by the needs of students on that particular campus and by the needs of the community surrounding the campus.

Legislation that seeks to create curricular uniformity across all campuses puts the current educational diversity that reflects our social diversity at risk. Such legislation would also make it more difficult for campuses to foster student success by tailoring curriculum (sequences of courses, for instance) to the educational backgrounds of students on that campus.

We also firmly believe that affordability and quality are critical to any meaningful notion of access. Students in public higher education institutions should not be required to pay additional costs to take a course (whether online or in-person) that is required to graduate.

For so many Californians, our public colleges and universities are still the largest and most consistent providers of quality courses (in a variety of formats), rich opportunities for academic success, and relatively affordable prices.

We believe that providing Californians with meaningful access to higher education requires that we provide adequate public investment in our university system.

Simply increasing online offerings (on the questionable assumption that it is cheaper) or handing off education to private vendors will not serve California well in the long run.

Legislators’ well-intentioned efforts to increase access for students ignore a proven solution that we know will increase access: investing resources into more class sections. Legislation that promotes too good-to-be-true alternatives to reinvesting in our public colleges and universities will not solve the state’s needs for an educated citizenry.

CFA continues to monitor and is negotiating with legislators with legislation impacting higher education and will keep you updated on the latest developments.
A Journey Into Change

“Together, we are powerful!” is the guiding light of the CFA Council for Affirmative Action

By Cecil E. Canton
CFA Associate Vice President, Affirmative Action
Criminal Justice, Sacramento

Last December, an intrepid band of CFA activists met as a task force to share their ideas about making that mantra—Together We Are Powerful—a more visible and vibrant part of our work.

The task force conversation revisited the original intent of CFA’s Council for Affirmative Action and examined the work the CAA has done to diversify and further democratize CFA. After all, making CFA a more inclusive and democratic union is critical to achieving the Council’s mission.

The task force decided to develop something big and bold, something not tried before in the history of the CAA or CFA. They decided to develop CAA-based diversity training workshops that would take our work to the campuses using the same successful delivery system used by the CFA Lecturers Council’s Nuts & Bolts and Pension & Benefits workshops.

These workshops would be focused on the disempowering force of hidden or unconscious bias, also known as implicit social cognition. The goal is to create workshops that could be used at every CSU campus to help faculty members become aware of their own unconscious biases and preferences and, through that awareness, to transform the hiring, evaluation and retention process for all the faculty in the CSU.

Additionally, workshop participants who successfully complete the workshops may, as written in the Anti-Racist Cookbook, “Build a shared vision of how to create a truly inclusive and respectful sense of community with other persons, especially those whose backgrounds are different from their own.”

There was unanimous agreement that something of this scope is needed on our campuses. But were the task force members all on the same page with the definition? What is hidden bias? How could they actually uncover it, much less develop a training module to address it?

Their work was informed by research conducted by the American Values Institute and the Equal Justice Society. Those groups describe hidden (or unconscious or implicit) bias as that which we carry without awareness or conscious direction. Everyone has unconscious biases and preferences. Unconscious biases or preferences are hidden prejudices that we all have operating on a subconscious level. This could be related to race, gender, disability, religion, etc.

Take the IAT at implicit.harvard.edu

- Click on ‘Demonstration’ link
- Click on ‘Go to the Demonstration Tests’
- After reading the preliminary info., click on ‘I wish to proceed’
- Select a test and follow the instructions for how to take it
- At least 1 test should focus on race
- At least 1 test should focus on gender
- Choose the remaining tests from 2 other categories such as age, politics, religion, etc.
The hope is that through uncovering each of our unconscious biases and preferences we will become more aware of (and change for the better) the way we behave in the workplace and increase the effectiveness of our interactions with others, especially those who may be different from us.

This is especially relevant to RTP committees and/or hiring/search committees. The idea is to foster an environment wherein we can recruit and retain a more diverse faculty workforce and decrease incidences of workplace hostility.

Helping Our Conscious Values Prevail

Advances in neuroscience and other social sciences have helped us to understand that people can consciously believe in equality while simultaneously acting on subconscious prejudices they are not aware they harbor.

By looking at the complexity of how our brains work, this research has given us a way to understand better how decision making happens in our minds. This understanding provides the foundation to disrupt the impact of hidden biases so that our consciously held values can prevail.

Implicit Social Cognition, also known as Hidden Bias or Unconscious Bias or Implicit Bias, arose as a way to explain why discrimination persists, even though polling and other research clearly shows that people oppose it.

Initially, some researchers conjectured that people sought to hide their bias from pollsters and simply lied about their views for fear of appearing prejudiced.

Neuroscience and the study of implicit bias allows us a glimpse into the human brain and an opportunity to unravel the mysteries of why we treat each other with cruelty or with care, and what ultimately leads us to create policies designed to help or to hurt.

The CAA task force decided early on that this was not to be your typical diversity workshop. This was meant to make the participant aware of the subconscious, hidden or previously unknown biases and preferences that exist in all of us.

This workshop would involve real and personal effort. This would mean sharing on a deeply personal level and going deep! The process would allow participants to gain insight and understanding as to how their personal cultural lens impacts daily decision making.

A workshop that is both engaging and creative was created. Participants will be required to take a few online tests that were developed using academic research methods to uncover each of our unconscious biases or preferences.

The CAA seeks to introduce this yet to be named workshop, at CFA’s Delegates Assembly in April.

Ask your local CFA staff and leaders about scheduling a workshop at your campus soon.

“Through uncovering each of our unconscious biases and preferences we will become more aware of (and change for the better) the way we behave in the workplace and increase the effectiveness of our interactions with others.”

The tests, called Implicit Association Tests (or IAT’s), are short, easy and even fun. The IAT was invented by Anthony Greenwald and colleagues in the mid 1990s. Project Implicit®, which allows individuals to take these tests online, is maintained by Greenwald (Washington), Mahzarin Banaji (Harvard), and Brian Nosek (Virginia).

The workshop is designed to allow discussion about the IAT test, an illustration of bias and exercises to uncover how bias has shaped participants’ individual lives as well as the organizations in which they work.

With this awareness, the workshop moves to a discussion methodology that guides participants through their past, present and future and helps them set goals for personal change while serving as facilitators of institutional change.

Initial feedback about this new workshop, gathered by formative evaluation has been very positive and shows exciting promise.

(Endnotes)
2 http://www.americanvaluesinstitute.org
3 http://writers.unconsciousbias.org
4 http://writers.unconsciousbias.org
5 http://www.equaljusticesociety.org
6 https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit
CFA Board passes resolution to support comprehensive immigration reform

The CFA Board of Directors adopted a resolution at its meeting in January that was submitted by CFA’s Council for Affirmative Action to “Support Comprehensive Immigration Reform.”

Among other things, the resolution notes that public policy on immigration is important to the CSU community. We have faculty colleagues who must deal with immigration in regard to their jobs and families. Also, many CSU students need “a path to citizenship” that will allow them to put their college degrees to work for themselves and for California.

The resolution reads:

Whereas, in 2010 CFA passed a resolution in support of comprehensive immigration reform and the Dream Act, siding with those who seek a more equitable, humane policy for all immigrants, and

Whereas, CFA has, historically and traditionally, championed equity, access and affordability in higher education and has passionately defended the rights of immigrant students and faculty,

Whereas, CFA has consistently worked with organized labor and community organizations and recognizes that the treatment of new immigrants is a reflection of the democratic values that define us,

Whereas, CFA supports a viable and humane roadmap to citizenship that would improve wages and labor standards for all workers by giving them a voice in the workplace and halting employers who take advantage of our failed immigration policies to pursue a race to the bottom,

Be it further resolved that, CFA supports a carefully constructed path to citizenship for our students and their families, and

Be it further resolved that, CFA reaffirms our support for fair comprehensive immigration reform now,

Be it further resolved that, the California Faculty Association will work with organized labor and community organizations and, wherever possible, will actively engage in voter registration campaigns and mobilization efforts on a local, state and national level directed at securing rights for immigrant students and their families.

Approved by the CFA Board of Directors, February 2013
CFA leader helped make the union a strong advocate for public higher education through tough economic times

By Alice Sunshine
Editor

At 5’11” tall, John Travis used to say he was not so large as people seemed to think. But those who met the former college football player and California labor leader knew he was a big man—in intellect, in abilities and at the union bargaining table.

The Humboldt State University political science professor and president of the California Faculty Association during some of the most contentious years in the California State University system, John Turner Travis, died February 6 after a battle with cancer. He was 68.

“With his calm demeanor and big heart, he somehow managed to keep us focused and united,” recalls Susan Meisenhelder, a CSU San Bernardino English professor who preceded him as CFA president. “When he started a meeting—as he invariably did—with that booming call to his ‘colleagues,’ we all knew it was time to get to work.”

Travis led CFA through years of deep funding cuts.

Those cuts led to loss of jobs and pay for the faculty while students were turned away or slammed with soaring tuition. Throughout Travis argued and organized to save the public university system and to defend the people who worked and learned in it.

Travis helped the faculty navigate the way to contract settlements over more than a decade, first as bargaining chair and then as president. In the 2006/2007 academic year, the union came within a few days of its first system-wide strike.
Along with a strong team of faculty leaders that included current CFA president Lillian Taiz, Travis led the organizing for university-wide protests that called for tuition rollbacks for students, fair pay for the faculty and other employees, and an end to rapidly rising university executive perks and pay.

“John was all about justice,” says Taiz. “He was incensed when people working with the former chancellor tried to take advantage of us by not bargaining fairly on our contract. And, he strongly believed it was not enough to be angry; we had to do something about it.”

Travis remained active in CFA as its political action committee chair until his illness intervened. “Just in the last few months, he was encouraged that he lived to see the beginnings of a positive change,” adds Taiz, referring to leadership and policy changes now underway in the CSU.

Travis was born June 2, 1944 and raised in Independence, Oregon, a small farm town that even today has only one stop light. As a child he was an altar boy at the local Episcopal Church.

His sister Jan Stapleton recalls that even in high school, “John was always a great one to have discussions, to challenge your mind all the time. He was adventurous. We were always into something and it was usually his idea.”

His father Guy, who died when John was 11, was a baker in the military during World War II and later became a local postman. His mother Marie worked for the telephone company.

“Education was John’s ticket in his life,” says his wife Beth Amen. “He never forgot that.”

Travis was a star offensive lineman on his high school football team that took the Oregon state championship in the 1960/61 school year. He won a football scholarship to Willamette University in Salem, Oregon where he studied political science.

“He took it all the way to Ph.D,” says Amen. “He always wanted to go to college. It was clear he would be an academic.”

Travis was a dedicated advocate for students. He wrote recommendations for dozens of students to get internships at the California state Capitol. When walking with him in the building, it was commonplace to hear aides greet him with “Hi Professor Travis.”

And he knew students had their own causes. During the 1990s one of his students became an old-growth redwood “tree-sitter” to protest logging of ancient trees.

“There was a big advocacy to stop clear cut by Maxxam Corp, the old Pacific Lumber,” recalls Chris Haynes, a friend and colleague at Humboldt State. “John hoisted a student’s exam up the tree because if the student had come down, he would have lost the tree. John took a lot of flack from the lumber company about why is a professor giving a test in a tree.”

Travis’ dedication to public service went beyond higher education. For many years he served on the Area One Board on Developmental Disabilities for northern California. He and Beth participated in dog rescue and adopted a number of dogs, especially boxers.

“We were lousy foster parents for the dogs because we ended up keeping them,” says Amen.

Travis loved catch-and-release fly fishing and he brought to the sport that same talent and focus as in his other endeavors. His favorite spots were Hat Creek in California, Henry’s Fork of the Snake River and Silver Creek in Idaho.
“He tied the flies, studied the area’s insects, and he caught some pretty big fish,” remembers Haynes. “The sport is catching the trout and like a lot of fishermen he also advocated for preservation of trout habitat.”

Amen, who went on many of the month-long fishing expeditions, recalls, “Fly fishing appealed to his intellect. He learned to make his own flies. When he cast it was beautiful, so graceful, it could bring tears to your eyes.”

On February 28, Assemblymember Wes Chesbro, a longtime friend of Travis, took to the floor of the California Assembly, spoke movingly about Travis’ life and career and adjourned the legislative day in his memory. His CFA colleagues at Humboldt State University hosted a memorial in Arcata on the same day. CFA will host a statewide memorial for him at its Delegate’s Assembly in April.

In addition to Beth Amen, John Travis is survived by his stepson Mark, sisters Jan Stapleton of Salem, Oregon; Judy Schroeder of Independence, Oregon; his brother Jim Travis of Boise, Idaho; and thousands of colleagues, students and friends who have benefitted from his endeavors.

Read remembrances of John Travis at www.calfac.org/tribute-john-travis

The family asks that in lieu of flowers or other gifts, contributions be made in John Travis’ name to the American Cancer Society. The web address for donations is www.cancer.org/involved/donate

Clockwise above: Travis with gubernatorial candidate Phil Angelides at a CFA Assembly, John Lloyd (History, Pomona) and Elizabeth Hoffman (English, Long Beach) at a rally, Travis addressing one of countless rallies for the CSU. Travis with George Diehr (Business, San Marcos) who sits on the CalPERS Board of Administration.

Page 20: John Travis often found himself surrounded by the news media as CFA fought for good contracts for the faculty and the CSU.

Page 21: (top) Travis administering an exam to an Old-Growth Redwood Tres Sitter in Humboldt County. (bottom) Travis chaired CFA’s Bargaining Team for many years through good and tough times.
CFA Welcomes New Staff

CFA is proud to welcome two new staff members to the union: General Manager Kristin Eldridge and Research Specialist Nancy Wiefek.

Eldridge started her career as a field organizer in electoral politics but quickly moved to the house of labor where she worked as a field organizer for SEIU, as Collective Bargaining Director at SEIU Local 721 and as Nursing Home Director/Interim External Organizing Director for SEIU-ULTCW.

Wiefek brings a wealth of experience in labor having worked for and with unions during most of her career. Her background includes a decade of experience conducting policy and survey research on the issues that affect the daily lives of CFA members including healthcare, pensions and education. She holds a Ph.D. in political science and her dissertation and book focuses on economic anxiety.

“We are very happy to have Kristin and Nancy join CFA,” says CFA President Lillian Taiz. “They both bring a strong knowledge of the labor community and valuable experience the issues that most impact our members.”

A Children’s Book for the 99%

Looking for a book for your child to explain what a union activist is? “A is for Activist” is an ABC board book for the next generation of progressives—families that want their kids to grow up unapologetic about activism, environmental justice, civil rights, LGBTQ rights and so on.

The book is written and illustrated by Innosanto Nagara who has beautified CFA’s magazines and promotional materials for years with his graphic design work.

Naomi Klein, author of the Shock Doctrine, called the book “full of wit, beauty, and fun!”

Learn more and find locations where you can buy the book at www.aisforactivist.com

Stay Informed & Protect Your Rights!

Follow CFA on Facebook
www.facebook.com/CaliforniaFacultyAssociation

Sign up for CFA Headlines, the weekly email newsletter: www.calfac.org/headlines

Protect Your rights!

JOIN Union,

Stay Informed
Become a CFA member today. It’s the smart thing to do.

Go to: calfac.org/join

Albert Einstein
Charter Member AFT Local 552
Princeton University