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THE MISSION & PURPOSE OF THE CALIFORNIA FACULTY ASSOCIATION

The California Faculty Association is the exclusive collective bargaining representative for the California State University faculty, including tenure-track faculty, Lecturers, Librarians, counselors and coaches. According to the CFA Bylaws, last revised April 2009...

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

a. To obtain explicit guarantees of academic freedom, tenure, and academic due process;
b. To create orderly and clear procedures for prompt consideration of problems and grievances;
c. To promote and protect the professional and economic interests of CFA and all bargaining unit members and,
d. To promote unity among academic employees and thereby enhance the effectiveness of the CFA in representing these employees.
Now that CFA members and the CSU Trustees have ratified the 2014-2017 contract for bargaining “Unit 3: Faculty,” it is important for each of us to understand what is in there, make sure it’s all implemented, and assist in completing the parts still to be determined.

About Ratification
The contract was ratified by CFA members overwhelmingly, about 9 to 1, with a large turnout. While that says there is great support for what we have accomplished, caution is needed.

The big vote was accomplished partially because we have reopeners on salary. That means—and it’s important for faculty members to get this—that we have only agreed on our raises, with some repairs to the broken salary structure, for the current year 2014/15. More on that below.

What Is In This Contract
See the accompanying box for the list of pay raises and salary adjustments available in the first year of the contract.

As explained below, we still must negotiate on raises in 2015/16 and in 2016/17.

There was recognition that excessive service, underfunded scholarship, excessive student contact, along with quality education, are things in the agreement that address real problems.

In the nearly 30 years I have been teaching in the CSU, this is the first time that CSU management has agreed that these are necessary issues to address if we are to provide a quality education to our students.

In addition, there are indirect things in this contract that will help with student-faculty relationships. There is progress in the areas of intellectual property, parental leave, sabbaticals and greening of the institution.

Here is a fast overview of what is in the contract based on your particular employment status. I urge you to go deeper by viewing the 2014-2017 contract page of the CFA web site where you can see the actual contract language and an FAQ with still more detail.

Senior Faculty
Those senior faculty who are lower paid, meaning they are below the Service Salary Increase (SSI) maximum, will receive Salary Recovery Adjustments of either 3% or up to the SSI max.

Senior faculty who are already paid above the SSI max, in addition to the General Salary Increase that goes to everyone, are eligible to apply for money in the pool on Workload & Service and remain eligible for funds and support from the Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Awards pool.

Lower-paid senior faculty also may be eligible for a system-wide Equity Pay program to address inversion and compression caused by hiring issues and lack of raises during the recession. It is based on a formula that considers both salary and job rank.

Lecturer Salary Corrections to fix misclassification of Lecturers who have languished in extremely low-paid salary ranges. This solution eliminates the lowest pay category for Lecturers.

A 1.6% General Salary Increase (GSI) for all faculty members.

Will the salary increases be retroactive?
A: Yes, they are retroactive to July 1, 2014.

See more FAQ on the CFA website at www.calfac.org/2014-2017-Contract
adjustment. When we get into reopener talks in May, we will work on compression issues for this group in years two and three.

Finally, the Faculty Early Retirement Program remains in place.

**Probationary Tenure-Line Faculty**

Like Senior Faculty, if you are below the SSI max, you will get an SRA of up to 3%. You may also be eligible for the system-wide Equity program and both the service and the workload pools in the RSCA.

Those hired in 2014/15 and 2015/16 also will have one course of reassigned time for each term during the first two years of your appointment. This will be time for you to establish your research agenda. Faculty hired in year 2016/17 will have one course release in their first year.

Your department should be compensated for this reassignment time for research to ensure that no workload increase is passed on to other faculty in the department.

**Lecturers**

Those who have a 3-year contract and are below the SSI max will receive an SRA of up to 3%.

The Lecturer L classification has been eliminated; this means if you have been in this range, you will be promoted to either Lecturer A or B depending on your academic qualifications.

Likewise some Lecturer A faculty who have been misclassified will be promoted to Lecturer B. (Check with your campus CFA chapter if you think you are eligible for promotion and have not heard anything about it.)

Each promotion entails a minimum 5% pay increase. Lecturers also are explicitly eligible for the RSCA pool and the CSU must notify by email every CSU Lecturer about this eligibility.

**Extension Faculty**

For the first time, CSU Extension Faculty can use and accrue some sick leave. The sides also agreed to further study of the terms and conditions, and to reopen negotiations on the topic of benefits for faculty working in Extension for Credit.

Librarians, Counselors & Coaches

There are some particulars that apply to each of these faculty jobs and these can be found on the CFA web site.

For some examples, see the article in this magazine about Librarian faculty by Kelly Janousek who serves on the CFA Bargaining Team.

An important highlight is that CFA and CSU management will work on classification changes that apply to Coaches. This means not just the proper status within the faculty, but the proper pay range as well.

**Everybody**

Everyone gets the 1.6% General Salary Increase. Everyone gets improved protections for your intellectual property.

Parental leave has been improved—now faculty can take up to a full term off for the birth or arrival of a child without having to use paid leave first, which used to put faculty at risk of going off payroll and losing benefits.

In the talks leading to this contract, we knew we needed to make at least some headway in fixing unfair hiring practices. During these talks we had an explicit recognition at the table that those who are primarily hired to be teaching faculty are an asset to the California State University, not a cost liability.

One would think that this would always have been understood—that teachers are a good thing, not a liability. Yet, it’s refreshing. This meant we didn’t have to fight over issues that we have successfully settled over the years, as we have in past talks.

Finally, we did not have to tolerate fear-mongering over our health care and retirement benefits. It is too common for some “thinkers” to behave as if we, and all working people who get sick or age, are a drag on society. The CSU management did not go in for this and worked to keep professional people in the CSU.

As we continue to improve the relationship—and we are continuing to work on improvement—we hope there will be better relationships between CSU management and CFA.

**GLOSSARY**

**FERP** = Faculty Early Retirement Program

**GSI** = General Salary Increase. Applies to all faculty.

**Progression** = The process by which a faculty member’s pay increases from the salary minimum to the SSI max within each salary range.

**Range** = The salary status that applies to each faculty member based on your rank and experience in the CSU system.

**Rank** = An academic status of a faculty member. Coach, Counselor, Librarian, and Lecturer, Full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor.

**RSCA** = Research, Scholarship & Creative Activity. There is a workload pool of Chancellor’s Office money (the RSCA pool) to which all faculty can apply for RSCA duties.

**SRA** = Salary Recovery Adjustment. A new salary program in the contract that applies to faculty who are paid below the SSI max in their salary range. This is not the same as an SSI, though it will be applied as one for purposes of Lecturer range elevation.

**SSI** = Service Salary Increase. These are salary adjustments to individual faculty. Those on the tenure-line can receive up to eight SSIs while in a particular rank. Temporary faculty are eligible for SSIs after earning 24 Weighted Teaching Units (36 in a quarter campus) of service credit in a department. SSIs are meant to adjust an individual’s salary up to the SSI maximum.

**SSI Max** = The top salary within a range which an individual’s normal salary progression can reach. The progression happens as individuals get SSIs, and other “within-range” increases such as an SRA.
We have a contract to implement; And, there’s more work to do to fix this broken salary structure

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

Dear Colleagues,

As we began the latest contract fight, the message was loud and clear from all of you on the campuses. That message was that our goal should be to remedy problems that had been created by seven long years of recession and administrative decisions that had left too many hardworking faculty languishing economically.

Second only to salary issues was the conviction that we must try to address the staggering increase in workload that has been taking a terrible toll on all of us.

As we prepared for negotiations by looking closely at all faculty salaries, we were shocked by the magnitude of the problems—in addition to across-the-board stagnation created by the total lack of salary increases, we identified inversion, compression and misclassification as endemic problems in what can only be called a broken salary structure.

It was clear to us that problems of this magnitude would take more than one year and probably more than one contract to fix completely.

The settlement we reached gets some money into the hands of faculty quickly and takes on one set of egregious problems in the first year.

Many of our colleagues who have struggled to live in our state on wages that literally rivaled those of fast food workers will find their lives improved.

The settlement also provides for reopeners on salary in the second and third years of the contract while preserving the faculty’s most potent economic weapon—the right to strike if we cannot reach agreement on a suitable salary increase at the bargaining table.

Still, despite some noticeable improvements in the bargaining process—a new workload initiative that is a historic first attempt at a concrete remedy for this vexing problem, and some improvements in important issues like sabbaticals, parental leave, intellectual property and more—all is far from well with faculty in the CSU.

Though the ink is barely dry on the new agreement, the truth is that we must all be preparing ourselves for the work ahead of us in May—returning to the bargaining table to demand that the administration fix our broken salary structure and ensure that all of our faculty make a fair wage.

I sent this message to the CSU Board of Trustees in November. Even as they ratified the agreement, they needed to understand that the discussion is far from over.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 6

“That campus Equity Pay programs happen is obviously important to whether faculty feel they have been dealt with fairly. So is the implementation of these programs—they must be true Equity Pay programs that faculty see as even-handed and equitably applied.”

CFA President Lillian Taiz visited Dr. Richard Pan, newly elected state senator, on “swearing-in” day for members of the state legislature at the State Capitol in December.
And possibly, negotiations will be smoother when they start up in the spring.

What Is Still on Our Plate?
We—the CFA Bargaining Team with your support—still need to negotiate the raises for the next two years. Those talks, called reopening bargaining because they reopen certain pre-determined parts of the contract, start in May.

This turns out to be the better play, because if we settled for the paltry pool of money the Chancellor offered late last year, we would be stuck with related paltry raises for at least two more years.

Fixing a dysfunctional salary system, engaging the poor priorities on some of the campuses, and tackling the underfunding of the CSU system by the state—it’s a work in progress. We’re not finished yet and there are still some crucial base hits to make.

There are two other important topics still to be addressed.

One is benefits for our colleagues who teach in Extension. Ironically, the classes that cost students the most often pay faculty the least—in dollars and in benefits like health care and retirement. This contract already entails sick time for them for the first time. The CSU needs to do better.

Campus-Based Equity Pay
The wide-ranging, complex topic that remains is campus-based Equity Pay, which is, at this moment, a program alongside system-wide Equity Pay. As you can read about elsewhere in this magazine, the contract provides campus presidents an opportunity to improve the salary conditions of the faculty by implementing Article 31.12 to establish a campus-based Equity Pay program before we commence bargaining over salary reopeners.

For example, and those of you dealing with this know just how infuriating it is, we have newly hired faculty at lower ranks making more money than long-term faculty at higher ranks. How does it happen? CSU managers, not the recently hired faculty, created this infuriating problem; they need to fix it.

Every campus CFA chapter is now working on a plan to get the appropriate campus-based Equity Pay program moving.

What happens in the coming months on implementing campus equity and reopening bargaining on salaries for years two and three will be critical in either reversing or cementing these sentiments.

That campus equity programs happen is obviously important to whether faculty feel they have been dealt with fairly. So is the implementation of these programs—they must be true “equity” programs that faculty see as even-handed and equitably applied.

The way in which other provisions are implemented will matter as well.

For example, faculty will be watching what presidents do with promotions. Do they use the tools—and the discretion—the contract provides them to correct problems when they arise? Or do they turn a blind eye and do the minimum that the contract requires?

I concluded my remarks to them by underscoring the reality that the agreement CFA members and the administration have just ratified is best seen not as the end of a process, but merely as the beginning.

For the CSU and the faculty to move forward, we must see it as only a first concrete move toward restoring faculty morale and rebuilding the salary and working conditions that must exist in the kind of CSU we all hope for.

Let me assure you, as I assured the Chancellor and Trustees, that statewide

On some campuses, the campus presidents and their retinues are willing to do the right thing and are making moves already. On other campuses, the presidents are failing to act. The faculty will provide the push.

And let me say, no matter what campus you are on and what kind of president your campus enjoys, we all benefit when a campus president does the right thing with the money that every one of them has available to them to hire and promote. We all benefit because the more these problems are solved locally, without money from the Chancellor’s Office, the more money system-wide is available to solve system-wide problems.

Let me conclude by praising the CFA Bargaining Team.

It is not easy to work the intense, often frustrating detail of contract talks into a teaching and scholarship schedule. It takes patience and a real commitment to care about people other than yourself.

I will never forget how important you, the Team, are to the faculty—and to our students, who after all, will be the people who carry it on into a future that we cannot even imagine today.
The benefits for Senior CSU Faculty are obvious

By Cecil Canton, Criminal Justice, Sacramento Member, CFA Bargaining Team

Our new collective bargaining agreement has obvious benefits for senior faculty. Most obvious is the maintenance of the Faculty Early Retirement Program. This is a very popular program that allows faculty to make a deliberate and controlled transition toward retirement.

But there are other benefits not as obvious as FERP.

Because our Bargaining Team chose to operate under the premise that, “a rising tide lifts all boats,” this contract begins the process of lifting our lowest-paid faculty—“the least among us”—toward financial and economic solvency.

This contract also manifests the evidence that our long broken and dysfunctional salary structure and system, rampant with inversion and compression problems, is finally being recognized as a problem by the CSU:

- In the first year, the contract sets in place Salary Recovery Adjustments for those faculty who are below the Service Salary Increase (SSI) maximum. This 3% increase applies to:
  - All tenure-track faculty, probationary and tenured, whose pay is under the SSI max,
  - Temporary faculty with 3-year appointments, and
  - Coaches with 6 or more years service in the same classification.

- The contract provides a 1.6% General Salary Increase (GSI), that is retroactive to July 1, 2014, for all faculty, including our most senior FERP faculty.

- This agreement contains a system-wide Equity Pay program funded with $2 million that is designed to address those probationary and tenured faculty who have been severely affected by the lack of raises.

- In addition to the system-wide Equity Pay, the contract also contains language that encourages campus presidents to enact separate, campus-based Equity Pay programs to continue the necessary process of addressing our broken salary structure.

- In years two and three of this agreement, because the CSU management was unwilling to offer more than 2% compensation pools, there is a provision to reopen the contract for salary negotiations. If we are unable to agree on an adequate salary package over the next two years, faculty retain the right to take job actions up to and including a strike.

These negotiated provisions will help to address the deficiencies caused by our problematic salary structure.

It goes without saying that our future retirement is dependent upon the present and future contributions of those that follow us.

Raising the salary of those junior tenure-track and contingent non-tenure-track faculty will better allow our retirement system to sustain senior faculty retirement benefits, as well as those of future retirees.

D.D. Wills, chair of the CFA Chapter at Cal Poly Pomona, welcomed faculty attending a Bargaining Information meeting on campus during the contract campaign.
One of the key components of the new collective bargaining agreement on salary (Article 31 of the faculty contract) is the opportunity for campus presidents to implement a campus-based Equity Pay program.

Such programs are intended to alleviate pay inequalities known as salary inversion and salary compression which have plagued faculty for many years.

The relevant contract language reads:

31.12 Presidents may make additional awards which, if issued, must address campus equity issues, including but not limited to inversion and compression.

The President shall consult with representatives of the campus CFA chapter in developing the procedures and criteria to be used in determining the distribution of such equity awards.

While not all departments and/or programs may be affected, the distribution of awards must use criteria that are developed based upon a campus-wide review of salary issues.

These awards are distinct from Market Increases set out separately in Article 31.25.

Salary inversion and compression have occurred in the CSU system for several related reasons.

The CSU must compete nationally for the best new hires, so starting salaries have increased based on the larger market. Sadly, because Service Salary Increases (SSIs) have been paid so inconsistently over the last 12 years, many faculty at the CSU have been unable to realize salary progression in their ranks or ranges. This has caused new hires to be paid more than (or close to) the salary of experienced faculty who have been on campus for many years. This is known as salary inversion (or compression).

Inversion can happen at any level of pay regardless of whether you are above or below the SSI max in your rank. A department may hire in new faculty at even higher starting salaries and the faculty already there may experience inversion or compression.

Salary compression occurs due to a lack of in-range progression because at the time of promotion, tenure-line faculty must get a minimum 7.5% raise or be moved to the minimum salary in the next rank.

This has caused many faculty to be clustered together at or near the bottom of the salary range, especially senior faculty in the highest range. They are all there at roughly the same pay despite differences in years of service—sometimes a decade or more of difference. This is known as salary compression.

Compression, then, means that wherever your pay lands after your last promotion through the ranks, that is likely to be where you will remain for many years. As people behind you also promote, experienced faculty will be paid the same as growing numbers of younger faculty moving up.

Add to this pile or problems, there are cases in which the administrators doing the hiring over the years “low-balled” new faculty at the time of hire. This has gone on generally on some campuses (and in some colleges), and it has happened specifically, in some cases by race or gender.

Outside of the tenure-line, Lecturers depend on steady payment of SSIs in order to gain eligibility for range elevation and the attendant pay increases. Lack of SSIs also has caused compression and, in some cases, inversion for Lecturers.

Based on the language in contract Section 31.12 and in consultation with local administrators, campus CFA leaders will be tasked with working to develop and oversee Equity Pay programs.
Pay programs to fix these problems.

As noted in the contract language, these Equity Pay programs are distinct from increases for market differences and must treat similarly situated faculty in similar ways, so management cannot discriminate or play favorites with the program.

Since a campus-based Equity Pay program is to be developed locally to address the particular problems on each campus, the programs may vary from one campus to another in size of award or criteria for distribution.

The programs may be designed to adjust salaries based on a standardized benchmark or they can be based on year of hire or year of promotion. They might also attempt to make a valuation of each year of service a faculty member has performed and use a percentage adjustment per year of service.

Additionally, such a program might count the number of missed SSIs that a faculty member should have gotten in recent years.

The programs might use a combination of the above designs or another novel approach.

The amount of awards will depend on how much money a campus president is willing to commit to it. On some campuses this may be just a few hundred thousand dollars. On other campuses where the problems are more severe, the cost may be multiple millions of dollars.

Please contact your campus CFA chapter to find out how you can help to make the Equity Pay program successful on your campus.

At Chico State, we are working with our campus president to move forward with a comprehensive Equity Pay program.

President Paul Zingg was enthusiastic about developing an equity program under the previous contract, so we worked closely with his office to develop some useful parameters to address inversion and compression issues and to estimate the costs of such a program.

Although those plans fell through, they have provided a solid starting point for a renewed effort under the new contract.

Some of the specific problems that Chico faces (which may be similar to issues on your campus) include very low average salaries, especially at the assistant and associate levels, as well as severe inversions due to many years with little or no raises.

This has put our incumbent faculty well behind the curve for market salaries. In fact, the average newly tenured associate professor salary on our campus is lower than the average starting salaries of our assistant professors.

We know that correcting these inequities will require a serious commitment of campus-based dollars, so we have been proactive in requesting budget information that allows us to help the campus administration find the needed resources.

It will be a complex process to work through all of the details of a comprehensive Equity Pay program with the president’s office, but we are thankful the new contract provides this opportunity to consult on a campus-based program and optimistic that the result will be a better, fairer salary structure for all our faculty.
The Contract and Librarians

By Kelly Janousek
Librarian, Long Beach
CFA Bargaining Team Member

I have the honor of representing the Librarians on the CFA Bargaining Team for the 2014-2017 contract. I thank many of you who reached out to me as the bargaining process took place and provided me articles in the contract that just do not work for Librarians.

This was my first time in bargaining and it was interesting to hear the history of the contract and how Librarians were finally added.

The first change was how Librarians have been listed in the contract — “Librarian Employees” — which does not embody the faculty status ideal. This has been changed in the new contract to “Library Faculty Unit Employees” like “Counselor Faculty Unit Employees.” Hopefully, this will stop the punching-a-clock mentality that has existed on some campuses.

To further the ideal of identifying us as faculty members, contract Articles 20.13 & 20.14 allow Librarians flexibility to schedule work in an electronic world. They state:

20.13 The affected librarian or counselor faculty unit employee may request a particular work schedule, specifying times and locations in which work is to be performed. All such schedules shall be subject to approval by the appropriate administrator.

20.14 A librarian or counselor faculty unit employee shall normally be required to be on campus on his/her workdays as defined by his/her work year or work schedule pursuant to 20.13.

This correlates with the rest of Faculty (Instructional) Unit Employees that Articles 20.1.c and 20.3.B recognize their duties may be done online and established what should be counted in workload.

I am sorry to say management would not forgo “approval by administrator” in this section.

However, I want to point out that those Librarians that are hired as “Lecturers,” now called “Temporary Faculty Unit Employees,” will see several article changes:

◆ Requests to be placed in the appropriate temporary faculty unit employee level will be honored. That is, no longer will there be a Lecturer L. Those with a Master’s degree will be in either the A or B range;
◆ A small change in the arrangement for preference for work has been made; and
◆ Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA) fund pools are available to temporary faculty unit employees who apply.

Those who are new to our CSU ranks will find Article 20.36: “Reduction in Instructional Assignments for New Probationary” to be helpful. Article 20.36 allows time release for new library faculty to allow them to get their research and scholarly activity started in the first two years and it can be banked with administration approval.

Some campuses like Long Beach have had this in place for several years, so if your campus needs helpful hints on implementation just ask.

Those of us who have been here for a while and who are being denied sabbatical, see Article 27.8. If you are denied a sabbatical because of campus program needs or campus budget implications, you cannot be denied the following year for the same reason or reasons.

Finally, there is Article 31: Salary, the question asked by everyone.

Remember when you look at the data on the CFA website for salary SS1 max, Librarian Faculty Employees work either 10-month or 12-month schedules and that makes a difference as to which side of the sheet you review.

COUNSELORS & COACHES

There are gains in the 2014-2017 contract for Counselors and Coaches, too. See the “2014-2017 Contract” page on the CFA website to learn more.


Faculty at Chico State met to hear details about contract negotiations last fall.
We are all Faculty;
RSCA awards now serve all

By Jonathan Karpf
Anthropology, San Jose
CFA Associate VP-Lecturers North
Member, CFA Bargaining Team

One of the many positive elements for Lecturer faculty in the new collective bargaining agreement (also called the CBA or “contract”) that was recently ratified has to do with Professional Development which is addressed in contract Article 25.

This new contract language consists of only two sentences—but with a single, particularly important word in the first sentence and two such words in the second sentence, boldfaced and capitalized below.

The new 25.6 reads:

ALL faculty unit employees are eligible to apply for and receive the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA) Awards funded by the Chancellor’s Office. Campus administrators SHALL send email notification to ALL faculty unit employees informing them of eligibility and application procedures every year that RSCA is funded.

And with those three words, Lecturers are treated as a part of the CSU faculty.

We all know Lecturers who are as professionally active as tenure-line faculty, engaging in active research and artistic endeavors and presenting papers at professional conferences and other venues.

But until now, many Lecturers were either never notified of these RSCA funds, never apprised of the application procedures and deadlines, or were told that these Chancellor’s Office awards were not open to Lecturers.

The CFA Bargaining Team has been unified in the belief that all members of the bargaining unit are faculty, and that fully engaging all faculty in all aspects of the university benefits students, benefits the university, and benefits society at large.

Toward that end, this two-sentence addition to Article 25 will ensure that:

1) Lecturers will be apprised of the availability of RSCA awards
2) Lecturers will be apprised of all procedures and deadlines for applying for such funds
3) Going forward, deserving Lecturers cannot be denied such awards simply based on our faculty status as “temporary” faculty unit employees

An injury to one is an injury to all, and a victory for one is a victory for all.

Even if you personally are not in a position to apply for RSCA funding, the fact that fellow faculty who work as Lecturers will now be able to do so is a positive change from previous contract language.

Throughout 2014, faculty members from all over California went to CSU Trustees meetings to speak out about teaching conditions on the campuses. Lecturer Patricia Donze told them about the low pay and limited support she has encountered since coming to teach at CSU Dominguez Hills.

LEARN MORE
This is just one of a wide range of changes to the the 2014-2017 Faculty contract that are important to Lecturers. Learn about more on the CFA web site at:
Contract: www.calfac.org/contract
Lecturers Council: www.calfac.org/Lecturers
Workload provisions break new ground in our contract

By Charles Toombs, Africana Studies, San Diego
CFA Associate VP-South
Member, CFA Bargaining Team

The new collective bargaining agreement (CBA) offers a number of bright spots in Article 20: Workload.

These additions to the workload article include important faculty issues previously not addressed in the CBA, and speak to some of the workload issues faculty members wanted in the new contract.

Article 20.36: “Reduction in Instructional Assignments for New Probationary Faculty,” provides CSU system-wide workload relief for new probationary faculty and establishes required minimum amounts of reductions in instructional assignments during the first two years of a faculty member’s probationary period.

Campuses may further reduce instructional assignments. Article 20.36 is important because significant variability existed from campus to campus in the amount of reduction in instructional assignments new faculty members received in support of professional development activities to help them meet requirements for retention, tenure, and promotion.

Article 20.36(i) and 20.36(ii) specify the details and amounts of reductions in instructional assignments.

“Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students,” Article 20.37 is another important addition to the contract’s workload provisions. This is a major achievement, a recognition by the CSU that some faculty are providing exceptional levels of service to students but are not receiving workload relief for this effort.

Although the amount of system-wide money awarded to this program (“a pool of $1.3 million, allocated based on campus full-time equivalent students”) is modest, its inclusion in the CBA is groundbreaking.

Faculty members have, over the years, told CFA and the CSU that many of them go well beyond their required faculty duties in providing service to help students succeed. Many areas of exceptional service that support student success, including faculty working in small departments, are in 20.37.

Of particular note is that assigned time from this pool of money may be awarded for exceptional service (“student mentoring, advising and outreach”) in activities that “support underserved, first generation, and/or underrepresented students.”

As the CSU student population has become increasingly diverse, faculty members, some of them underrepresented themselves, have been providing exceptional levels of support in helping these students to succeed.

For such faculty, these student service commitments and activities can impact their professional development activities. In other words, they are culturally taxed (see Dr. Cecil Canton’s article on cultural taxation in California Faculty magazine Fall 2013 on the CFA website).

That the CSU recognizes this particular exceptional service work and includes it in the CBA is an accomplishment of the CFA Bargaining Team and of faculty throughout the CSU who have provided narratives and details, in many forums (CSU Board of Trustees, Legislative Committees and others), of their actual workload experiences serving the above-mentioned students.

In addition to addressing cultural taxation, Article 20.37 provides assigned time from the pool for “development and implementation of high impact educational practices; curricular redesign intended to improve student access and success; service to the department, college, university, or community that goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of all faculty; assignment to courses where increases to enrollment have demonstrably increased workload; and other extraordinary forms of service to students.”

Faculty will be able to apply for assigned time from this pool and faculty governance (rather than the administration) shall develop criteria and procedures for the use of the funds and evaluation of applications.

2014-2017 CONTRACT
A Journey into Change: An Unconscious Bias Workshop

By Audrena Redmond
CFA Staff, Council for Affirmative Action

This fall marked the campus presentation kickoff of the CFA Council for Affirmative Action’s “A Journey Into Change”: An Unconscious Bias Workshop.

The workshop was developed over two years by a CAA task force to help faculty and administrators become aware of unconscious biases, preferences, and micro-aggressions that interfere with the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty.

This four-hour workshop was created with every CSU campus in mind, and it places a particular emphasis on hiring, evaluation and retention practices.

“A Journey Into Change” is different from other campus workshops to which it might be compared because it is not focused on liability and how to avoid legal pitfalls. Rather, a key goal is to transform the individual to affect change through personal understanding of oneself and as an active participant on campus and in the CSU system.

This goal sets the workshop apart from others that members of the campus community may have experienced.

Five campuses hosted the workshop this inaugural semester—Fresno, Monterey Bay, Sonoma, East Bay and San Marcos. Campus diversity officers participated at Monterey Bay and East Bay and at San Marcos the campus diversity office co-sponsored.

The workshops were well attended by participants who had taken implicit association tests before coming as strongly requested. The evaluations reflect that these also were well received. In fact, many participants remarked to the trainers that the time went by quickly, they were engaged, and they hoped the workshop would be repeated.

The host campuses have reported that the workshop provided an opportunity for team building among the chapter’s elected leaders and activists, and greater understanding among faculty and with campus diversity officers, where they participated.

In the coming weeks, workshop participants will receive a copy of their action plans developed in the second half of the workshop. And some will come together to discuss the steps they are taking as transformed faculty and colleagues.

With a successful inaugural fall behind us, the CAA looks forward to the spring schedule, which is filling up quickly. Those interested should contact Angela McIntosh amcintosh@calfac.org and myself aremond@calfac.org

Thanks to the host campus CAA representatives John Beynon (FR), George Station (MB), Erma Jena Sims (SO), Nick Baham (EB) and Sharon Elise (SM); to workshop trainers Cecil Canton, Ted Scott-Femenella, Chris Cox, Theresa Montaño, José Cintrón, Jeff Tan, Mernie Aste and Nena Torrez; and to CFA staff assigned to CAA Maureen Loughran along with myself.

To learn more about the CFA Council for Affirmative Action and the “A Journey into Change” workshop please visit www.calfac.org/post/journey-change

The first Unconscious Bias Workshop to be held on a CSU campus was at Fresno State last fall. In this photo, Ted Scott-Femenella, a Lecturer in Social Work at Sacramento State who traveled to Fresno to participate in the launch, spoke to the faculty in attendance.
Issues before the Academic Senate, CSU

By Steven Filling
Accounting, Stanislaus
Chair, Academic Senate CSU

California Faculty Association’s Board of Directors and the Academic Senate, CSU exchange reports at our respective meetings. Here are some important topics as of late 2014:

Reducing the required units for programs

In 2013, the CSU Trustees set the minimum number of units for a bachelor’s degree at 120 semester or 180 quarter units. Now it says the maximum also is 120 or 180. Requiring more units means getting an exemption from the Chancellor’s Office.

Historically, some CSU programs such as engineering, accounting and music have required more than 120.

The Trustees have instructed campuses to review all programs above 120 and reduce them or request an exception. One way to do that is to waive GE requirements.

For example, Long Beach engineering requested students not be required to take critical thinking. Fullerton engineering seeks to reduce GE by 9 units—three courses.

GE is important to a student’s education. Whittling away at it, saying we don’t need a course in critical thinking or such, impoverishes our students’ education and undermines the notion of what is an “educated person.”

The Trustees initiated the reduction because they believe it will speed time to graduation and allow more students to attend the CSU. Obviously, we would like to live up to the CSU’s mission to provide post-secondary education and allow more students to attend the CSU.

Obviously, we would like to live up to the CSU’s mission to provide post-secondary education and allow more students to attend the CSU.

To do that, we must acknowledge the realities of our students existence—faster works for some, not for others. Many of our students work and have family responsibilities. How can we help them get a college degree, too?

ASCSU adopted a resolution last year that says we understand the need to streamline programs and that the curriculum is a faculty issue. Some programs are not suited to the lower unit requirement.

Also, ASCSU is actively pursuing the process by which programs get exemptions. There doesn’t seem to be a well-defined process system-wide.

Accountability Measures

The CSU is mandated by the state legislature to report on 16 measures. These include 4- and 6-year graduations rate, the achievement gap (the difference between graduation of at-risk populations and the general population), and the persistence rate (the rate at which freshman progress to becoming sophomores).

The ASCSU passed a statement asking the Trustees to include an expression of concern to the legislature about the measures that were chosen.

The 4-year graduation rate, for example, measures little about CSU students’ lives. Few graduate in four years because their lives are too busy for 15 units every term. There appears to be a lack of understanding for this.

The ASCSU also asked the Trustees to convene a task force of faculty and administration to devise more appropriate measures. And, the measures report needs context, such as the availability or lack of funding to address the concerns.

Student Success Fees

The Trustees heard an information update from the Student Success Fee Task Force, formed earlier in 2014 after the governor’s budget language included a moratorium on tuition and fee increases.

The Task Force was composed of two presidents from campuses with these fees and two Trustees, one of whom is the student Trustee. Despite the ASCSU’s request to include faculty, none were.

The report included a stipulation that these fees must be the product of some form of “alternative consultation” with students that was not putting it to a vote on campus.

Students have debated whether the alternative consultation has been more or less inclusive. And there is division over whether the fees are the best way to meet the CSU’s financial challenges.

The Academic Conference

This annual event until the last budget decline was resurrected in November. Trustees, faculty and administrators gathered for workshops and talks to build a working relationship. It was contracted to the Hilton Long Beach, but because it is being boycotted, the event moved to the Chancellor’s Office.

An interesting workshop clearly evoked how income trumps educational preparation. Only 33% of students in the lowest income quintile, even when they are in the best segment academically and took AP classes, are likely to complete a degree. Yet, students with poor academic records but higher incomes are likely to complete at the same rate of 33%.
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AB 2610 (Williams): Definition of supplanting

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

According to state law, self-supporting courses shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a non-self-supporting basis during the regular academic year. However, in December 2013, the California State Auditor's Office released an audit of the policies, procedures, fee structures, revenues and reserve balances within the CSU Extended Education program and found it to be unclear whether supplanting of state-supported courses occurred.

The State Auditor's office recommended adding clarifying language to the Education Code, specifically a definition of the term “supplant” and a description of how the CSU should measure whether supplanting is occurring. AB 2513 would have done just that, by providing a clarifying definition of the term “supplant” and requiring annual measures by the CSU and CCC to ensure state-sponsored course offerings are not supplants.

After substantial amendments, the contents of AB 2153 were moved into another bill, AB 2610, which was later held in the Senate Appropriations Committee without a vote.

AB 46 (Pan): Student data

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

In January 2013, San Jose State and Udacity, a Massively Open Online Course (MOOC) provider, made a Contract to develop a pilot program called San Jose State Plus, offering college credit to SJSU and non-SJSU students. The pilot was to study questions about online learning including MOOCs. San Jose faculty created and taught the courses in collaboration with Udacity.

After the first semester of the pilot, the results were leaked and the public became aware of the dismal pass rate of all the students enrolled in the courses. A short time later, SJSU announced suspension of the program.

The Academic Senate, CSU requested student data from Udacity, since a condition of the Contract was to provide ASCSU with access to information. Udacity hesitated, and it wasn't until a public records request was filed that the ASCSU got any student data; however, the data provided by Udacity did not include all the information requested.

In light of this, AB 46 would have required the Trustees to make student academic information available, on paper and in electronic form, to the ASCSU on request. Although this measure enjoyed strong bipartisan support, it was vetoed by the Governor.

Online Education

Several short points:

Research continues to indicate strongly that online education works for some people but not everyone.

The ASCSU has been unable to get data on success or completion rates for students taking online courses from other than-their-own campus. The registration has been problematic, in part because staff must do cross-campus registration by hand; the computer systems are not yet tweaked for it. So far, there is nothing to indicate this moves students to graduation more quickly.

Cal State Online has become “the portal” to all things online in the CSU. It no longer aims to offer its own classes through the Pearson for-profit platform.

How students pay for online classes remains problematic. While the CSU charges more for them, they are not covered by financial aid. We need to learn how this impacts the populations the CSU seeks to service, particularly those most at risk of not making it to a degree.

Education is a humanistic enterprise. When we talk about efficiency and effectiveness, we still need to remember our students are humans and not widgets.
The CSU Trustees’ 2015/16 budget request presses the governor to up his numbers

Though the governor’s signature on the state’s 2014/15 budget was barely dry, CSU number crunchers were already back at work last fall on a 2015/16 fiscal year draft budget for the CSU Trustees annual budget request-o-rama each November.

The CSU’s budget proposal started out as an information item at the September 2014 Trustees meeting. It was adopted by them in November with some amount of debate and worry, especially over how the governor wants to account for capital outlays like building repairs.

The CSU budget request went to the governor to be worked into the state budget plan that customarily is announced in early January, and which was still to be announced as this magazine went to press. (See the CFA website for updates.)

The Trustees’ budget request for the CSU calls for nearly twice as much in additional funding as Gov. Brown had slated for the system when he laid out his four-year, $511 million supplemental funding plan that began in 2013/14.

Specifically, the CSU’s request for the coming fiscal year is an increase of $216.6 million from the state, an amount well above the $119.5 million the governor has indicated he will allocate.

To get a sense of comparison, for the current 2014/15 budget cycle, the CSU Trustees requested $237.6 million in new state funding—the CSU actually received $142.2 million.

CSU budget revenues are split: half coming from the state’s General Fund and the other half from tuition. Student fees have been frozen through the 2016–17 budget year, and university officials assert that some 20,000 students have been turned away from the CSU every fall between 2010 to 2013 due to fiscal constraints.

The Trustees’ proposal, which would set the CSU’s annual spending at $4.7 billion, includes $103 million for about 10,000 more students—a 3 percent increase—and accommodates demand from current students for more, badly needed course offerings.
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Weber to chair Assembly Budget Committee

California state Assemblymember Shirley Weber, San Diego State faculty and a member of CFA, has been named chair of the Assembly Budget Committee.

The committee studies and holds public hearings on the California state budget proposed by the governor.

“The CFA San Diego State Chapter is pleased with the excellent leadership Dr. Weber has demonstrated since being elected to the California Assembly,” said Charles Toombs, CFA Associate VP South.

Toombs added, “In her new role, she will be one of the most influential members of the Assembly and will bring to her work a tremendous knowledge of and expertise in higher education issues in California.”

Charles Toombs, left, and Shirley Weber, right, at the 2014 CFA Equity Conference in Los Angeles.
The California State Budget & our contract: 2015 and beyond

In order to achieve an agreement with management late last year, CFA ratified a three-year contract—but it was specified that both sides agree to reopen Article 31 (Salary) this coming May and again in May 2016 to negotiate further salary increases in years two and three of the contract.

CFA went with this approach because the Chancellor would not agree to what we on the CFA Bargaining Team felt would be adequate funds devoted to salary increases in those “out” years. He held firm that the budget for each year must be in place prior to agreement in contract talks.

Faculty have suffered from stagnant wages for six years, and we have labored under a broken salary structure that created salary inversion and compression. The contract for 2014-15 provides some corrective measures to address our broken salary system, including re-classification of Lecturers, a statewide Equity Pay program, and the ability for campus-based equity programs to fix inversion and compression.

In the out years, we will have to work with CSU management to persuade the State Legislature and the Governor’s office to augment the CSU budget in an amount sufficient to address stagnating salaries.

In November, State Controller John Chiang released his monthly report covering California’s cash balance, receipts, and disbursements in October 2014. It was encouraging.

Total revenues in the fourth month of Fiscal Year 2014-15 were $6 billion, coming in above the Budget Act’s estimates by $662.2 million, or 12.3 percent. For the fiscal year as of his report (July 1-October 31), total revenues reached $27.9 billion, beating estimates by $1.2 billion, or 4.5 percent.

“Four months into the fiscal year, California’s coffers overflow by $1.2 billion. The news comes on the heels of two other positive developments: the vote to strengthen California’s rainy-day fund through Proposition 2, and the credit upgrade that followed one day later,” Chiang said.

He added, “To further boost California’s credit worthiness and sustain prosperity on a long-term basis, we must next tackle the growing $64 billion unfunded liability stemming from providing health benefits to our retired public workforce. To not only protect taxpayers, but also the retirement security promised to our firefighters, teachers, and other providers of critical public services, we can no longer deny, delay, or equivocate.”

Controller (now Treasurer) Chiang is quite right that we can no longer deny or delay what is due to public sector workers, including the faculty of the CSU system.

Budget surpluses are projected to continue growing, with the possibility of doubling
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In an election to fill the post, state workers elected Theresa Taylor, an employee of the Franchise Tax Board who is a leader in SEIU Local 1000. She was endorsed by CFA.

CFA President Lillian Taiz congratulated Diehr saying, “George has served the faculty in the CSU, public workers in our state, and the people of California well. He labored during very tough economic times. It has been important given CalPERS size and influence not only on our standard of living but on public policy regarding workers’ retirement and health care everywhere.”

Taylor brings extensive financial experience to the job. She will serve a four-year term beginning on January 16, 2015.

“I am truly honored by the support I received from state employees,” Taylor said. “I greatly appreciated the support of the California Faculty Association and enjoyed meeting with CFA members. I am ready to serve and pledge to protect the health care and retirement security of all CalPERS members.”

San Marcos prof retires from CalPERS Board; CFA-endorsed Taylor elected to seat

George Diehr, a San Marcos business professor who represented state employees on the CalPERS Board of Administration for 12 years, retired this fall.

In an election to fill the post, state workers elected Theresa Taylor, an employee of the Franchise Tax Board who is a leader in SEIU Local 1000. She was endorsed by CFA.

The first wave of students affected by this lack of parity in funding between CSU on one hand and California Community Colleges and K-12 on the other will be in 2015/16—not far away from now.

The CSU also will continue to compete with other essential state programs for its funding demands.

The governor has already cited California’s unprecedented drought and firefighting needs in vetoing an extra $100 million in funding the Legislature attempted to allocate to the CSU and UC in an end-of-session budget bill last August.

University officials also warned that the governor could siphon in excess of $300 million from the state’s $1.1 billion reserve to address prison overcrowding and associated court mandates.

by the time the reopener talks on salary in our contract begin in May 2015. A budget surplus of some $2.4 billion could provide much-needed relief to the faculty.

Our challenge will be to coax elected officials to release some of this money to supplement the Governor’s proposed 4 percent budget augmentation to the CSU for fiscal year 2015.

And, the fight will continue as we must then convince the Chancellor to direct an adequate amount of the increased funds to address faculty salary stagnation.

We will need your help to lobby State Legislators both in Sacramento and in their local District Offices during CFA Lobby Days in early March. Please contact your local CFA chapter leaders or email me at kwehr@calfac.org to find out how you can help win fair salary increases for faculty.
Quality online teaching: Experimenting with what can really work in an unexpected discipline

By Leslie Bryan
Theatre Arts & Liberal Studies Depts, CSU San Bernardino
CFA Vice-President of Lecturers, South

In spring 2012, I had the opportunity to teach a modern dance class for the Theatre Arts Department at CSU San Bernardino. It had been several years since I taught this course using the “tried and true” method that focuses on genre-specific technique, historical context and the creative processes.

Given the push for online technology in higher education, I knew I wanted to expand my instruction beyond the traditional teaching methodologies for dance.

As a dance educator for The California Arts Project (TCAP) I have been part of a recurring conversation among arts educators about the need to incorporate technology when teaching the Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA). This requirement is also part of the VAPA framework that outlines the pedagogy of arts educators in public school.

One of the standard requirements of a university level dance class is to have students research specific dancers and/or choreographers, and then present their findings in an essay and/or class presentation. Part of the course is spent viewing the works of specific choreographers/dancers and discussing their works during class.

These methods involve a considerable amount of class time, which leaves less time to focus on dance technique and skills. On a 10-week quarter campus, these types of projects can absorb a lot of time that should be spent on the physical experiences of the specific dance form.

I have had conversations with staff from the Office of Distributed Learning (ODL) as to how I could move my classes to the online format. When I was first approached with this idea I thought it was ridiculous. How was I going to teach dance online?

Would I be in a video room with a camera that was live-streaming all of my movements and comments? Were the students filming their own dance movements and then uploading the videos for me to view? Would I lose the quality and integrity of the material or cheapen the student experience by moving to online?

Although some students would jump at this opportunity, others would cringe and how would I keep them engaged in the online experience?
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Nevertheless, I decided to embrace the use of technology and innovate my dance instructions with the inclusion of research blogs. With the help of an ODL advisor, students were assigned their own blog pages on which they posted their findings on the work of a specific choreographer/dancer including three online dance videos, a biography and an aesthetic critique of the artist work.

Students then had to view at least two other student blogs and post an additional aesthetic response as to what they liked or disliked and why.

Some students were more successful than others due to a higher level of computer and online skills, and some required additional technical help. I invited my advisor from ODL to come to class to assist the students with their blogs and also had students peer-teach each other.

I found that students actually spent more time engaged in the research project due to their excitement at having their own blog pages. Although I did have to spend some class time with technological tutorials, it was considerably less time than it would take to present and view the whole project during class time.

This innovation has proven to me that even a non-traditional course can embrace online technology — as long as it is used to enhance student learning and not to displace the quality of instruction.

Often times, faculty who are also union activists are criticized for a perceived dislike for and push back against online instruction. The California Faculty Association has been an advocate for quality online education as long as it is used as an educational tool to augment student learning.

Next steps for the modern dance course are to have the students video tape their creative process and blog these choices, receiving feedback from each other before submitting the final video to me.

The use of blogs not only challenged my approach to dance instruction but that of the future dance teachers I am training.

In spring 2014, my innovative work was acknowledged with the 2014 Outstanding Originator of Distributed Learning (OODL) Award. I was surprised and delighted with this award and realized that if I can do it, anyone can!
Faculty tackle the crush of student debt at CFHE gathering of faculty organizations from across the U.S.

By Niesha Gates
CFA Communications Specialist

With every number, breath caught and heads shook. Some 3.8 million college students are in debt. Of those, 6.2 percent are at risk of defaulting on loans. Total student debt in the United States? $1 trillion.

It is an ever-increasing number that is helping to drive income inequality, hampering graduation rates and preventing access to higher education.

And in 2014, it was a focal point at the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education’s Seventh National Gathering in Albany, New York. There, leaders from student organizations nationwide discussed the rising tide of student debt and the impact on students and families.

In the California State University system alone, an average of about 52 percent of 2013 graduates left with student debt, to the tune of about $16,285 on average, according to data compiled from 17 out of 23 CSU campuses by the Project on Student Debt, and further analyzed by CFA.

In Fall 2013, CSU Students for Quality Education (SQE) surveyed students at CSU campuses, asking them what their needs are and about problems they face.

“The biggest concern was student debt,” said Kristal Raheem, an SQE leader and senior at Sonoma State. Raheem was among student leaders who spoke at the CFHE gathering in Albany.

The escalating cost of higher education is contributing to the rising tide of student debt.

Seeing the compounding effects on CSU students, SQE leaders and members have been fighting campus efforts to pass various campus-based fees, some of which are branded “student success fees.”

Campus-based fees, which often are touted as funding to help students graduate on time and to hire more faculty, have passed at nearly half of CSU campuses and have spiked tuition for students by hundreds of dollars.

“Every time they get a new batch of students they try to sell those fees,” Raheem said.

At Sonoma, students were able to successfully beat the passage of the fees. In December, students at Sacramento State voted down a fee to finance construction of an event center that would have cost each student more than $400 a year.

But the challenge of rising costs and skyrocketing debt persists on all CSU campuses.

Sadly, CSU statistics are relatively low compared to the national average. About seven in 10—nearly 70 percent—of college seniors who graduated from public and private nonprofit colleges in 2013 had student loan debt, according to the Project on Student Debt’s November 2014 report.

Those borrowers owed an average of $28,400, up two percent compared to $27,850 for public and nonprofit graduates in 2012, researchers found.

The staggering amount of student debt is financially crippling future generations, and nearly guarantees those holding the debt remain burdened throughout much of their adulthood. Some are so far in debt that they’re choosing to drop out of college and work dead-end jobs to make ends— and in this case loans—meet.

But rising student debt has another ill-fated outcome within higher education—it’s preventing students from getting to college in the first place.

Hundreds of thousands of academically CONTINUED ON PAGE 22
Sac State students vote to reject campus fee hike

Nearly 7,000 Sacramento State students voted down a $438 mandatory annual campus-based fee hike by 79.6 percent in December.

The fee increase, known technically as a Category II Fee, was floated to build a 5,000-seat arena on campus to host sporting and possibly other events.

Sacramento CFA Chapter president Kevin Wehr said, “The students have spoken with a strong and unified voice, not just for students today, but for fair access for the students of tomorrow.”

Noting that on other campuses students were unaware of votes on fee hikes, the Sacramento chapter of Students for Quality Education tabled to tell students about the vote and provided laptops so students could vote on the spot.

The 6% hike would have risen yearly with inflation. It was proposed despite the statewide tuition freeze Gov. Brown has made a requisite to his CSU funding plan.

The vote adds to a wave of discontent over rising costs at public universities, including the proposed 5 percent annual tuition hikes in the UC and campus-based so-called “student success fees” in the CSU. The Trustees formed a study committee on “success” fees.

Other campuses also are considering new fees. At California Faculty press time students awaited results of a vote on a new fee at CSU Monterey Bay. If adopted the fee, which would rise in increments to as much as $700 a year, would be used to build a new recreation center.
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Qualified potential students are missing out on a college education due to cost concerns, according to the Project on Student Debt. This, in turn, jeopardizes the number of degreed and credentialed professionals entering the workforce.

The Campaign for the Future of Higher Education has long advocated for examination of ways to improve college affordability, including free public higher education, and more vigorous debate of proposals that would allow students more opportunity and less debt.

The grassroots campaign, along with its member organizations, will continue to encourage discussion and push for reform that will help turn the focus back to where it belongs—our students and their education.

The discussion continues at CFHE’s eighth national gathering in Los Angeles in 2015.

To join the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education or to read more about its efforts, visit www.futureofhighered.org.

The fee increase, known technically as a Category II Fee, was floated to build a 5,000-seat arena on campus to host sporting and possibly other events.

Sacramento CFA Chapter president Kevin Wehr said, “The students have spoken with a strong and unified voice, not just for students today, but for fair access for the students of tomorrow.”

Noting that on other campuses students were unaware of votes on fee hikes, the Sacramento chapter of Students for Quality Education tabled to tell students about the vote and provided laptops so students could vote on the spot.

The 6% hike would have risen yearly with inflation. It was proposed despite the statewide tuition freeze Gov. Brown has made a requisite to his CSU funding plan.

The vote adds to a wave of discontent over rising costs at public universities, including the proposed 5 percent annual tuition hikes in the UC and campus-based so-called “student success fees” in the CSU. The Trustees formed a study committee on “success” fees.

Other campuses also are considering new fees. At California Faculty press time students awaited results of a vote on a new fee at CSU Monterey Bay. If adopted the fee, which would rise in increments to as much as $700 a year, would be used to build a new recreation center.

To join the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education or to read more about its efforts, visit www.futureofhighered.org.

CFA stood with the recently elected president of the National Education Association at a news conference in Oakland calling for federal and state action to turnaround the drastic growth in student debt.

CFA President Lillian Taiz (left) attended with Theresa Montaño (second from right), a CFA leader who is national president of NEA’s National Council for Higher Education.

CFA Vice President Kim Geron (second from left) joined NEA President Lily Eskelson García (right), other higher ed leaders and the recently re-elected California Superintendent of Education Tom Tolakson at the podium to describe what California State University students are up against.
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CFA President Lillian Taiz (left) attended with Theresa Montaño (second from right), a CFA leader who is national president of NEA’s National Council for Higher Education.

CFA Vice President Kim Geron (second from left) joined NEA President Lily Eskelson García (right), other higher ed leaders and the recently re-elected California Superintendent of Education Tom Tolakson at the podium to describe what California State University students are up against.

To join the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education or to read more about its efforts, visit www.futureofhighered.org.
CSU students protest hikes in campus fees, take their case to the Trustees

The debate over student “success fees” and other the campus-specific fees tacked on top of CSU students’ system-wide tuition—came to the CSU Trustees at their November meeting while students protested outside. Here is an excerpt of testimony presented by one of the students who addressed the meeting.

My name is Cheyenne Aldridge and I am a fifth-year student at Sonoma State. I rely primarily on financial aid (scholarship, grants, loans) and work two jobs to help sustain my off-campus bills.

My education has become a financial burden and I can not afford to pay a dollar more.

Sonoma State’s president Ruben Armiñana stated that he did not think the fee would dime the cultural diversity of our campus.

Well, I am here to prove that it does. I speak for students of color, students from low socioeconomic statuses, the 56 percent of students who receive financial aid, and students who are just trying to get an affordable, quality education.

As you know, we at Sonoma State were able to defeat the student success fee.

The Sociology Club on our campus was the first to hear of this fee and thought it was their responsibility to bring awareness to the students. They held “informationals” about the short- and long-term effects, positive and negative, if this fee were to be imposed.

Soon after, Associated Students held meetings in favor of the fee. Many students were unaware of this fee and felt they were paying enough.

In time, Students for Quality Education and the Sociology Club got over 1200 students to sign a petition in opposition to the fee and, through a media blast, we gathered hundreds of student testimonies about how these fees would affect them.

We were able to defeat the fee.
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