

Bargaining Talking Points

Salary

- **What is the chancellor proposing?**
 - [See the full proposal here.](#)
 - The chancellor is refusing to give faculty the pay increases they deserve.
 - Instead, she is only offering a 3% one-time taxable bonus. For a part-time lecturer that makes \$40,000, that's a one-time payment of \$1,200 before taxes.
 - A one-time bonus is not a substitute for fair compensation, and it undermines the labor and dedication of hard-working faculty.
 - Management also proposed a 3% General Salary Increase (GSI) for 2026-27 that is not retroactive, and a salary and benefits reopener for 2027-28. They also want to create a "workgroup" to review faculty health care benefits with a clear intent to shift more of the cost of health care onto faculty in 2028.
 - Although the chancellor has spent months denying faculty fair pay, she approved huge salary increases to executives such as presidents and vice chancellors without any hesitation. In annual base salaries alone, campus presidents make between \$370,000 and \$611,000 and vice chancellors make between \$368,000 and \$466,000.
 - This offers a clear insight into her priorities.
- **What are we proposing?**
 - [See the full proposal here.](#)
 - We are demanding that the chancellor put students, faculty, and staff first. That simply means paying workers a just and living wage so that we can give students the education and commitment they deserve.
 - For all faculty, we are proposing that:
 1. Full-time equivalent faculty be paid at least 10% of the chancellor's base salary (currently this would be a \$79,500 minimum).
 2. We receive a cost-of-living increase every year.
 - a. A cost-of-living increase on an annual basis is a normal thing that employers give their workers to keep up with the cost of inflation. It is not a gift. It is not charity. And it should not be viewed as kindness. It is wage justice, and required to keep faculty at least 2% ahead of inflation every year.

3. We receive automatic yearly step increases to move faculty up the salary structure.

- **What's at stake here?**

- What's at stake isn't just our contract; it's the future of public higher education. The chancellor is using Trump's playbook to consolidate power to the richest in the system by exploiting faculty, students, staff, and taxpayers.
- We deserve better, and the chancellor should know better.

Academic Freedom

- **What is our overall proposal?**

- We demand that faculty members shall not be punished or retaliated against for exercising rights to free speech, expression, and assembly either in the performance of university duties or in engagement and expression outside the classroom, office, library, sports arena, clinic, the university, the larger academic community, or the community at large.
- [See the full proposal here.](#)

- **What else are we fighting for?**

- We are fighting for faculty to have the right to determine appropriate pedagogy so long as faculty members meet learning outcomes as assigned.
- We want to protect faculty members from censorship or retaliation that may arise from activities connected to scholarship, research, discovery, and creative endeavors.
- The CFA Bargaining Team has also proposed specific Academic Freedom protections for counselor, coaching, and librarian faculty.
- We have also proposed protective measures to resist fascism. For example, our proposal would require the CSU to support faculty who are targeted due to their speech on or off CSU campuses.

- **What is management proposing?**

- Management's counter is to simply reassert the [preamble of our contract](#), which doesn't offer enough solid protections to academic freedom in these turbulent times.
- In bargaining, management also proposed language from the [CSU's 1971 policy on Academic Freedom](#). The policy was written during a time of

intense right-wing backlash (led by then-Governor Ronald Reagan) against higher education in California.

- We cannot accept management's infuriating and chilling counter. We will fight for the Academic Freedom protections that faculty need and deserve.
- [See the full proposal here.](#)

AI

- **What is our overall proposal?**
 - Our proposal includes protections for using or refusing to use AI technology, professional development resources to adapt pedagogy to incorporate the technology, and further protections for faculty intellectual property.
 - [See the full proposal here.](#)
- **What are the details of what we're fighting for?**
 - We proposed that faculty retain the right to determine appropriate pedagogical methods, course design, and the reasonable use or non-use of AI in their work activities.
 - The introduction of or use of AI systems should not alter or diminish legal standards governing ownership of intellectual property.
 - We want management to agree that neither the use of nor refusal to use AI products or technologies be the basis for disciplining faculty. We also proposed that management cannot base personnel actions or decisions on reasonable use or non-use of AI.
 - We proposed that the instructor of record be limited to human faculty members or other qualified university employees. We also proposed that management must not assign or reassign other work of CFA members to AI.
 - We want to guarantee that management make professional development opportunities available to faculty on the use of AI systems and other emerging technologies. We want management to establish a \$2.5 million fund to support professional development in this area.
- **What is management's counterproposal?**
 - [See the full proposal here.](#)
 - Management proposed moving AI from a standalone article to a side MOU that expires with the contract. They also refuse to agree that counselor, librarian, and coach work not be replaced by AI.

- They proposed that management maintain the right to introduce, pilot, modify, or discontinue use of AI systems.
- Their proposal places responsibility on faculty, staff, and students to ensure “Confidential, restricted, or otherwise sensitive information” not be used with generative AI systems in ways that “compromise data privacy”
- Management agreed that faculty have authority over AI use in their pedagogy and instructional activity.
- Management conceded that AI cannot be “appointed, assigned, or recognized by the University as an Instructor of Record for any course. Faculty retain primary instructional responsibility.”
- They proposed language that it will make “reasonable efforts” to consider bias in AI systems the CSU implements for academic or administrative purposes.
- Management proposed that AI may support or augment human tasks “but shall not independently determine employment actions.”

Appointment

- **What did we propose regarding appointment?**
 - [See the full proposal here.](#)
 - We proposed that official notice for appointments must be given at least four weeks prior to the start of the appointment.
 - The CFA Bargaining Team also proposed that any faculty classified as “temporary” by the CSU, with appointments in multiple departments, should be assigned the same base salary and range for all departments, and should reflect their highest base pay appointment.
 - Faculty on temporary appointments currently require six consecutive years of service before they are offered a three-year appointment. We are proposing that we reduce that requirement to only four years of consecutive service before they reach their three-year contract.
 - We have also proposed stronger language to create a more accessible pathway for faculty on temporary contracts to transition into tenure-track or permanent positions.

- The CFA Bargaining Team put forward substantial changes to the order of assignment to strengthen seniority rights and the process by which a faculty on a temporary appointment can become full-time.
- We proposed that each campus must have a minimum of 50% of its counselor faculty be appointed into either tenured or probationary appointments. We also proposed that counselor appointments require a recommendation to the president from the campus' counselor committee—which is elected by counselor faculty.
- **What did management counter?**
 - [See the full proposal here.](#)
 - Management rejected nearly every CFA proposal and included nonsensical modifications to a few of them.
 - They first proposed a five-year appointment for lecturer faculty that requires approval by the appropriate administrator and a questionable and subjective “exceptional” evaluation. This would mean that deans could gift a special five-year appointment to their favorite few, while denying it for the vast majority of lecturer faculty. They have since moved off this position.
 - Management also changed the order of work assignment to include a “scholar/artist in residence,” which would replace the visiting faculty classification. Campus administrators would be in a position to renew, extend, or repeat without limit this scholar’s appointment for as long as they wanted without any input from faculty. They would also receive work ahead of most lecturers in the order of assignment.

Workload

- **What is the CFA bargaining team demanding?**
 - We are demanding an end to overwork and free work in the classroom, library, mental health clinics, and athletic facilities. This means:
 - Courses need to have predictable caps on enrollment
 - Research must be compensated
 - Counselor direct service must be defined
 - Counselors and librarians must have more flexibility in their work schedules

- Faculty on "temporary" contracts should be compensated for service work
 - [See the full proposal here.](#)
- **What else are we fighting for?**
 - We are also proposing contract language on a clinical professor, teaching professor, and clinical faculty. These assignments may include instruction, research, scholarship, creative activities as well as the supervision of students' clinical work, internships, or other applied professional experiences.
- **What did management counter?**
 - They rejected our call for compensated research and service.
 - Management also rejected course caps and compensation for service for contingent faculty.
 - They rejected a guarantee of 1 remote work day per week for counselors and librarians. Management also rejected defined direct service time for counselors and wants to keep "shall endeavor" language instead of committing to a goal on counselor to student ratios.
 - Management rejected language ensuring no faculty could be penalized for refusing to teach a large class.
 - They also rejected a proposal to allow all faculty to vote in department chair elections.
 - [See the full proposal here.](#)