



CONNECT 7

The statewide publication for support staff professionals in Unit 7

IS YOUR CLASSIFICATION OUT OF DATE?

Library Assistants and Reprographics Employees

Many CSEA classification and qualifications standards (CQS) are seriously out of date, having been written or last revised in the 1960's or 1970's. The CSEA Classification Committee wishes to offer support and guidance to employee efforts to have their standards revised, and the CSEA staff in Sacramento can offer technical assistance. It is the affected employees themselves, however, that must take the lead because they are the ones who know best what they do and what up-to-date classification standards should contain. A successful project is therefore the result of the combined efforts of the Classification Committee, the staff at CSEA headquarters, and the affected employees themselves. Two groups have recently begun to organize to collect data and create proposals for presentation to the Chancellor's Office, the Library Assistants and employees in the reprographics classifications. Both classification groups received equity increases during the last round of bargaining. This does not preclude additional increases in the future.

LIBRARY ASSISTANTS

A Library Assistant at San Luis Obispo, Joan Kennedy, is organizing the project. These individuals serve as intermediaries between the central coordinating committee and the Library Assistants on their campus, forwarding information from the committee to the campuses and the ideas of employees back again to the committee. They have created a central coordinating committee to set the goals, establish the timelines, keep the project moving, and ensure that all Library Assistants will have their input considered. The survey they developed will be available on-line soon.

REPROGRAPHICS

The classifications in this area include: micrographics technician, supervising mi-

crographics technician, duplicating machine operator I, duplicating machine operator supervisor I, duplicating machine operator II offset, duplicating machine operator II direct impact, reprographics processes supervisor I, reprographics processes assistant. Three employees in Pomona have agreed to take the lead on this project. They have developed a very cool website (www.fairpay4us.homestead.com/index.html) and an email address (fairpay4us@yahoo.com). They are now

collecting the names of employees willing to be contacts for their campuses. They still lack a contact person for the following campuses: Fresno, Fullerton, Long Beach, Northridge, Sacramento, San Jose, and Stanislaus. Please check out their website and complete their online survey.

Is your classification out of date? Contact Alice Gold, Chair of the Classification Committee, to find out what you can do? agold@calpoly.edu

Moving through your salary range: MSIs and In-Range Progression

As a result of recent contract negotiations, Performance Based Salary Increases (PBSI) and Service Based Salary Increases (SBSI) have been eliminated. Your salary range now consists of just a minimum and maximum amount. There is no service maximum versus a PBSI maximum. If you would like to see your range, look in the back of the current Contract or look on the CSEA/CSU web site. Now, the question becomes, how do you progress through that broader range? In the current contract, there are two ways. The first is the new Merit Salary Increase. If you received a satisfactory or better on your performance evaluation, you will receive a 1.2% salary increase. If you received above a satisfactory on your Performance Evaluation, you will receive a small amount in addition to the 1.2% increase. That amount will differ on each campus, but everyone at the same level will receive the same amount on the same campus. The MSI will move you through your range. The MSI is a one year program. It is anticipated that the Labor Management Committee will recommend

a more comprehensive compensation plan for upcoming full contract negotiations.

The second way you can move through your salary range is by receiving an In-Range Progression. This program has been in affect for one year. Few campuses have yet developed policies nor fully educated their managers in its use. But it exists and can be applied for and employees on many campuses have received them.

Many employees take on additional responsibilities and learn new skills over time, as a normal progression in their positions, while they basically continue to do the same job, within their same classification and skill level. The intent of In-Range Progression is to reward these employees with a raise. It was also intended that while Human Resources may monitor the process, the decision is to be made at the budget authority level. It can be given at any time with a minimum of a 2.5% increase and no maximum. Discuss this with your supervisor. Refer him/her to the contract or to Human Resources if he/she needs more information.

Administrative Support Assistants, Coordinators and Analyst / Specialists

Although CSEA succeeded in obtaining revised classification standards and up to date job titles, we have heard from employees that many issues remain. As a result, the CSEA Classification Committee created a new subcommittee to examine the status and working conditions of employees in these classifications, to solicit their input, and to recommend solutions to any demonstrated problems. The members are:

Alice Gold ASC, SLO
 Connie McCarroll AAS, Long Beach
 Diane Anderson ASC, Humboldt
 Stella Washington ASA, Fresno
 Gail Salgado ASC, Monterey Bay
 Judy Castaneda AAS, LA
 Jeannie Ranney ASC, San Diego
 Joanne Dill AAS, SLO

The subcommittee held its first meeting in Sacramento on November 17th where workload and In-Range Progression were the main topics of discussion. Some of the factors contributint to increased workload are the implementation of the faculty contract, the decentralization of responsibilities from campus administrative to academic departments, implementation of CMS, the consolidation of units/departments, the downsizing of staff, increased faculty hiring including more temporary faculty, and the rise in the

student population.

The biggest difficulty we face in demonstrating that our employees are in general working longer and harder is the lack of claims for overtime pay or CTO time. Many of us absorb more work by skipping our lunch and breaks and working longer hours without claiming additional compensation.

The committee also explored the legal definitions and status of exempt versus non exempt, an issue of great importance to Administrative Analyst/Specialists. The impact of year round operations also entered the discussion.

The actions decided upon, at this time, were as follows:

- To pursue legislation that would investigate the existence of discriminatory pay practices in the CSU.

- The creation of a Know Your Rights flyer on workload.

- The creation and distribution of a survey on workload.

- The collecting of data on the numbers of staff, students and faculty in the CSU over time.

The discussion of In-Range Progression will continue.

Our next meeting took place January 20 at Cal Poly in San Luis Obispo.

CSU wage inequity study

A bill authorizing a comprehensive study of wage inequity in the CSU is in the process of being reintroduced for legislation for the third year in a row. Assembly bill 43, by Assemblyman Herb Wesson, would authorize the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) to conduct a study and make recommendations that would achieve pay equity for female and minority employees. The study would focus on "the impact

of discrimination, the segregation of jobs by gender or race, the undervaluation of women's work on the wage gaps between male and female employees, and between white and minority employees of the CSU.

Thousands of CSU employees represented by CSEA may be underpaid because of their gender and/or race in spite of federal and state laws prohibiting discrimination. Wage inequities are exacerbated as a result of the CSU historically not compensating employees adequately for the education and experience they have.

Despite previous bills which were not signed by the Governor, a faculty study conducted by the National Education Association, found that the university's merit pay system discriminates against women, resulting in raises for female professors that are on the average, 8% less than what their male colleagues are receiving. On the Sacramento campus, this disparity is 24%. Preliminary evidence suggests a similar pattern of inequity for minority professors. The university disputes the conclusions drawn by this study, calling attention the fact that large salaries are found in the full-professor ranks, which are still dominated by men.

This study of faculty compensation inequities underscores the need to perform a comprehensive review of employees pay inequities, as it suggests a deeply-rooted and system-wide problem.



Newly-elected Bargaining Unit 7 Council members are (l-r): Rosa Natividad, Los Angeles; Rita Glynn, Stanislaus; Alice Gold, San Luis Obispo; Kathryn Plunkett, chair, Bakersfield; Stella Washington, Fresno and Deborah Corey, San Marcos. They are elected from the 23 campuses' Unit 7 representatives and are responsible for over 6,000 employees, 85% of whom are female.

Classifications versus Skill Levels Reclassification vs. In-Class Progression

With your new classifications come a new concept called skill levels. Previously, if your classification had a I and a II, such as Graphic Specialist I and Graphic Specialist II, this indicated two separate classifications. To move from I to II necessitated a reclassification. Now, two levels have been included within the classification, and to move from I to II necessitates an In-Class

Progression. The procedures are exactly the same for both, and they both provide a minimum five percent (5%) increase, but in-class progression should be easier to attain, because it does not require the candidate to demonstrate a change in duties, simply a natural progression to higher level duties within the same position.

What about WORKLOAD?

Watch for the upcoming survey on workload. CSEA Classification Committee is preparing a survey that will be available on-line.

ROD GAULMAN, Senior Labor Relations Representative, joins the Unit 7 team. Rod's experience is in labor, legal and alternative dispute resolution. He came from the Civil Service Division where he worked for three years with CSEA.. He brings to the CSU Division an extensive background in human resources management and labor and employment law. "I am enjoying working in the CSU system where I see there's a lot of work to be done. I'm impressed with the new staff talent in our Division, and I know we can make a difference in strengthening the Union."



CSEA / CSU BARGAINING UNIT 7 REPRESENTATIVES

CAMPUS	CHPT.	BU 7 REPRESENTATIVE	PHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
Humboldt	301	Mary Greta	(707) 826-3657	(707) 826-3657	mg2@axe.humboldt.edu
Chico	302	Kevin Brennan	(530) 898-5992		kbrennan@csuchico.edu
Sacramento	303	Vacant			
Sonoma	304	Marie Lovell	(707) 664-2905	(707) 664-2675	marie.lovell@sonoma.edu
San Francisco	305	Cindy Reedy	(415) 338-1833	(415) 338-1984	cindyr@sfsu.edu
Hayward	306	Vera Porter	(510) 885-3513	(510) 885-2167	vporter@csuhayward.edu
San Jose	307	Elvira Acevedo	(408) 924-5200	(408) 924-5191	acevedo@email.sjsu.edu
Stanislaus	308	Rita Glynn	(209) 667-3461	(209) 667-3848	rita@science.csustan.edu
Fresno	309	Stella Washington	(559) 278-2919	(559) 278-6964	stellaw@csufresno.edu
Bakersfield	310	Kathryn Plunkett	(661) 664-3343	(661) 665-6901	kplunkett@csu.edu
Los Angeles	311	Rosa Natividad	(323) 343-8869		rnativi@cslanet.calstatela.edu
Northridge	312	Vacant			
Chancellor's Office	313	Anne Pham			
Dominguez Hills	314	Beverly Wilson	(310) 243-3321	(310) 764-5914	bawe10@yahoo.com
Long Beach	315	Frances Johnson	(562) 985-7336	(562) 985-7003	fjohnson@csulb.edu
San Luis Obispo	316	Alice Gold	(805) 756-1752	(805) 756-2435	agold@calpoly.edu
Fullerton	317	Darlene Trostad	(714) 278-4344	(714) 278-7042	dtrostad@fullerton.edu
San Diego	318	Marcia Pullin	(619) 594-4082		mpullin@mail.sdsu.edu
Pomona	319	Deborah Campbell	(909) 869-4557	(909) 869-4337	drcampbell@csupomona.edu
San Bernardino	320	Denise Gipson-Perry	(909) 880-5098		dgipson@csusb.edu
San Marcos	321	Deborah Corey	(760) 750-4820	(706) 750-3248	steward300@hotmail.com
Monterey Bay	322	Gail Raucherbaumer	(831) 582-4451		gail_raucherbaumer@monterey.edu
Maritime Academy	323	Charles Constantine	(707) 654-1176		cconstantine@csum.edu

UNIT 7 GRIEVANCES – UPDATE

Filed on Behalf of Employees in Administrative Support Coordinator and Analysts/Specialist Classes

The CSEA continues to pursue two statewide grievances relating to the administrative support coordinator and analyst/specialist classifications that were created in 1999.

The first grievance, filed in November 1999, seeks to compensate temporary employees as well as some 10/12 workers who did not receive money that was due to them when the CSU mistakenly instructed campus payroll offices to award the 1.98% increase that had been negotiated by the CSEA and CSU only to those

employees who were in pay status as of July 1, 1999. The CSEA and CSU are setting a date to hear this Level IV grievance in the very near future, and CSU representatives have indicated a willingness to resolve the matter expeditiously.

The second grievance concerns reclassification requests that had been put on hold pending the outcome of the CSEA and CSU negotiations over the new classifications. Negotiators for both sides had agreed that during the changeover period – from February 1 to June 30, 1999 – no reclassifications

would be implemented. Several CSU campuses misinterpreted this to mean that no reclassification requests would be accepted, considered, or granted during that period. In fact, no such moratorium was contemplated during the changeover, and numerous employees were affected by the erroneous instructions. The CSEA grievance requests that these employees be retroactively granted their reclassification, with back pay, service credit and retirement contributions. This Level IV grievance is still pending.

Q&A: Questions about the “Equity List”

Q: Why were the ASA and ASC classifications not on the equity list this year?

A: The ASA/C’s had already received a 3% salary increase in 1999, in conjunction with the classification revision that took effect in April 1999.

Q: Is there a difference between an equity increase and a classification revision increase?

A: Yes. An equity increase is given when there is proof of differences in pay for a classification in a similar industry and the bargaining parties agree on an amount of increase. The classification revisions have resulted in higher level responsibility and broader range of duties, for which we have bargained a minimum of 3% increase. (You may liken this to a reclass, except that a reclass carries a minimum of 5% increase.)

Q: How are equity increases funded?

A: Equity increases should be funded out of campus funds or by the Governor’s augmentation to the compensation pool. In the 1999 ASA/C case, the 3% was achieved by using 1998 money that became available

July 1, 1999, (1.02%) and by using compensation pool monies (1.98%). Equities should not be funded out of the general compensation pool, but because the bargaining team was committed to a minimum 3% increase for classification revisions, which addresses the higher level work/equity, and because the Governor’s augmentation never materialized, they carried through for us. Over 6,000 employees received 3% classification/equity increases!

Q: How does our bargaining team develop an equity list?

A: The equity list can be developed in five ways:

1) The bargaining team along with the Classification Committee uses the annual Department of Personnel Administration listing of benchmark classifications for salary comparisons;

2) Employees in a classification organize themselves and provide the bargaining team with information that supports their position that their pay lags “outside CSU” industry levels;

3) The Chancellor’s Office submits classifications they have determined to have re-

cruitment or retention problems;

4) Classification revisions have included salary revisions addressing higher level work;

5) Justice — some of our lowest paid employees cannot make a living on their salaries.

Q: How are the increases determined?

A: Our list may coincide with the CO’s. When this happens, we bargain until we reach agreement on the percentage increase. More often, however, we must justify our position. The bargaining team may call in “expert witnesses” (employees within a given classification) to testify before the bargaining teams. Then, negotiations begin.

Q: How can I help my classification be considered for an equity increase?

A: Anyone can begin by gathering salary data and position descriptions of similarly classified employees in non-CSU industries. For help, contact Alice Gold, Classification Committee chair, at agold@calpoly.edu. See related article, *Is Your Classification Out of Date?*.

AT THE TABLE

A Personal Perspective on Bargaining 2000*by Alice Gold*

There were eleven of us, all just regular old employees, all stewards, except for our professional negotiator, Teven, who kept us on track, herded us around, picked us up at the airport, spoke for us at the table. There was an administrative support coordinator and an administrative support assistant (Unit 7), an instructional support technician and a computer technician (Unit 9), a laborer and a warehouse worker (Unit 5), and a nurse and a lab technician (Unit 2). Our officers were a collections rep and an instructional support technician.

How did we get to the "Bargaining Table"? We were elected unit reps at our home campuses, and then were elected chair and vice chair by the other reps for our unit councils. Chairs and vice chairs bargain for the employees in their units, an awesome responsibility. Added to that were our two statewide officers. That's who bargains. Who sat on the other side of the table? We faced the Chancellor's office chief negotiator, three human resources directors from three different campuses, and a facilities manager. This was the first experience at bargaining for a few of us on both sides of the table.

This is how it works. Both sides take the current contract and mark it up. We take out language we don't like by simply crossing it out. We add in new language we want, and underline it so it stands out. One side explains their changes and the other side explains their changes, and we ask each other what the intent of the changes are. Then one side responds to the others' proposal by submitting a second proposal, and then they return it, and it goes back and forth until there is agreement on every single article being negotiated. For example, our initial proposal requested a 5% minimum increase for employees receiving an in-range progression. When it did not appear that they were going to agree, we lowered that to 2.5%. This, they accepted. Since this was re-openers and not full bargaining, we only marked up articles 20 (salary) and 21 (benefits). As limited as it was, we still discussed issues as diverse as parking fees, shift differentials, asbestos work, and fee waiver. We were also bargaining over new Unit 7 and 9 classifications.

Usually it takes a long time to prepare a response. So there is a lot of waiting. It can even be the better part of a day. I read an entire book. Some did crossword puzzles. We ate a lot. Those with laptops read their email. We got bored. We discussed strategy. We worried about our jobs and our families.

There were late nights and early mornings and lots of traveling. In an attempt to bring the process to the campuses, we bargained at Sacramento, San Francisco, Chico, Fullerton, Fresno, and the Chancellor's Office. Unfortunately, we saw little of those communities. The local chapter often held lunch meetings where the CSEA bargaining team answered employee's questions.

There were missed meals and too much food and not enough exercise. I tried to take a swim one evening in a hotel pool that was next to the freeway. Oh, for the Cal Poly Rec Center. There were jammed copy machines and broken hole punchers. There were a lot of migraine headaches. We shared laughs among our team and between the teams, sometimes to break the tension, and sometimes out of exhaustion. There were typos on the proposals that gave away the store (had the wrong amounts or the wrong dates) that served as comic relief. Both sides killed a lot of trees.

What we had in common was that both sides wanted a contract. The trick was to figure out the bottom line. What would we be willing to go to impasse for and what

must they absolutely have before they could sign? The single most important issue was probably PBSI. We proposed a Merit Salary Increase, similar to SBSI, to replace it. They took that idea and further developed it. Defining it and refining it so that both sides' constituencies would ratify it was a major task.

So what, you ask, gave us all of this expertise? A steward's work is to enforce the contract and in the process we learn what works and what doesn't work. My Unit 7 chair and I had spent several years of our lives thinking and breathing classification and the last year learning about what parking officers, campus guards and dispatchers do. Everyone had different areas of interest and expertise, and there was our chief negotiator to keep us logical and consistent. There were parts of our proposal that were dropped pending further research. We did not know everything about everything. There were times when the facts meant one thing to us and something else to the other side. We all learned a great deal, about how campus policy is made, how salary ranges are derived, and what employees are concerned about.

The next time you are in Long Beach, go to "Mossville", a family restaurant that serves the best Cajun food I have ever tasted. That's the table we sat at to celebrate after we had all signed our names to the Tentative Agreement.



Unit 7 reps on the 2000 bargaining team Alice Gold and Kathryn Plunkett take a breather during negotiations on the Fresno campus. Bargaining is scheduled to alternate between the Chancellor's Office and campuses, which gives the rank-and-file employees an opportunity to observe the negotiating process. Pictured behind them is the vineyard, famous for fine wine and part of the agricultural program at Fresno State.

— IN PROFILE —

CAREY MILLS, Dispatcher, San Luis Obispo Campus

**"In This Job, No Two Days Are The Same
And Your In-Box Is A Four-Section Communications Console"**



We rarely think of campus safety as an integral part of the education process, but it is a vital component among the many that support educators and students. While students focus on learning, people like Carey Mills are quietly making sure the campus is a safe place for all, at all times of the day and night.

Campus dispatchers are on duty 24-7, and at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo it takes four full timers and one part timer to cover all of those shifts. Only one dispatcher is on duty during any of the shifts.

Carey brings a wealth of expertise to her position. She worked for the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Department for fourteen years before coming to Cal Poly, first as a part timer in 1993, and then permanently full time since 1996. She also brings a life-long passion and commitment to the dispatcher profession. "Even as a kid, I wanted to be involved in law enforcement," she says. She always knew she wanted to be a central part of the public safety net. Being a dispatcher puts her in just that position.

Although I interviewed Carey one evening during a summertime lull in activity, the day-to-day workflow is completely unpredictable. Fall and spring seem to be much busier times, but a dispatcher must always be prepared to respond with flawless efficiency to whatever kind of call comes in. "It helps to be easy-going, and you have to be able to handle multiple tasks," including a complicated, four-section communications console which is connected

to the campus, outside community, state and nation. Telephone lines, including four in-

coming emergency lines and six business lines, are set up to auto-dial numerous local agencies. The radio channels (15 are currently in use) provide links to off campus law enforcement and emergency services. One of the two computer consoles provides links to databanks that give the dispatcher immediate access to drivers license, vehicle registration, stolen property, firearms registration, wanted persons, and many other kinds of law enforcement information on a

local, state and national level. The other computer console is the campus public safety system, used for routine on-campus information management.

These four consoles are a sort of dispatcher's inbox, but the dispatcher never knows what she will find when she turns to it.

"Statistically, we're the safest campus in the CSU system," Carey says. Yet despite the data, the recent rape and murder of Cal Poly student Rachel Newhouse, and the 1996 disappearance of another Cal Poly student, Kristen Smart, a perception persists that the campus is not as safe as it really is.

Why does Cal Poly come out on top statistically? Carey believes one big reason is because the university attracts so many of the best students in the state. "The majority of our students are here to learn and better themselves. They're very focused on their studies. They have clear goals in mind. That helps keep the crime rate down because they're not typically out causing trouble or mischief, or disturbing others."

Another thing that keeps the crime rate down on the Cal Poly campus is the sense of community that people feel, and the willingness to help others. This can complicate the job of a dispatcher, however, as the console lights up with good Samaritans calling in about a crisis. Carey remembers one difficult medical aid call she took. An electrician working in the administration building suffered severe burns in an electrical accident that literally shook the entire building. The system, and the sole dispatcher at

its helm, was immediately overwhelmed with several calls reporting the same inci-

dent. While reassuring workers calling in from the administration building that there had not been an explosion, Carey was simultaneously busy managing a critical situation that required immediate medical assistance. Fortunately, a custodian with a radio was the first to report the incident, almost at the same instant it happened. This gave Carey the chance to contact emergency medical and fire services within seconds, describing the details of the event as she learned them from

the custodian and other callers on the scene with the injured worker — all the while watching her phone lines light up with calls from people in the building either wondering what was going on or wanting to report what they knew. But getting emergency response teams to the scene is the first priority, and in a major crisis call like this one, it sometimes takes her a couple of hours to get back to everyone who called.

Working as a university dispatcher, Carey and her colleagues must be prepared to handle all possible law enforcement crises, but realistically, "we don't have bank robberies, pursuits, and shootings here. Still, you need to be prepared to handle that type of incident at any time." Indeed, on the very evening of my conversation with Carey, a shoot-out had occurred in a faculty office at a quiet Arkansas university campus. "This is where my fourteen years with the sheriff's department is invaluable," she says. Over the course of those many years as a dispatcher there, she had dealt with it all.

But fourteen years is a long time to be exposed to the more toxic elements of our culture. One of the big reasons she left her much more highly paid position with the county to come to Cal Poly is the sense of renewal she feels in dealing with the student population. "I see their sense of hope and I am enriched by that," she says. "Working with the students, I realize that we can really make a difference and have a positive impact. I love that."

The peace of mind Carey bought with the rather sizeable pay cut she took in 1993 in order to work at Cal Poly is now a thing of the past. The CSEA just successfully negotiated a 12% increase in pay for campus dispatchers, which brings them to within about 10% of what other agencies in the state pay. How does she feel about that? "It's tremendous!" It was a great effort carried forward by the dispatcher supervisor, Fred Mills, and CSEA Unit 7 representatives who took the dispatchers' pay inequity case to the bargaining table and successfully negotiated the pay increase for them.

Meanwhile, the next time you think of campus safety, think about the people like Carey, sitting quietly at their "in-boxes," making our workplaces safer for all.

"Statistically, we're the safest campus in the CSU system"

Unit 7 Equity List

CSU Employees Receive Salary Increases for 2000-2001

CODE	TITLE	% INC.
1100	Payroll Tech	3%
1101	Payroll Tech II	3%
1102	Payroll Tech III	3%
1426	Micrographics Tech	3%
1428	Supervision Micrographics Tech I	3%
1450	Duplicating Machine Operator I	5%
1464	Duplicating Machine Supervisor I	5%
1466	Duplicating Machine Operator II, Offset	5%
1467	Duplicating Machine Operator II, Direct Impression	5%
1471	Reproduction Processes Supervisor I	5%
1472	Reproduction Processes Assistant	4%
1502	Shipping & Receiving Assistant I	4%
1504	Mail Services Supervisor I	4%
1505	Mail Clerk	4%
1506	Storekeeper I	4%
1509	Stock Clerk	4%
1549	Property Clerk II	4%
1550	Property Clerk I	4%
1413	Graphics Specialist I	3%
1415	Lead Graphics Specialist	3%
2936	Slide Curator II	6%
8349	Public Safety Dispatcher	12%
8353	Supervising Park Officer	3%

CODE	TITLE	% INC.
1553	Inventory Clerk	4%
1727	Supervisor Account Clerk I	3%
1730	Accounting Technician I	3%
1733	Accounting Clerk	3%
1740	Accounting Technician III	3%
1741	Accounting Technician II	3%
1758	Collections Representative I	3%
1759	Collections Representative II	3%
2905	Library Assistant II	3%
2906	Library Assistant I	3%
2907	Library Assistant III	3%
2908	Library Assistant IV	3%
4791	Buyer I	3%
4792	Buyer II	3%
4739	Buyer II - Lead	3%
4794	Buyer III	3%
4795	Buyer III - Lead	3%
1160	Editorial Aid	9%
1414	Graphics Specialist II	3%
2935	Slide Curator I	6%
8341	Parking Garage Supervisor	3%
8351	Parking Officer	3%
8352	Campus Guard	3%

JOIN
THE
UNION
TODAY!



MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION • California State Employees Association
Local 1000, SEIU, AFL-CIO, CLC — 1108 'O' Street • Sacramento, CA 95814 • (916) 444-8134

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT

Chapter

Social Security No.	Last Name	First Name	Initial
Number and Street		City	Zip Code
Employed by	Department or Campus - work location		Room No.
Classification	\$ Monthly Salary	Business Phone	Home Phone
Recruiter Name		Recruiter S.S.#	

I hereby apply for membership in the California State Employees Association (CSEA) and hereby agree to abide by the CSEA Bylaws and Policies, including those of its divisions (collectively referred to as "Policy File.") In becoming a member I authorize CSEA to establish with the appropriate agency the withholding from my pay or retirement allowance of CSEA dues and any benefit deductions. I understand that my membership rights are set forth in the Policy File, which is subject to amendment by CSEA, and are affected by applicable labor contract(s) ("A Memorandum of Understanding" or "MOU") between CSEA and the State of California or the California State University, and a copy of the Policy File and applicable MOU are always available to me by contacting CSEA Headquarters, 1108 'O' Street, Sacramento, California 95814. Should an applicable MOU provide for the maintenance of membership, I understand that I must remain a member for the duration of the MOU, except that I may terminate membership during the last thirty (30) days of such MOU.

Unless instructed to the contrary below, CSEA is hereby further authorized to withhold from my pay or retirement allowance an additional \$2.00 per month for CSEA's non-partisan political activity.

C-7 (4/00)

Form 1 (9/96)



By writing my initials in this box I instruct CSEA NOT to withhold an additional \$2.00 per month for political activity.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION
Local 1000, SEIU, AFL-CIO, CLC
930 R Street
Sacramento, CA 95814



Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 855
Sacramento, CA

CSEA UNIT 7 BARGAINING COUNCIL

Kathryn Plunkett, Chair
Bakersfield

Beverly Wilson, Vice Chair
Dominguez Hills

MEMBERS AT LARGE

Rita Glynn, Stanislaus
Alice Gold, San Luis Obispo
Rosa Natividad, Los Angeles
Stella Washington, Fresno

EDITORIAL STAFF

Kathryn Plunkett, Editor
kplunkett@csu.edu

Writers:

Alice Gold
agold@calpoly.edu
Hylah Jacques
hj Jacques@calpoly.edu
Patricia Jing-Wright
pjwright@csu.edu

In-Range Progression Survey

*Have you taken the
In-Range Progression survey yet?*

If not, please help us by completing this survey online or by returning it to your campus Unit 7 or Unit 9 representative by February 28, 2001. We encourage you to log on to <http://tags.fmcs.gov>.

Click "log in" and use ID: IRP and Password: 20003.

Survey results will be used to assist us in bargaining.

INFORMATION REQUEST

Were you denied the opportunity to submit a request for classification review between the dates Feb. 1, 1999 and June 30, 1999? If you were, please contact Kathryn Plunkett, kplunkett@csu.edu.