WHAT IS HIGHER EDUCATION’S obligation to society as the economy slowly recovers from the Great Recession? What do we owe to millions of workers who remain suspended, the rug pulled out from under them, wondering where they will land as they replace their jobs, homes and savings, and rebuild their lives?

How do we keep the doors of opportunity open to the millions of young people for whom higher education is the launching pad to productive adulthood—a means to learn who they are, what they can do, and how they will pay their bills despite an economic future more uncertain than what their parents knew?

What do colleges and universities owe to businesses and legislatures? These entities have expectations for building a workforce, but they lack the will or resources to contribute to the cost.

Finally, what is the obligation of institutions of higher education—from community colleges to research universities—to provide sustainable jobs to their own frontline workers, the faculty and academic staff who have the most direct impact on student success?

This issue of AFT On Campus tackles some of these questions. In “Fueling Economic Growth” on page 2, economists Noah Berger and Peter Fisher show that an educated workforce has the greatest impact on a state’s economic prosperity over time. Depriving state coffers of revenues that are necessary to sustain public education undermines long-term goals for productivity.

Making sure students are able to complete college successfully and continue to the next step—more school or a job—is another area that has an impact on individuals and the economy. The Accelerated Study in Associate Programs, or ASAP, at the City University of New York’s two-year colleges is resulting in remarkable graduation rates for nontraditional students, as described in “Acing Community College,” on page 6, written by Ann Hulbert of The Atlantic. It shows the power of targeted interventions—such as small financial grants, and emotional and academic guidance—to keep adult students on their chosen paths.

Another major help for nontraditional students in career education would be protection from the abusive practices of some for-profit colleges. On page 14, policy analyst Ben Miller, of the New America Foundation, explains why the federal government must craft and enforce strong gainful employment regulations to rein in predatory for-profit programs.

Speaking of questionable practices, we cannot discuss employment in the United States without talking about higher education’s reliance on contingent faculty—and the havoc it wreaks on academics’ lives. In “Occupy Higher Education!” on page 9, CUNY’s Michael Fabricant issues a call to arms that will resonate for those who believe in the strength of unions to give voice to the disempowered. On page 10, we tell you more about what the AFT is doing to move in new directions on adjunct organizing.

It is a travesty that higher education institutions are crucial to feeding a full-employment economy, yet they are among the biggest exploiters of contingent workers, as Henry Ford Community College’s John McDonald points out in “Dirty Secrets,” on page 13. Such policies not only rob students, they undermine and dehumanize the instructors. You can read some of their stories on pages 10, 12 and 13.

The AFT believes that we must reject policies of austerity that lead to disinvesting in higher education and shifting the funding burden from the public sphere to the backs of students and contingent faculty. It’s time to reclaim the promise of affordable, high-quality higher education for the country.

—BARBARA McKENNA
A hand up is not a handout
RANIDI WEINGARTEN, President, American Federation of Teachers

AMERICANS LOVE THE NOTION that we can all pull ourselves up by the bootstraps. Yet in this time when millions of jobs have vanished in the United States, supports for struggling Americans are crumbling, and education budgets have been squeezed and slashed, we need to focus on another enduring American ideal—strengthening the rungs on the ladder of opportunity.

Rather than helping the millions of individuals and families who have been affected by the economic earthquakes that have reshaped the American economy, many GOP lawmakers are employing an alarming blend of spin and psychology to justify unraveling the social safety net. Their rationale? Extending unemployment benefits would be a “disservice” to jobless individuals, and the food stamp program encourages “dependency” and “discourages people from working.” Such logic ignores the millions of people who rely on assistance not because they are shirking work, but because they’re unable to find it. The troubling message is that aid for people in poverty or in crisis is a handout, not a hand up.

Let’s do a mini-lesson in critical thinking. Here’s a glossary of programs that many lawmakers love to hate. Let’s examine whether they are a drain on or a benefit to individuals, their families and our communities.

Unemployment insurance: There are currently more out-of-work job seekers than jobs being created, and many new jobs require new skills. Unemployment insurance is a lifeline for Americans looking for work as well as for their families. And it’s good for the economy. Unemployment insurance lifted an estimated 2.5 million people out of poverty in 2012 alone. One dollar of extended unemployment insurance pumps $1.49 back into the economy.

Food stamps: The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program helped 4 million people climb out of poverty in 2012 and kept millions from going hungry. And every $5 billion of food stamps generates up to $9 billion in economic activity.

Medicaid: The Affordable Care Act allows states to expand Medicaid coverage to many more low-income people, with the federal government picking up almost all of the costs. Not surprisingly, expanding Medicaid to cover low-income adults reduces mortality and improves access to care, particularly preventive care, which lowers healthcare costs. Yet 25 states, cheered on by the Tea Party, have refused to expand coverage.

Pre-K: High-quality early learning programs help close the school readiness gap for disadvantaged children and lead to greater literacy, decreased need for special education services and increased high school graduation rates. At-risk children who attend high-quality early learning programs have been shown to have increased employment as adults and higher lifetime earnings, as well as reduced incarceration and less need for social welfare programs. Every dollar spent on high-quality programs produces long-term savings of at least $7.

Minimum wage: Raising the federal minimum wage to $10.10 by 2016 would restore it to roughly the same inflation-adjusted value it had in the late 1960s, according to the Economic Policy Institute. Such an increase would raise the wages of 27.8 million workers, and grow gross domestic product by about $22 billion, resulting in the creation of roughly 85,000 net new jobs.

Paid sick leave: Paid sick leave offers economic benefits by reducing workforce turnover, increasing productivity and lowering healthcare costs. And the health and societal benefits are priceless. Paid leave is a lifeline for female workers in particular, 42 million of whom are in poverty or on the brink, and for the 28 million children who depend on them.

Retirement: Half of American households have less than $3,000 in retirement savings, and those near retirement have less than $12,000. Many have none. Social Security provides more than 90 percent of retirement income for a quarter of married couples and almost half of unmarried people. Yet rather than confront our retirement insecurity problem, states are making it worse by cutting public sector pensions.

Union membership: The decline in unionization is directly related to the decline of the middle class, stagnant wages and rising income inequality in America. Workers’ pay is higher when they’re in a union, and they have greater access to health insurance and retirement benefits.

The shifts in our economy have shown how easy it is to fall into poverty and how hard it is to climb out. But this decline is not inevitable and it is not irreversible. The policies described above, including a strong labor movement, are rungs on America’s ladder of opportunity. They should be strengthened, not destroyed.
Fueling Economic Growth

A well-educated workforce is key to state prosperity

BY NOAH BERGER AND PETER FISHER

HISTORICALLY, U.S. ECONOMIC growth and prosperity have been achieved through an implicit partnership of federal, state and local governments, a partnership that worked astonishingly well for a period after World War II.

The federal government provided overall economic stability and sought to ensure that the economy never veered too far from full employment. State and local governments assumed primary responsibility for the education system, which produced a more skilled and productive workforce. Federal and state governments invested both in infrastructure, and in basic research that provided enormous long-term benefits for the private sector. The end result was a long period of postwar productivity growth, the prerequisite for growth in the standard of living.

During the 1970s and 1980s, state and local governments across the country became convinced that they should play a more aggressive and expansive role in economic policy. Economic development became accepted as a major function of state and local government, and came to mean the direct promotion of private investment within the borders of a state or city. This led to escalating competition for a limited supply of private capital investment through increasingly generous incentive packages.

As public resources are squandered on unproductive state efforts to capture private investment at the expense of other states, it becomes more difficult to fund the kind of education system innovations needed to raise U.S. educational performance up to the levels of other advanced industrial societies.

State economic development wars squander resources

While cutting costs to business has become the principal focus of economic development policy in many states, more and more states are cutting programs across the spectrum to lower state taxes. In many cases, these ideas are promoted as a way to attract employers from other states—to steal jobs by offering incentives to business leaders.

But evidence has shown that, in the long run, these strategies are inefficient and ineffective. State and local taxes on business are simply too small a share of total business costs to play a significant role in location decisions; other factors—labor skills, wages,
access to inputs and markets—are much more important. Yet business tax breaks are expensive, and they take money from investments in education and infrastructure that increase productivity and support growth.

As public resources are squandered on unproductive state efforts to capture private investment at the expense of other states, it becomes more difficult to fund the kind of education system innovations needed to raise U.S. educational performance to the levels of other advanced industrial societies. Furthermore, investments in public research universities are important to enhancing the nation’s rate of innovation as the products of basic research are spun off in new private ventures, and to maintaining or recapturing our leadership role in new technologies. Inadequate investments in education weaken the ability of a state to develop, grow and attract businesses that offer high-skill, high-wage jobs.

Strong state education systems are not just good for the national economy; they are good for the citizens of the state. Ultimately, state economic policies seek to improve the lives of the people in the state, which means creating conditions in which people can get jobs that pay enough to support a family and provide economic security. This leads to a virtuous cycle, as working people who can afford to buy goods and services support local businesses and the local economy.

**More education vs. low taxes:**

**What the research shows**

What can state governments do to boost the economic well-being of their people? That is the central question of state economic policy. We believe—and our research shows—that education investment, not low taxes, is key to state prosperity.

When we look at data from across the country, two clear conclusions emerge:

- There is no correlation between the overall level of taxation in a state and the ability of the economy to support high-wage jobs; and
- There is a very strong correlation between how well-educated a state workforce is and the ability of the economy to support high-wage jobs.

Looking at Figure 1’s graph of overall tax levels and median earnings (a measure of wages that includes both hourly and salaried employees), one might suspect that there are just too many differences among states to see a clear correlation on any one variable.
It turns out, however, that when we look at how well-educated a state workforce is, Figure 2, we see an extremely strong correlation with economic strength: States with a well-educated workforce have higher median wages than states with a less educated workforce.

Overwhelmingly, high-wage states are states that have a well-educated workforce. There are virtually no outliers: There are no states with a well-educated workforce that don’t have relatively high median wages, and there are no states, with the exception of Alaska and Wyoming (which have resource-based economies very different from the rest of America), that have high wages and a poorly educated workforce.

To some degree, this finding is simply stating the obvious. We know that individuals with higher levels of education will generally earn higher wages (see Figure 3), and it makes sense that what is true for each worker would be true for the workforce overall.

In our modern economy, employers who pay good wages generally need well-trained and better-educated workers. By improving the overall level of education of its workforce, a state can increase the productivity of firms in its economy. That allows firms to increase both profits and wages. As economist Timothy Bartik has shown, an increase in labor supply increases labor demand, because additional labor attracts employers, and additional higher-skilled labor attracts

---

**THE JOBS FORECAST: TROUBLE AHEAD**

Job growth and education requirements through 2020

**BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT:**

- **36 percent** of the job openings will not require education beyond high school.
- **35 percent** of the job openings will require at least a bachelor’s degree.
- **30 percent** of the job openings will require some college or an associate degree.

**In 70 percent of all occupations, math knowledge is either very important or extremely important to success.**

There will be **55 million job openings** in the economy through 2020: 24 million openings from newly created jobs and **31 million openings due to baby boomer retirements.**

The United States will fall short by **5 million workers** with postsecondary education, at the current production rate, **by 2020.**

**SOURCE:** “Recovery: Job Growth and Education Requirements through 2020,” Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce (2013); cew.georgetown.edu/recovery2020.
employers with more skilled jobs.

Ultimately, the wealth of a society can increase only if the economy becomes more productive. A more productive economy can support both higher wages and higher profits, as well as shorter work weeks and a better quality of life. So the question of how to increase productivity needs to be at the center of any debate about state economic development.

**Why are states shortsighted?**

As obvious as this fact is, education often receives less attention in state economic policy discussions than do taxes, regulations and business incentives. Why? In part, it could be that states seek quick fixes, and building a well-educated workforce can require a long-term commitment. But there’s another reason why education may not be receiving the attention in state economic development debates that the data suggests it should: The pattern we see today, where there is an extremely strong correlation between the level of education of a workforce and the wages of the people in that state, is relatively new. As recently as the late 1970s, many of our highest-wage states had very few workers with college degrees.

In the 70s, states with heavy industry and strong unions had high-wage economies with good jobs for many workers regardless of their level of education. But in today’s world, states that want to build strong, high-wage economies cannot ignore the importance of providing all their people with the opportunity to receive a high-quality education (and the related supports all children need to reach their full potential).

At the national level, there are a number of policies that can raise wages across the board: appropriate fiscal policies during periods of underemployment, equitable labor laws that allow workers to organize, trade policies that aim to raise living standards in the United States and abroad, and regulatory policies that protect our economy. But very few of these tools are available to state governments. States can enforce labor standards, like minimum wage laws and sick leave provisions, that make life significantly better for lower-wage workers and have a modest positive effect on the overall economy. But along with those steps that can improve the lives of working people immediately, states can build long-term economic strength by investing in strategies that improve the education, skills and productivity of all of their people.

Providing expanded access to high-quality education and related supports, particularly for those young people who today lack such access, will not only expand economic opportunity for those individuals, but will also likely do more to strengthen the overall state economy than anything else a state government can do.

**References**


The question of **how to increase productivity** needs to be at the center of any debate about state economic development.
When Daquan McGee got accepted to the Borough of Manhattan Community College in the spring of 2010, he was 19 and still finding his footing after a two-year prison sentence for attempted robbery. He signed up for the standard battery of placement tests in reading, writing and math; took them cold; and failed two—writing and math. Steered into summer developmental education (otherwise known as remediation), he enrolled in an immersion writing course, which he passed while working full time at a Top Tomato Super Store. Then McGee learned of a program for which a low-income student like him might qualify, designed to maximize his chances of earning a degree. At a late-summer meeting, he got the rundown on the demands he would face.

McGee would have to enroll full time in the fall, he was told; part-time attendance was not permitted. Every other week, he would be required to meet with his adviser, who would help arrange his schedule and track his progress. In addition to his full course load, McGee would have to complete his remaining remedial class, in math, immediately. If he slipped up, his adviser would hear about it from his instructor—and mandatory tutoring sessions would follow. If he failed, he would have to retake the class right away. Also on McGee’s schedule was a non-optional, noncredit weekly College Success Seminar, featuring time-management strategies, tips on study habits and goal setting, exercises in effective communication, and counsel on other life skills. The instructor would be taking attendance. If McGee complied with all that was asked of him, he would be eligible for a monthly drill: lining up in one of the hallways in the main campus building to receive a free, unlimited MetroCard good for the following month. More important, as long as he stayed on track, the portion of his tuition not already covered by financial aid would be waived.

In a hurry to make up for his wasted prison years, McGee signed up. The pace, as he’d been warned, was fast from the start, and did not ease up after the fall. McGee, a guy with a stocky, boxer’s build, doesn’t gush—he conveys low-key composure—but when I met him in October 2012, early in his third year, he had only praise for the unremitting pushiness, and for the array of financial benefits that came along with it. The package was courtesy of a promising experimental initiative that goes by the snappy acronym ASAP, short for Accelerated Study in Associate Programs. Last winter, McGee graduated with an associate degree in multimedia studies. It had taken him 2½ years.
Committing to completion

In the community college world, McGee’s achievement is a shockingly rare feat, and the program that so intently encouraged him to accomplish it is a striking anomaly. The country’s low-cost sub-baccalaureate system—created a century ago to provide an open and affordable entry into higher education to an ever more diverse group of Americans—now enrolls 45 percent of all U.S. undergraduates, many of them part-time students. But only a fraction ever earn a degree, and hardly anyone does it quickly.

The associate degree is nominally a two-year credential, and the system is proud of its transfer function, sending students onward to four-year schools, as juniors, to pursue a bachelor’s degree—the goal that 80 percent of entrants say they aspire to. Reality, however, typically confounds that tidy percentage of entrants say they aspire to. In urban community colleges like the Borough of Manhattan Community College, the national three-year graduation rate is 16 percent. Nationwide, barely more than a third of community college enrollees emerge with a certificate or degree within six years. Behind these dismal numbers lie the best of intentions. Community colleges have made it their mission to offer easy access, flexibility and lots of options to a commuter population now dominated by “non-traditional” students.

If anything, with enthusiasm rising for massive open online courses, or MOOCs, the higher education pendulum is now swinging further in this direction. The current interest in “competency-based learning”—liberating students to earn degrees not by amassing credit hours but by preparing for assessments of particular skills at whatever pace and by whichever route they choose—is part of the same trend. Some reformers see the seeds of a revolution in college education, promising ultraconvenient, self-guided, low-cost courses of study for everyone. The “beginning of the unbundling of the American university” is how one observer has described the transformation. All it will take for students to avail themselves of this emerging opportunity is a clear sense of where they’re headed, lots of self-motivation, and good access to information about what mix of skills is likely to lead to a promising career.

And therein, of course, lies the problem.

If you stop and think about it, the existing postsecondary educational hierarchy could hardly be more perverse. Students at the bottom, whose life histories and social disadvantages make them the most likely to need clear guidance and structure, receive astonishingly little of either. Meanwhile, students at the super-selective top, prodded toward high ambitions and disciplined habits by attentive parents and teachers ever since preschool, encounter solicitous oversight every step of the way.

In 2009, President Obama announced his American Graduation Initiative, calling on community colleges in particular to boost their completion rates. Yet a burgeoning array of efforts to help struggling students over this or that hump has, for the most part, delivered disappointing answers. Despite lots of pilot programs that have produced small, short-term boosts (marginally more students passing remedial courses or persisting for another semester), graduation rates so far have barely budged.

The implicit philosophy behind the program is simple: Students, especially the least prepared ones, don’t just need to learn math or science; they need to learn how to navigate academic and institutional challenges more broadly, and how to plot a course—daily, weekly, monthly—toward long-term success.

The associate degree is nominally a two-year program intended primarily for low-income students with moderate remedial needs, and a third of the students attempting it are being pushed back out as late as their third year. The program’s top administrator described to me as “insane”—a three-year graduation rate of 50 percent—and according to the university’s own data, the program has exceeded it. The social-policy research organization MDRC (formerly the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation), which began an independent study of the program in 2010, calls ASAP’s record “unparalleled.” Researchers randomly assigned the study participants to either ASAP or the regular community college track, and while three-year results won’t be ready until this summer, preliminary outcomes, just released, show the ASAP students to be dramatically outstripping the control group on every count—persistence, credits earned and graduation rates. A third of the students who enrolled in ASAP in the spring of 2010 finished in 2½ years (compared with 18 percent of the control group). Nationwide, that’s the proportion of all community college students who emerge with a credential in six years.

The secret of ASAP’s success lies outside the classroom. The program enlists extra tutors and caps some classes at 25 students, but otherwise doesn’t touch pedagogy. Instead it aims to counter the community college culture of early exits and erratic stops and starts. ASAP is designed to instill, and make it possible to fulfill, the expectation that college will be a continuous, full-time commitment, just as it is for traditional, four-year students on leafy quads. Timing matters: Miss out on getting a postsecondary credential by 26, and your odds of ever earning one drop.

ASAP offers lots of guidance, a dose of goading and a variety of well-timed incentives to its participants (average age at admission: 21), who must sign on to the goal of graduating within three years. The program is intended primarily for low-income students with moderate remedial needs, and it accepts applicants on a first-come, first-served basis. By next fall, ASAP expects to enroll more than 4,000 students. [Editor’s note: The Professional Staff Congress, the union representing faculty and staff at CUNY, has gone to the state capitol to argue for resources to expand the ASAP approach across the system.]

The implicit philosophy behind the program is simple: Students, especially the least
prepared ones, don’t just need to learn math or science; they need to learn how to navigate academic and institutional challenges more broadly, and how to plot a course—daily, weekly, monthly—toward long-term success. Pushy parents, an asset many of them don’t have, could tell you what it takes to make that happen: a mix of enabling and persistent nudging.

Lesley Leppert-McKeever, who has directed the Borough of Manhattan Community Colleges ASAP program from the start, summed up the message to students this way: “Look, if you do your part, we’ll do our part, and together we’ll be able to meet your target.”

ASAP advisers presume that building habits of engagement takes concerted effort. It’s not just that students are stretched thin by family and work demands. Many also lack college-savvy guidance at home, or past school experience to draw on.

ASAP’s structure and no-nonsense style invite accusations of paternalism—precisely what community colleges have been eager to avoid in the college-for-all era. Yet the prevailing model, a Chinese-menus-style panoply of options without any real guidance, has not empowered academically insecure students; it has failed them. Good information, well-structured expectations, timely counsel, confidence-instilling directives—these are essential ingredients of education, and they are all the more important for marginal students and for those blazing a trail to college for the first time in their family’s history. ASAP sets out to take students’ college goals seriously, and to help equip its participants to take those goals seriously as well. The program’s ethos of persistence is contagious. “There’s definitely a shift, different for every student,” Leppert-McKeever told me, “when suddenly an immature, unfocused student gets more serious.”

ASAP isn’t cheap—the program spends roughly $3,900 annually per student, on top of the $9,800 that the CUNY community college system spends on each of its full-time students every year—but if you calculate expenditures per student who actually graduates, it saves money. The program isn’t cutting-edge either, except in delivering unprecedented completion rates. Scaling up such a comprehensive effort would be a challenge, and full-time college, of course, is never going to be for everyone. Yet at a moment when proponents of “disruptive” technology are promising a transformation of higher education, ASAP offers a different path, based on the premise that disruptions on the way to degrees are exactly what students at lower-tier schools need to avoid. If America is serious about being an opportunity society, Daquan McGee and students like him deserve the advantages of the old, steady way of going to college and starting on their careers.
American Federation of Teachers
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BY MICHAEL FABRICANT

OVER THE PAST TWO DECADES, scorch-and-burn policy directed at higher education, K-12 schooling and healthcare has intensified.

Policymakers have promulgated a series of initiatives intended not only to starve but to monetize public services. What this means, in part, is that market-faith-based political ideology dominates policy decision-making.

In the present fiscal and political moment, public services are ever more likely to become centers of profit-making. From charter schools to profit-making hospitals to Phoenix University, the evidence is clear. As historic rates of profit are more difficult to achieve outside of ever-riskier speculative bubbles, the gaze of private entrepreneurs searching for new zones of opportunity has increasingly focused on the public purse—and specifically on public education, which in the United States alone represents $600 billion of potential revenue.

The labor force left behind in these starved public institutions is expected to shoulder more and more responsibility for less and less pay, professional development and hope of making a difference. It is within this context that the role of part-time faculty in public higher education must be understood. Part-timers are the very cheap labor force necessary to sustain starved public higher education institutions.

A brief history of part-time faculty labor

The experience of the City University of New York, situated within a global city, is representative of trends within public higher education both nationally and internationally. Before the fiscal crisis in New York City, the number of part-time faculty at CUNY was relatively small. These instructors largely filled niche positions, either teaching courses that required a very specialized expertise not otherwise available, or providing, as a distinguished writer, artist or practitioner, a perspective critical to disciplinary discourse. Individually and collectively, these faculty often were not eligible for permanent positions because they lacked academic credentials.

Clearly, the needs they filled continue to exist and drive a share of the demand for part-time faculty labor. However, the rapid expansion of part-time faculty labor during the past 40 years cannot be ascribed to this rather narrow set of needs and demands.

The second stage in the evolution of the part-time faculty labor force has coincided with the growing fiscal crisis of public universities. Recent accommodation to the starvation of public education has resulted in an intensified exploitation of instructional labor through lower hourly pay, few (if any) benefits and little job security, as contrasted with full-time faculty. For CUNY—an urban system of two- and four-year colleges, professional and graduate schools, and research institutes—this intensified exploitation has resulted in a 60 percent increase in part-time faculty during the past 13 years. Presently, these contingent workers are teaching more than 50 percent of the courses at CUNY.

Michael Fabricant is a professor of social welfare at Hunter College of the City University of New York and treasurer of the Professional Staff Congress. This article is adapted from "The 21st Century Gold Rush: The Plunder of Public Assets and a Radically Restructured Teaching Labor Force," from the September 2013 issue of Working USA.
IN THE WINTER OF 2006, I was an adjunct English professor at a university in Fairbanks, Alaska, with a baby due at the beginning of the spring semester. If I needed to take maternity leave, it would be unpaid. But the choice that I faced—either care for my newborn and go broke, or keep teaching—was never really a choice. At 27, I was a college professor on food stamps.

In 2003, my husband Alex and I built our own house on land we’d bought for cheap. Three years later, the house was still unfinished, but it was dry and warm, and we had nowhere else to live. Alex was working full time and trying to finish the house. I was teaching and taking care of two kids under 3. After Adelaide was born and I couldn’t work, we ran out of cash for gas and groceries. We decided to apply for food stamps. We relied on them for part of 2006, but as soon as the next semester started, I went back to teaching.

Growing up, I always thought teaching at a university was a “good” job, with security and respect. But in my experience, adjunct professors are underpaid, receive no benefits, have no job security and get very little respect. The majority of college classes nationwide are taught by adjuncts.

Being an adjunct professor means that I’m only ever hired for the length of one college semester, and, after 10 years of teaching, I’m paid $4,000 per course I teach. My potential for promotion is nonexistent. So are my benefits. I work days, nights and weekends—grading, planning, teaching—and Alex and I trade off watching the kids.

Today, I’m still an adjunct professor, but I don’t feel as helpless as I did a few years ago. As for Alex, he received a grant from the Rasmuson Foundation for emerging artists, which enabled him to establish his own design studio, AlexMetalArts. In November, his work was included in an exhibition at a local gallery. For the moment, we can pay our bills. Maybe one day we’ll even get to take a vacation.

Kate Quick is an adjunct professor who lives in Fairbanks, Alaska, and teaches at the University of Alaska, where she is a member of United Academic Adjuncts/APEA/AFT-AAUP. These comments are excerpted from a column published in the Huffington Post on Jan. 24, 2014.

The time is now for organizing contingent faculty

Heartening developments on Capitol Hill and in the nation

DESPITE DECADES of agitation, action and organizing, the problems of a higher education workforce that is now predominantly contingent outrun union advocates’ ability to keep up with organizing demands. The AFT represents the largest number of adjunct, part-time and nontenure-track faculty—more than 100,000—and is charting a plan that will lead organizing efforts in new directions.

At the January meeting of the AFT’s Higher Education program and policy council in Washington, D.C., the stories of disillusioned yet still passionately committed adjuncts informed every aspect of the discussion. Nationally, the higher education division is analyzing the results of a Hart Research Associates survey of part-time/adjunct faculty priorities and needs. In Philadelphia, it is organizing a corps of 15,000 adjuncts who teach in a 30-mile area that includes 43 colleges and universities.

There have been other recent developments that are heartening. On Jan. 24, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce released “The Just-in-Time Professor,” a report compiled by the committee’s senior Democrat from California, Rep. George Miller. He held an online e-forum to collect information and adjunct experiences, and heard from more than 800 people. The report is the first official acknowledgement by a congressional committee that the academic staffing crisis in higher education is severe. Adjuncts do not have the time and resources they need for things like adequate class preparation and office hours. “What is especially troubling is the clear link the report makes between the exploitation of adjuncts and the quality of education that college students receive,” notes AFT President Randi Weingarten.

Also in January, the New Faculty Majority, a coalition of faculty and academic organizations, held a research briefing on Capitol Hill, which AFT leaders attended. It presented results from the Delphi Project on the effect on students of a workforce that is more than 70 percent contingent, when graduate employees are factored in.

AFT leaders are committed to moving in new directions to strengthen the voice and reach of this essential part of our workforce, says PPC Co-Chair Sandra Schroeder, who is an AFT vice president and past president of AFT Washington. This will occur through organizing, advocacy, greater participation on the union’s governance boards, community outreach, and deeper communication about the impact on workers and students of failing to invest in the academic workforce.
movement, which will deploy more and more part-time faculty in profit-making sites. The ascent of virtual learning, and the consequent packaging and transmission of courses to growing audiences through Moocs (massive online open courses), represent a next stage of development for higher education. This third movement will likely place an increasing number of part-time faculty outside the formal university, join their work more explicitly to profit-making, and structure their instruction to follow standardized Mooc curricula.

It is within this context that virtual learning in starved public universities will likely produce greater concentrations of part-time faculty laboring under the degraded conditions of standardized curricula, increased class sizes, and diminished time to initiate or sustain contact with students.

The consequent organizing dilemmas
Perhaps the single most important issue facing public higher education is the cheapening of its labor force and the reduced quality of classroom instruction. For unions, changing that reality requires us to address three organizing dilemmas.

1. How can part-time faculty create alliances with full-time faculty when their interests appear to be so disparate? Moral invective, exhortation and/or critique will not be effective in either the short or long term. Falling wages and diminished job security will continue as long as management can exploit vulnerable and cheapened academic labor. Relationships have to be built, deepened and extended over the long term based on shared interests. This organizing work requires learning how to engage across experiences, especially for more privileged full-time or tenure-track faculty. Consequently, a primary task for full-time faculty is to learn how to listen to and engage with part-timers, and anticipate impediments as well as construct a shared agenda for change.

2. How can part-time faculty build collectivity given the press of individual survival needs? Organizing requires time and space. How does one find the time to build political power in the midst of running from course to course?
The exploitation of part-time faculty labor has been accompanied by rapid increases in tuition, often especially affecting very poor students of color.

course, trying to scrape together the money to meet housing, food and healthcare needs, without job security? And how does one deal with the depletion of energy often leeching from alliances with authority figures who manage course distribution? Organizing requires robust relationships. How can those relationships be built, given this press of time and the reality of part-time faculty hurtling through the space of multiple course assignments in different places? Organizing requires optimism; however, cynicism about the prospects of collectivity or unions is persistent. How might we use new forms of technology to engage part-time workers, collectivize their experience virtually and, in turn, reinvent union organizing? Equally important, how can we build strategically toward selected movement events that will be successful in creating both the evidence and the hope that collective action will improve the circumstances of part-time faculty?

3. How do we build alliances outside the university at a moment when every other part of the nonprofit and public sector world is burdened with intensifying austerity? The Occupy Wall Street movement pointed us in the right direction. Redressing inequality and redistributing concentrated private dollars into job creation and livable wages through the commons must be at the heart of our shared political agenda. Greater investment in healthcare, education, infrastructure construction and the development of green industries through redistributive tax policies must be at the center of the struggle.

In the absence of such redistribution and investment in the economy, labor in and outside the academy will continue to be marginalized, and the present crisis of diminished demand and expansive debt will only intensify. The organizing work locally, nationally and globally must emphasize not only the sense of progressive taxation but also the particular ways in which it can benefit the 99 percent.

Clearly, this is not an exhaustive listing of our organizing dilemmas. No simple answer exists for how to build part-time faculty power. There must be many organizing conversations between full- and part-time faculty to build a web of relationships and identify which issues represent the best beginning points for launching a campaign. Full- and part-time academics and sanitation workers, people of color and white folks, public workers and those we serve, must cohere into a single fighting force.

Our political project must, in large part, involve enlarging informal and formal activist networks, thus bolstering our sectarian union fight, while searching for ways to expand campaigns into a social movement. This can be done by joining with other workers—not out of an abstract solidarity, but out of a deeply felt understanding that job insecurity, declining wages, cannibalization of public services and heightened vulnerability are widely shared experiences. The attack is not simply on the academy or even the public sphere, it is on every worker.
Dirty secrets

The appalling irony of adjuncts’ role in higher education

BY JOHN MCDONALD

THE EXPLOITATION of adjunct faculty has long been higher education’s dirty little secret. Less noticed is that it is an appalling irony.

Truth be told, the “dirty secret” hasn’t been “little” for some time. At most public institutions, adjunct faculty are responsible for 50 to 70 percent of the instruction taking place.

AFT surveys indicate that fully one-third of adjunct faculty rely on several low-wage, no-benefit appointments to survive. This percentage is certainly much higher for many adjuncts at many colleges. In fact, the workloads of adjunct/part-time faculty often amount to a full-time position and more, with many teaching multiple sections at two, three, four and, yes, even five institutions.

Rep. George Miller (D-Calif.) and the House Committee on Education and the Workforce recently released “The Just-In-Time Professor,” a report on the pay and conditions of adjunct faculty. The story it captures, complete with heart-rending testimony from adjuncts, means the dirty secret is out.

Miller’s report also identifies a “paradox”: The federal government and many states are calling for—and students are seeking—education that will prepare students for middle-class, secure careers and opportunities for advancement. That ultimate goal is precisely what is denied the adjunct faculty who are expected to provide these students such education and opportunity.

Aside from the immense challenges adjunct faculty face in providing students a high-quality education, aside from research that shows student persistence and retention is enhanced by faculty who are afforded the time and professional compensation to mentor as well as instruct students, aside from all this—what message is being sent to students about the value of the hard work that education entails, about the possibility of economic advancement and social mobility, and about the liberating value of education?

What message is being sent when the faculty teaching these students have pursued advanced degrees, mastered pedagogy, kept current in their fields, and struggled to conduct research and publish, yet are paid subsistence wages or worse and are denied benefits, job security, true professional standing and any semblance of a career ladder?

Perhaps worst of all, we must acknowledge the appalling fact that the exploitation has put the burden of higher education’s funding deficits onto the backs of adjuncts.

For decades, state funding of higher education has plummeted. As a consequence, tuition and student debt have soared, as have the numbers and misuse of adjunct faculty.

The exploitation has put the burden of higher education’s funding deficits onto the backs of adjuncts.

Thanks to AFT efforts over the years—and to Rep. Miller—light is being shed on the “dirty big secret” and appalling irony of exploited adjunct faculty. It is in our students’ interest, our profession’s interest and the nation’s interest that this light becomes political heat.

WHEN I WAS PROMOTED from part-time to full-time academic work, naturally I was elated. No poor person is going to decline a near doubling of his or her wages. But emotionally, I went into a state of shock that persisted for over a year.

What I was feeling was the moral exhaustion of my poverty washing over me, all of its toxins released into my system at once, to be finally washed out of my bloodstream. All those terrible lies I told myself to sustain myself through years of iniquitous suffering—lies I told so I could face my colleagues and my family, and so I could do the work that was destroying me—all those lies were called out at once, and the second I was no longer poor, I had the strength to see what poverty is.

No college has to be a factory that assembles poor people. No college has to create a class of near-homeless professors, of trembling shadow people, deflated in their self-esteem, and racked by feelings of defeat and worthlessness—men and women who are ashamed of what they are, ashamed to admit to the students who rely on them that they are cut from cardboard, ashamed to admit they are village beggars in a charming stage production where they pretend to be the leaders of classrooms. Colleges that pay starvation wages engineer broken families and the spiritual collapse of otherwise productive people.

Oppression isn’t economical or efficient. The societal costs of inequality, and inequality of opportunity, are towering, but regrettable there are people in America who believe poverty is a good in itself, worth perpetuating regardless of its price in human lives.

I am very happy now, and grateful to be spared that senseless suffering, but that only means I can see the horror of adjunct life more plainly than I was able to before.

Mario Hernandez is a lecturer at the State University of New York at Cortland, a member of the United University Professions/NYSUT/AFT and a former adjunct faculty member who lives in Lansing, N.Y. These comments are an excerpt from a statement read at a New Faculty Majority briefing for congressional staff in Washington, D.C., Jan. 24, 2014.

John McDonald is president of Henry Ford Community College Federation of Teachers and an AFT vice president.
BRANDON ENROLLED in a medical assistant program at Sanford-Brown College in 2009 in the hopes of becoming a laboratory technician. All it took was a quick Internet form, a phone call and an interview, and he was on his way. But the program was not the launching pad he expected. After what he described in public comments as “long nights of work that were, needless to say, not challenging at all,” Brandon eventually completed his program in good standing. But no jobs were forthcoming, and the loans he borrowed for school grew to $25,000. Discouraged, Brandon ended up in the distribution center of a shipping service, indebted and without a job in his field of study.

Unfortunately, too many career-oriented postsecondary programs are producing thousands of students like Brandon, people with significant debt and little in the way of promised career or economic returns. And U.S. taxpayers are helping to foot the bill through the billions of dollars in federal student grants and loans these programs receive each year.

The Obama administration and the U.S. Department of Education are working on regulations that would turn off the federal spigot for career programs that load students up with unaffordable levels of debt. Known informally as “gainful employment,” these regulations would rely on the actual earnings and debt levels of graduates, as well as the default rate of federal student loan borrowers, to judge whether postsecondary programs should continue participating in the federal student aid programs. They apply to not-for-profit as well as for-profit programs.

The gainful employment regulations would affect bad career training programs throughout higher education, but such programs appear to be disproportionately present in the for-profit sector. All told, these schools receive almost $26 billion a year in federal grants and loans. In exchange, 1 out of every 5 borrowers from a for-profit college defaults on his or her loans within three years of entering repayment. These colleges account for nearly half of all loan defaulters during the same time period. Over the long term, the department projects that 48 percent of the dollars it lends to two-year for-profits will end up in default. For these students, the promise of a better life through education turns out to be a series of significant financial penalties, ruined credit and a debt that will be nearly impossible to get rid of, even in bankruptcy.

Actual earnings and debt information for thousands of programs released by the de-
partment illustrate just how big a need there is for greater accountability for career programs. There are more than 2,000 programs where the average graduate had student loan debt but did not earn enough money to keep a family of two out of poverty; 90 percent of these are at for-profit colleges. Students who did all that was expected of them and earned a postsecondary credential should not find themselves struggling to cover bare essentials.

**Standing up for students**

Producing gainful employment regulations that successfully address these problems is not a given. The department tried to issue similar regulations in 2011, releasing a weak rule that made significant concessions to a well-funded and hard-fought opposition effort funded by the for-profit college industry and employing some of the most expensive lobbying firms in Washington. Even that watered-down rule still prompted a lawsuit by the for-profit colleges’ trade association. A federal judge agreed with the industry on technical grounds, but noted that the department still had the authority to regulate in this space. “Concerned about inadequate programs and unscrupulous institutions, the Department has gone looking for rats in rat holes—as the statute empowers it to do,” the judge wrote.

So far, the department has used the opportunity to redo the gainful employment rule to craft a smarter regulation. The latest public proposal unveiled in December 2013 would cause programs with the worst results to lose eligibility to offer federal student loans and grants more quickly than the original rule, and would require those with middling outcomes to improve over time or also become ineligible. It would also have failing programs provide debt relief for students, an idea never included in the first set of regulations.

But there’s a long way to go before the regulations are finalized. And pushback against gainful employment is already starting to ramp up among some members of the House of Representatives and in the op-ed pages of the *Wall Street Journal*. With future work on the regulation occurring in private within the department, expect both the public and behind-the-scenes pressure to increase over the coming months. How the administration reacts to this pressure will have significant implications for protecting thousands, if not millions, of students across the country.

---

**DEBT-END STUDY**

**WHY STUDENTS NEED TOUGH PROTECTIONS FROM FOR-PROFITS**

**MANY STUDENTS WHO ENROLL FAIL TO COMPLETE LEAVING THE COLLEGE WITH TAXPAYER MONEY AND THE STUDENTS WITH DEBT**

**Percentage of 2011-2012 Undergraduates with Any Student Loan Debt**

- Public: 37%
- Private Nonprofit: 21%
- Private For-Profit: 46%

**FOR-PROFITS PROVIDE PREPARATION FOR LOW-PAYING JOBS NOT CAREERS**

**FOR-PROFITS HAVE A DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE OF LOAN BORROWERS AND DEFAULTERS**

- 13% of students
- 31% of loan borrowers
- 46% of loan defaulters

**FOR-PROFIT COLLEGE STUDENTS TAKE ON MORE DEBT AT HIGHER AMOUNTS WITH LESS LIKELIHOOD OF MAKING REPAYMENTS**

- Percentage of 2011-2012 Undergraduates with Any Student Loan Debt
  - Public: 49%
  - Private Nonprofit: 70%
  - Private For-Profit: 85%

**THE SOLUTION: TOUGHER REGULATIONS, KNOWN AS “GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT”**

**SOURCE:** New America analysis of U.S. Department of Education data, courtesy of Ben Miller; Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS); “2011-12 National Postsecondary Students Aid Study,” NCES; “Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study,” NCES (2009).
UI-CHICAGO FACULTY HOLD TWO-DAY CONTRACT STRIKE Its patience worn thin after 18 months of bargaining, the University of Illinois at Chicago United Faculty union held a two-day strike Feb. 18-19. The union, which is jointly affiliated with the AFT, the Illinois Federation of Teachers and the American Association of University Professors, comprises two units—one with 725 full-time tenure-track faculty and the other with 425 nontenure-track faculty. It gained recognition in 2012. The key unresolved issue is wages, says UICUF President Joseph Persky, especially for the 70 nontenure-track faculty who currently earn $30,000 a year. The union has proposed a minimum of $45,000 for those faculty. The union is also fighting to give nontenure-track faculty a greater voice in their departments. “We’re looking to make them real active members of their departments, as opposed to being treated like academic gypsies,” Persky told the Chicago Sun-Times. The strike has drawn national attention because it is the first one in decades at a research institution, and because the faculty have so clearly made the connection between the welfare of nontenure-track faculty and that of tenure-track faculty.

A REPRIEVE IN CALIFORNIA A San Francisco Superior Court judge has granted a preliminary injunction to prevent the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges from withdrawing the accreditation of the City College of San Francisco, which would have been effective July 31, 2014. On Jan. 2, Judge Curtis E. A. Karnow ruled on several motions in lawsuits brought by the California Federation of Teachers and AFT Local 2121 (which represents faculty at CCSF), and by San Francisco City Attorney Dennis Herrera. The judge granted Herrera’s motion that the disaccreditation decision be withdrawn while a legal case against ACCJC proceeds through the court—a process likely to extend well beyond July 31. The judge wrote both that the City Attorney’s case had a chance of prevailing and that the harm done to city residents by allowing ACCJC’s ultimate sanction to go forward would be “catastrophic”: “Without accreditation the College would almost certainly close and about 80,000 students would either lose their educational opportunities or hope to transfer elsewhere; and for many of them, the transfer option is not realistic. The impact on the teachers, faculty, and the City would be incalculable, in both senses of the term: The impact cannot be calculated, and it would be extreme.”

CFT President Joshua Pechthalt speaks to press after the Dec. 26 Superior Court hearing.

On Feb. 11, a member of San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors introduced a resolution calling on California Community College Chancellor Brice Harris to restore CCSF’s democratically elected board of trustees. The chancellor replaced the board last July and appointed a Special Trustee with Extraordinary Powers—who has the power to hold closed-door meetings and grant raises to administrators while other employees get pay cuts.

HIGHER ED LEADERS TALK RATINGS WITH DUNCAN AFT higher education local leaders, in Washington, D.C., for an AFT program and policy council meeting Jan. 23, sat down with U.S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan and some of his staff to share observations from faculty and academic staff regarding the Obama administration’s latest policy idea—a national rating system that ties federal financial aid distribution to institutional performance. Former AFT Washington President Sandra Schroeder, who is an AFT vice president, expressed the “grave concerns” of her members about the plan, which many fear will reward the affluent and hurt underserved students. President Obama unveiled his proposal last summer. The U.S. Department of Education would collect data on factors such as graduation rates, graduate earnings, the number of students receiving Pell Grants and average student loan debt. Starting in 2018, the department would use that information to determine how much aid an institution’s students would qualify for. The goal is to increase access, reduce costs and improve outcomes in higher education.

The response from the higher education world—which has been dubious for decades about the findings of the annual U.S. News & World Report college rankings issue—has been underwhelming. A poll conducted by Gallup and Inside Higher Ed in December, for example, showed that 65 percent of college presidents felt the plan was not a good idea. While affirming the validity of the goals of access and affordability, educators worry that the plan won’t be an effective way to achieve them. They also worry that the effect of the plan will be to reward the more affluent institutions and students, and cut back on institutions serving lower socio-economic groups and
nontraditional students. This would deprive the very group that needs more resources to ensure students complete college successfully.

These were some of the points AFT leaders underscored, while also describing the great diversity of the institutions in which our members work and of the students they encounter daily in the classroom. The AFT is the only faculty organization that has met with Duncan and his staff on this issue.

**MICHIGAN RESEARCH ASSISTANTS HAVE RIGHT TO BARGAIN** A United States District Court has ruled that the Legislature and governor of Michigan violated the state’s constitution in 2012 when they passed and signed into law a provision saying graduate research assistants at the University of Michigan are students, not employees, and don’t have the right to vote on the question of collective bargaining.

The provision appeared suddenly in March 2012, tacked onto an unrelated bill in the Republican-dominated Legislature. It came after the assistants, known as Graduate Student Research Assistants, had organized themselves to join the existing Graduate Employees’ Organization, representing teaching assistants at the university since 1975. The UM Board of Regents had also stated its support for the GSRAs’ right to decide to hold a vote.

After Republican Gov. Rick Snyder signed the bill, the GEO, graduate research assistant Christie Toth and the UM Board of Regents sued. The court held that the manner in which it was rushed through the Michigan Legislature as an amendment to P.A. 45 violated the “title-object” clause of the Michigan Constitution, which forbids legislation that includes numerous disparate matters.

“This is yet another example of Gov. Snyder and the Republican-controlled Legislature ignoring the rules to advance their own anti-worker political ideology,” said AFT Vice President and AFT Michigan President David Hecker when the ruling was announced.

“We’re gratified the judge ruled that the law targeting GSRAs’ rights to organize is unconstitutional. We still firmly believe that GSRAs are workers entitled to protections under the law, including the right to have a union should they decide to organize,” says Andrea Jokisaari, a GSRA in the Materials Science and Engineering Department and the chair of GEO’s GSRA Organizing Committee.

Toth, who was a GSRA from 2010-2013, is now working on her dissertation and hopes her colleagues will get to exercise their rights. “We call on Attorney General [Bill] Schuette to let the district court’s ruling stand,” she says.

**ILLINOIS UNIONS SUE STATE OVER PENSION LAW CHANGES** The Illinois Federation of Teachers and its partners in the We Are One Illinois coalition filed suit Jan. 28 to overturn Senate Bill 1, the bill Gov. Pat Quinn signed into law that slashes retiree pensions and health benefits. The suit argues that the “pension theft” law violates the pension clause of the Illinois Constitution, which unequivocally states that a public employee’s pension is a contract that the state cannot diminish or impair. The coalition is suing the governor, other constitutional officers, the state retirement systems and their boards.

The Illinois Legislature has underfunded the public employee pension fund for decades, failing to make state payments while employees consistently put in their share. S.B. 1 will reduce the value of the retirees’ pensions by 35 percent over 20 years. The We Are One coalition made alternative proposals, including closing corporate tax loopholes and increasing worker contributions, as part of pension reform discussions in the months leading up to the bill’s passage.

Two days after We Are One filed suit, Illinois House Speaker Michael Madigan, a Democrat representing Chicago, introduced a bill to cut the corporate tax rate on profits from 7 percent to 3.5 percent. It is projected to save businesses $1.5 billion in 2015. Coincidentally, that’s the same amount of “savings” to the state that S.B. 1 is projected to produce in 2015.

**STUDENTS WANT HIGHER ED, NOT DEBT** Last year, the national level of student loan debt soared over the $1 trillion mark, surpassing credit card debt levels. A college education, which used to be viewed as a ticket into the middle class, is now felt as a sentence of servitude and a brake on important adult milestones such as buying a home or starting a family.

To come up with solutions, the AFT and dozens of labor and student groups, nonprofits, progressive think tanks and grassroots organizations have formed a coalition and launched a campaign, “Higher Ed Not Debt.” The long-term vision of the campaign is to ensure that high-quality higher education is affordable and accessible to all, without the burden of financial hardship. The campaign’s website, higherednotdebt.org, outlines its core principles:

- Support borrowers currently paying off the existing $1.2 trillion of debt;
- Address the causes of declining affordability and quality, including changes to state funding and financial aid policies;
- Educate the public about Wall Street’s complicity in the creation of the $1.2 trillion student debt crisis; and
- Plan actions of civic engagement across all geographic, demographic and political lines.

Already, the AFT and other organizations are coordinating legislative, organizing and communications strategies around student debt and college affordability in California, New York, Ohio, Oregon and Wisconsin. In March, the campaign will release a report on the collusion of Wall Street and colleges to profit off students through predatory or exploitative financial arrangements.

Christie Toth, far right, was a University of Michigan graduate student research assistant who joined the Graduate Employees’ Organization in successfully suing Michigan.
**Discounted rates for AFT members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Name</th>
<th>Usual Price</th>
<th>Year Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Rate for members and college students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economist print/digital</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune</td>
<td>$59.95</td>
<td>$29.98</td>
<td>$29.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls’ Life (ages 10-15)</td>
<td>$19.95</td>
<td>$14.95</td>
<td>$14.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamour</td>
<td>$18.97</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>$19.95</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Digest</td>
<td>$27.94</td>
<td>$24.97</td>
<td>$24.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper’s Bazaar</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper’s Magazine</td>
<td>$21.17</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights for Children (6-12)</td>
<td>$34.95</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Beautiful</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InStyle</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$19.50</td>
<td>$19.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiplinger’s Personal Finance</td>
<td>$23.95</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladies Home Journal</td>
<td>$16.97</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac World</td>
<td>$19.99</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad Magazine</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Claire</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Journal</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Stewart Living</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mens Health</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>$39.89</td>
<td>$34.95</td>
<td>$34.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money magazine</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Earth News</td>
<td>$19.95</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Trend</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$13.96</td>
<td>$13.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nation [47 is]</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Geographic Traveler</td>
<td>$17.95</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oprah</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Science</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Simple</td>
<td>$28.95</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbook</td>
<td>$17.97</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road &amp; Track</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stone</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runner’s World</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saveur</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science News</td>
<td>$54.50</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific American</td>
<td>$34.97</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic Parent/Child</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$9.97</td>
<td>$9.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>$17.97</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventeen</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShopSmart</td>
<td>$34.95</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Air &amp; Space</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Living</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Illustrated</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
<td>$69.99</td>
<td>$69.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste of Home</td>
<td>$44.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Vogue</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>$59.75</td>
<td>$39.95</td>
<td>$39.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Out - New York</td>
<td>$39.94</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town &amp; Country</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Leisure</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Guide</td>
<td>$58.14</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Us Weekly</td>
<td>$69.96</td>
<td>$59.97</td>
<td>$59.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Health</td>
<td>$17.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman’s Day</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women”s Health</td>
<td>$17.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women”s Health</td>
<td>$17.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women”s Health</td>
<td>$17.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women”s Health</td>
<td>$17.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>