

California State University, Chico

Academic Senate
(530) 898-6201, Zip 020
MEMORANDUM

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, December 10, 2015, 2:32 p.m., K-207/209

PRESENT: Boyd, Calandrella, Cross, Crotts, Donoho (Sager), Elrod, Ferrari, Ford, Gray, Heileson, Hoffman, Janos, Jarquin, Kipnis, Kirchhoff, Livingston, McConkey, Meadows, Nichols, Ponarul, Pratt, Roll, Rowberg, Schierenbeck, Scholz, Schulte (Seipel), Selvester, Sistrunk, Stapleton, Thompson (Kemper), Traver, Wilking, Zartman, Zingg

ABSENT: Boura

Chair Boyd called the meeting to order at 2:32.

The meeting began with a moment of silence for Dr. Katie Whitlock, Department of Music and Theatre, who passed away unexpectedly.

1. Approve Minutes of November 12, 2015 and December 3, 2015.

Elrod offered a number of editorial corrections and wording suggestions to the Minutes of December 3: Page 11 (paragraph 5) cut the phrase “which she did not mitigate by other considerations at all”; page 12 (paragraph 9) add to line “... available to all the deans and we would figure out how to make them available online.”; page 13 (paragraph 3) add “...between AA and Student Affairs for new international students above the established baseline.”

Stapleton suggested changing the wording of her statement in the minutes on page 12 (paragraph 10) “...they spend foundation account money to run the basic operations of their department. She thought the information collected from the colleges might not reflect the true OE costs of operating their departments, only the amounts allocated to operate the departments. If accurate budget needs are to be reflected, the true costs should be collected.”

Minutes approved with corrections to the Minutes of December 3.

2. Approve Agenda.

It was moved to postpone definitely to February 18 consideration of item 3: Proposed EM on Appointment, Evaluation and Support of Department Chairs, Directors and Unit Program Coordinators.

Change to the Agenda approved.

The revised Agenda was approved.

3. Proposed Resolution: Senate Statement of No Confidence in President, Interim Provost, and Vice President for Business and Finance–Action Item.
<http://www.csuchico.edu/fs/documents/fall-2015/12-10-15/proposed-reso-no-confidence-12-10-15-final.pdf>

Boyd congratulated the members for surveying their constituents and colleges and performing their due diligence as representatives in determining what their constituencies were thinking about this resolution.

In terms of process, Boyd explained that this Resolution came before us by unusual means in that it did not emerge from the Executive Committee, nor did it proceed to one of the standing committees. This document was proposed on the floor of the Senate last week and passed as an Introduction item, which essentially means the Senate felt it was worthy of consideration without any sense of approval or disapproval of its merits.

Boyd hoped everyone, in the best traditions of Chico, would remember to remain respectful and collegial even though the issues are highly emotional. She explained that there are currently 34 voting members of the Senate. The President's Cabinet are all members as well. Although they do not have voting rights, they may speak freely. The Chair has a responsibility to follow a speakers' list to promote everyone speaking, but she is supposed to seek different voices, especially if someone has not yet been heard. What this means is that the Chair will recognize speakers who have not been heard before those who have already.

For this meeting particularly, we will be guided by Robert's Rules of Order that admonishes speakers not to repeat unduly what has already been said. Those with prepared written statements are welcomed to speak, though they should try to be mindful of the course of the debate. Members of the galley were thanked for attending and reminded to have a Senator recognize them after that Senator has been recognized by the Chair.

Speakers were reminded that the meeting is recorded with an audio device and to state their names.

The video camera technician recording part of the meeting was Anthony Peters with Action News.

Since Livingston introduced the Resolution, he was allowed to speak first to it. He noted that when Anna Moore presented the resolution last week, she provided a powerful explanation of why some HFA faculty had been moved to this. He hoped this explanation could be added to the document as a useful context to explain why it had come forward. Schierenbeck promised that she would move to split the motion later in the meeting.

Livingston moved to append Anna Moore's comments as a rationale to the document/ Seconded.

The additional language is as follows:

“We ask for this resolution because it is the right thing to do.

We ask because it is unethical for my fellow lecturers to be notified of probable spring lay-offs in November. Because it is unethical for executive leadership to demand that chairs, deans, directors, coordinators, professors, and assistants spend inordinate amounts of their time accounting and re-accounting for every dollar, and asserting and re-asserting their need for reasonable monetary support. Because it is unethical for executive appointments to be made without following rules of process and procedure. Because it is unethical for faculty and staff to face humiliating difficulty when requesting university space for our students, programs, and events. Because it is unethical for values like diversity to be stated rather than funded. Because it is unethical for this or any public university to become a corporate structure; institutes of learning are not businesses, nor should they be governed as such. Because it is unethical for executive leadership to cut budgets, keep faculty and especially staff salaries stagnant, and accept large raises in the same year. Because it is unethical for executive leadership to frog-march our administrators, colleagues, and co-workers out of their offices.

Because the faculty, staff, and students who work at this institution and seek its potential as inspiration, hope, and a better future deserve tangible support and respect—even and especially when we disagree with executive leadership decisions. Because too many mistakes have been made, too many reasonable requests for accountability, explanation, and shared governance ignored and scorned. Because it is unethical for executive leadership to demonstrate such ignorance, disrespect, and incompetence in different ways year after year.

Because it is time that faculty exercise its power and vote decisively for no confidence.”

Nichols spoke to the language of proposed addition. He objected in the last sentence of the first paragraph to the use of the term “frog marched”. This is a term used for coercion against someone’s physical will, which is not appropriate. If this has happened even metaphorically, he has no real knowledge of it.

Point of order was made that the motion to add the language as an appendix must be decided before discussion about its wording ensued.

Motion passed

Ponarul objected that he had not had time to consider the motion, that the copy of the resolution and appendix had only been forwarded to him on December 6th and seemed unnecessarily rushed. He also believed that the second sentence which refers to “my fellow Lecturers” showed a lack of scholarly editing and revision and that some of the other language was not well conceived either.

Meadows moved that the second sentence of the rationale be altered to read: “We ask because it is unethical for Lecturers to be notified of probable work reductions in November.” She explained that the change reflects what is actually happening, which is not the spread of technical lay-offs, but actually work reductions among Lecturers. /Seconded

Motion passed.

Roll explained that she is a representative of the College of BSS that that this colleague was strongly in support of the resolution noting that two departments had voted unanimously, while others had clear majorities in support, and only four individuals expressed opposition. Some had expressed fear that retribution would follow these sentiments, which Roll thought showed the lack of trust that people have on this campus. She expressed her sorrow that we have arrived at this Resolution and for all the hard work it has taken when we could be doing things for our students.

Thompson moved to redact the sentence from the second paragraph: “Because it is unethical for values like diversity to be stated rather than funded.” She explained that she is a Senator at-Large and that people had expressed to her that things are moving in the right direction with campus diversity efforts, personnel, and funding and referred to the letter sent by Michelle Morris and Tray Robinson describing current efforts. She admitted that there is concern about future funding, but that this statement is better removed. /Seconded.

Boyd reminded Senators to make a motion and speak briefly to it, and wait for a second before making a fuller argument.

Zartman had a question for the authors of the rationale, more than the body. He noted that there might be concern for specific areas of promoting diversity that are larger than a checklist of funded programs. He wondered what sentiment was about having this sentence deleted.

Heilesen recognized Anna Moore in the gallery. She explained that she had no issue with the sentence being redacted from the rationale if it can be read ambiguously. The sentiment was intended to criticize executive management and not staff who we all recognize work tirelessly to advance diversity efforts with what they have.

Motion passed.

Sager suggested another redaction of the sentence following the last one: “Because it is unethical for this or any public university to become a corporate structure; institutes of learning are not businesses, nor should they be governed as such.” /Seconded.

Sager explained that as a professor in the College of Business he found the sentence unnecessarily venomous toward business in general. He noted that different businesses are structured well or badly, and that it is a generalization that is too sweeping.

Ferrari thought that the process of deleting multiple sentences from the document was problematic. They were supposed to serve as generalizations, and if they were unclear, what they needed was more evidence to support them specifically, not their removal.

Stapleton wondered what the author of the document was implying with this language as she had a sense of the meaning, but was interested to hear more.

Boyd reminded Senators that this is now a Senate document and that it should read as Senators design it to be. So, although it is common while discussing curricular issues to look for the

intentions of the authors, and it is natural that we may want to discover more context to certain language, we are ultimately responsible for it.

Zingg spoke about the problems of evidence that supported a vote of “No Confidence.” He said: “If the academic Senate is a jury in these matters, and my colleagues and I are defendants, it is not simply a case of courtesy, it is a case of due process that jury and defendants understand the meaning of the assertions and accusations, just as surely as the evidence against them.” He referred to the messages that he had sent to the Senate the night before and this morning that he said addressed every provision in the resolution and in the rationale with questions and defenses.

Cross explained that he was going to speak about other issues, but when he heard the comments from the President about due process, he thought he should speak and say that he personally knew about the lack of due process on campus, and that this lack was actually evidence. He said he was unsure whether he would say he was “frog marched off campus”, but that he was heavily escorted off campus. He had never once gotten to face any accusations in front of his peers, but had instead been met by a private investigator who was hired to interrogate him and as soon as the investigation was over, he had been handed his suspension papers.

Boyd reminded Senators to speak to the motion about redacting the single sentence.

Sager said he recognized the spirit of the sentence he had wondered about and thought that the next sentence seemed to speak to its intention more specifically.

Motion did not pass.

Elrod decided to read the email that she had sent to members of the Academic Senate earlier this afternoon. She explained that she was providing clarification and correction to misconceptions about the Academic Affairs budget timeline and process beyond what she said at the Senate meeting on December 3 and the Chair’s Council the next day. She reiterated the timeline of her efforts by stating that leaders in Academic Affairs and the Deans were instructed to plan their budgets in spring and July 2015 using the minimum base of their 2014-15 state allocations. Her office continued to work with deans and their budget staff in August and September and the budget was published in October and released to the colleges as soon as it was completed in early November. No budget information was withheld.

Elrod acknowledged that this is a challenging situation because while we received new funding from the state, our reserves have continued to diminish which has created a false sense of budget security.

In her presentations on December 3 and 4, she repeated that there must not be significant course cancellations, nor impacts on part-time lecturer employment in the spring semester. To support this goal she has already made several one-time allocations from the reserves to help colleges, and she expects to make more of these. For example, the library was given an additional one-time allocation of \$140,000 to ensure that it can operate at full capacity

The assessment of programs and accreditation costs will be supported and monies will be available to continue college assessment momentum. A budget taskforce will be assembled to plan for the 2016-17 academic year. The growth of tenure track positions has continued to increase as well.

She thanked the many deans that she knows are continuing to work with their Chairs in creating shared governance structures to continue to manage and plan the Academic Affairs budget into the future. She recognized that this year has been a time of transition which is often unsettling, but requires our shared commitment to work together especially to prepare for the transition to a new President.

Livingston recognized Sarah Cooper from the gallery. Sarah Cooper decided to read a letter that she sent to All Faculty and All Staff and four news outlets. She hoped that the Senate would proceed with caution as she believed that the move to vote “No Confidence” in our senior campus leadership was based on misinformation.

She was saddened to have witnessed the conscious misinformation created by what another faculty member told her another faculty member involved in the Campus Climate Survey group had said about senior management when producing that survey. She also described the wide-spread panic the new faculty and our most venerable assets, the lecturers, had felt from the initial impressions created by the release of the Academic Affairs budget that had been corrected by the Provost’s report on December 3. And worst of all, she had heard members of the campus community, even those in authority, repeat malicious gossip about the personal lives of senior management.

This is contrary to her own understanding of the ways both Academic Affairs and Business and Finance have been working together to respond actively to calls for more transparency and appropriate processes so that anyone reading all the reports and presentations that have come out of late would react positively. She hoped that we could move away from negative stereotypes about the leadership of this campus “be the change we hope to see.” We should work to build together what we said we hoped to in the Campus Climate Survey.

Meadows observed that the Provost’s remarks about moving forward were great, but they represent too little, too late. As a department Chair, she wished Elrod had involved the Chairs in the discussions and consultation about what her plan was much earlier. Meadows has cancelled three courses and five activity sections, and she will still be \$10,000 in the hole. Next semester, if we use the same budget process, she will cancel an additional fourteen, three units courses. That will impact her students.

She also wondered if the Chancellor’s Office had sent the budget to campus in August, why didn’t we get a budget plan until late October?

Meadows also responded to the general idea that we just need to work together by explaining that as a member of the Resolution Response Team, she has spent hours and hours trying to work together. Some things have been accomplished (including the creation of the Ombuds Office, and the first Campus Climate Survey), but in general, progress has been stymied.

Schulte began by saying that she is speaking for those who cannot speak for themselves. She lamented the amount of energy she has spent working to make sure faculty, students and staff voices are heard by senior management, whose behavior has not instilled confidence. The number of stories she has heard from those who have been bullied or mistreated is an emotional drain. The quantitative data in the Climate Survey alone is significant and underlines the number of people who cannot sign their names to a piece of paper because they fear retribution and loss of their jobs. But remarkably, these people still love this place and working here.

Schulte has learned from teaching Social justice courses that the first thing one must do when hearing the laments of people with less power is to believe them. The second lesson is that social justice work is uncomfortable and messy and when you know you would like to run away, you must learn to lean in to use your agency to make change.

Jarquin described how she and Michael Pratt had taken great care to illicit student input as they moved forward after the Resolution was introduced last week.

Pratt explained how the Student Academic Senators had carefully contemplated the resolution and from what they understood, they were inclined to vote favorably for it. Despite the merits of some of the resolution claims, however, they believe that it is unfair to aggregate all three administrators into one resolution. They believe it is fair that each administrator should get to address the allegations being made against them and that more proof of specific negative actions be proven against them since the results will be so significant to these administrators. The burden of proof must fall on the writers of the resolution and proof of student harm must be proven adequately. The campus must proceed with all due deliberation as well as expeditiously to return to its primary mission of promoting student success.

Jarquin said that the student officers echo many of the sentiments expressed by the Student Academic Senate, but that the officers feel that the inability of campus to work together is disrupting the success of students. They feel they do not have enough information to decide to support this resolution because of its broad and sweeping accusations.

Rowberg began by expressing her anger at the waste of her time over the last week while she is supposed to be admitting students. She disagreed with how this process has gone. She thinks the Senate deserved time and notice to consider the resolution as opposed to hitting us in the last week of school. She does not favor the resolution and would like to recognize Annabel Grimm to speak for the managers of the division of Business and Finance.

While they stood behind her, Annabel Grimm read the letter sent by her team to Senators on December 8. This letter called on Senators to reject the Resolution as it will destroy the genuine progress that has been made in addressing campus concerns. It will negatively impact students, and will tarnish the reputation of Chico State.

The members of the Division recognized that their Vice President has led many initiatives (many behind the scenes) and had sheltered them through one of the worst economic times in California history. She has dedicated herself to promoting transparency by directing the implementation of

the OpenGov Financial Portal and professional development and training offerings that are higher than ever. She has committed staff and resources to create this greater collaboration and transparency. The resolution is misplaced, vitriolic and not truly reflective of the will of the entire campus community.

The management team would like to offer its testimony should there be fact-finding by the Senate on this matter. They hope that an alternative course will promote the principles of civility, respect and shared governance.

Thompson reminded Senators that she is a Senator at-Large and as such, she spoke to staff, students, faculty and administrators. From these conversations, it is clear that there is strong support for a vote of “No Confidence”. This vote would be largely symbolic, but it would have significant ideological consequences: It would communicate the deep rupture of shared governance on our campus; it communicates the break -down of transparency and trust, as exemplified by the budgetary decisions others have discussed today. These have been late and unexplained and have created a breakdown of trust that could easily have been avoided by upper management.

The vote of “No Confidence” also communicates something about the potency of the Academic Senate – that we are a viable and responsive body that accurately and fairly represents our campus community- and that we take action when we are called to do so. When 58% of the faculty have taken the time to fill out the Campus Climate Survey and the results of the Resolution Response team are failing, it calls upon us to act. Most critically, it sends a strong message to our next campus President, that we are in need of repair and restoration and we want someone committed to seeing this as an opportunity for change.

Schierenbeck moved that the names of Interim Provost Susan Elrod and Vice President for Business and Finance Lori Hoffman be removed from the first resolution clause. /Seconded.

Schierenbeck argued that she has been on this campus for 18 years and that the problems have been worse in the last decade. She believes she has been treated without due process and humiliated in ways that have affected her career trajectory and that these may be attributed to President Zingg. She admitted that she does not always agree with what Susan Elrod or Lori Hoffman have done. She hopes this process will be a wake-up call for the Provost and that she would no longer say that there have been no lay-offs when many have suffered work reductions that are significant. She believes that Lori Hoffman has been a very strong leader, which brings unfair attention to her decisions because there has been a vacuum at the top.

Heilesen would like to request that the vote on this motion be by secret paper ballot. /Seconded.

Sager suggested that the document was written with the three individuals in mind. Removing two individuals seems to require another document be introduced and so he does not favor the separation of names.

Nichols favored the amendment because it was the opinion of many other individuals in the College of Natural Sciences. He also did not believe that Interim Provost Elrod should be held

accountable as she was not here and the problems with the latest budget release do not rise to the level of a vote of “No Confidence”.

Zartman opposed the motion because he thought the precipitating event of the Resolution was the way the budget was rolled out with the confusion of the deans and the hardship to lecturers and the other ramifications must include the Interim Provost. As far as the Vice President for Business and Finance is concerned, he appreciated the goodwill of the managers of the division, but he noted the double standard of procedures and processes that he has seen directors and department heads suffer as members of Academic Affairs that do not affect Business and Finance that ruins morale on campus. All three individuals have created the deleterious impacts on the whole campus.

Sistrunk spoke against dividing everybody up because of how the culture of management works. The interconnections of officials are constituted so that they are all responsible together. The necessity of providing evidence of each of the three separately as if we were trying people in a court of law does not fit the way a resolution works. Fairness is inherent in the process, but the due diligence of consultation should already have been occurring.

We should also remember our lived experience in the Senate. We have been asking for clarification about the budget and the filling of budget positions since the Interim Provost arrived. We have wondered about the loss of very capable people in Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs. There seems to be a reorganization of Academic Affairs and the economic sub-structure of it which feeds into the nature of the campus itself. The fact that the Vice President for Business and Finance could assure us that the Cabinet has funds to cover the catastrophe of the latest budget from Academic Affairs demonstrates that there is a different kind of budgeting that is ongoing and not transparent. We need to consider these people together as they are working closely together.

Ford explained that to properly represent his constituency he would need to speak to both sides of this motion. While he agrees with Zartman’s analysis, it is definitely true that the buck stops at the top. The misdeeds of those below the top leader are solely that person’s responsibility. On the other hand, leaving the three names together will send a clear message to the incoming President that we have severe issues with many of the top officials in our administration.

Zartman would like to merge what Ford and Schulte said earlier. In regards to the Presidential search, as Anne said, we are not a group of people who cannot be pleased who are bringing this forward. We have shown that we are willing to address the underlying challenges to work shoulder to shoulder on the task with whoever comes.

We will vote by secret ballot. (A break was called).

Motion failed with 10 for the measure and 23 opposed.

Sandy Parsons from Student Affairs was recognized in the gallery. She proceeded to read a written statement on behalf of the Division of Student Affairs which called on Senators to reject the resolution unless it was clearly in the students’ best interests. While there was Campus

Climate Survey, there has been no other broad consultation about the issues presented in the resolution. Because it lacks specificity the leadership of Student Affairs cannot support it. The timing of the resolution will negatively affect the presidential search as it shows we can't manage our challenges and seek inclusive resolution. The resolution also asserts the primacy of Academic Affairs which fails to recognize how the entire campus is mutually responsible for educating and supporting students. This resolution subjugates all the other divisions. The Academic Senate was urged to consider other alternatives to this vote and to vote for hope and not fear.

Joe Wills then spoke from the gallery on behalf of University Advancement. He read a letter that was sent to Senators on December 10. It recognized that University Advancement has been widely successful in gaining financial support for the University since 2012. It argued that a vote of "No Confidence" in our leadership will be detrimental to the momentum of our fund-raising efforts and damage the reputation we have built. The resolution will go against the inspiring public image we have cultivated. This is profoundly important in the new landscape of funding for higher education in which private support has become more important. We should be trying to build our confidence together.

Malcolm McLemore also spoke from the gallery. He thanked his colleagues for sharing their thoughts and recognized that people are feeling discouraged. Currently we have a population of faculty and staff who have felt neglected and bullied and this has been exacerbated by hiring practices that have proved divisive between departments. This has been fueled by underpaid, and undervalued employees. It is his fear that these problems have brought us to a resolution that shows the same lack of shared governance that it is trying to quell. This vote will only serve to create a false positive. The resolution bares the identifications of students and staff whose wishes are not reflected by it. McLemore believes that it is more important to concentrate on diversity efforts to welcome the new President.

Scholz admitted that he was uncomfortable with the manner and the speed with which this resolution has come forward since last week. He shared Ponarul's discomfort with the language of the rationale. He moved that the resolution be tabled until after the winter break has ended and that the process then move forward with suitable time to consider. Motion to Postpone Definitely until February 18 /Seconded.

Livingston spoke against his fellow HFA Senator and reported that practically all of the people he spoke to were for the resolution. He argued that they are angry and would like the issue settled before we take off for intercession.

Meadows was confused whether the motion would have to go through FASP or not.

Cross said he was proud that people had found a way to bring the issue before the Senate to make their voices known. He thought this should be encouraged and not discouraged.

Boyd clarified that while there are more standard ways that measures come before Senate, there was no breach of process to bring this Resolution forward.

Thompson recognized a student “James” from the gallery who said that he still does not have a very clear picture of all the reasons to support the Resolution. He hoped since the measure purports to represent all members of the community, that more student voices would be included. He wondered what the harm in delaying the measure would be.

Boyd explained that someone had said that we will end discussion at 5:00, but this is not true as this is a very important discussion and we will take as long as it takes to finish.

Roll recognized Maribel Delaseb from the gallery who introduced herself as a student in BSS. She hoped the issue would be postponed so that Senators would have more time to understand the issues involved, and where students are. She said the University is like her family and that the President is like her father and that she hoped the decision would not be rushed since it had such significance.

McConkey recognized John Roussell in the gallery. He introduced himself as invested in the CSU system as he grew up in South Central LA. He believes the classroom and education are the most important foci of the University and that students should not have to bear the brunt of the financial burdens. He supports the Resolution.

Boyd reminded everyone that we have a motion on the floor to postpone the Resolution. That is what we are speaking to.

Crotts explained the motion and the described all the variations that can happen to a document that has been postponed.

Secret ballot was requested/ Seconded.

There were objections to the motion to use a secret ballot so it had to be voted upon. Secret ballot passed. (Short recess was called).

Motion failed: 17 yeah and 17 nay (a tie fails, Boyd cast a vote).

Selvester read Ferrari’s comment as she had to leave to teach: “What are the students’ best interests in this discussion, because she does not believe that overworked and underpaid faculty and staff serves them. How does supporting senior administrators and leaders that do not consult with faculty and staff in a public University represent the best interests for students? The Student Senators, if she remembers the wording correctly do not believe the resolution should pass if student harm is not proven. This is not always easy to measure and there is a reason for that. Faculty and staff on this campus have worked tirelessly to limit student harm to the minimum. I invite the students to ask the faculty and staff how much their working conditions have been impacted so that student learning conditions would not be? I am not disappointed that I have had to spend time with this over the last week, as it is exactly why I was elected. I am supposed to serve faculty, staff and students.

Heileson recognized Scott Dickerson a Unit 9 steward for CSUEU in the gallery. He wanted to bring up the staff side of the Resolution. He pointed out that the thrill everyone feels about our graduation rates is attributable to faculty and support staff directly. The staff support for all the

paperwork and processes has meant that the workload has been enormous. Raises have been extremely difficult to get as the paperwork has been horrendous. HR has actually worked to help out staff, but Business and Finance have quashed their efforts and does not have the staffs' best interests at heart. This has led to multiple grievances with the Vice President of Business and Finance. The Executive Board of CSEUE voted yesterday to support this measure unanimously because they have heard complaints for years and seen the fear of retaliation that inhibits people from speaking out. All the stewards have suffered retaliation. As staff, we have proof of everything that is on this resolution and can go back for years for documentation. He concluded by wishing that we would vote for the Resolution today.

Ford passed out an amendment to the Resolution that he was asked to introduce. He moved to add this resolution clause to the document as the next to last clause. Moved/ Seconded.

“RESOLVED. That the constituencies represented by the Academic Senate of CSU, Chico will welcome any new administrator who embraces the spirit and intent of shared governance, good faith information sharing, transparency, and mutual respect and who would actively work to correct the issues identified in this resolution, and”

Ford said he had not yet decided to support the Resolution.

Heileson spoke in favor of the additional clause because staff have been asking her all week what the Resolution would accomplish. She described the Resolution as a roadmap for a new President coming to Chico to follow for success. It explains what to do and what not to do. It will attract a good candidate specifically who wants to fulfill our expectations for a good leader. Heileson will be voting for the majority of the staff who have contacted her and told her how they feel.

Motion passed.

Malcom McLemore wanted to recognize C.C. Carter from Student Affairs who appreciated the conversation about all the people that representatives have spoken with but he wanted to point out that not all the divisions are being recognized and the students specifically did not support the measure. He thought if the measure passed that the managers of the divisions that spoke against it should be recognized as against the resolution. He believed a vote of “no Confidence” would not serve to move us forward. He personally felt it would move us back.

Zartman wanted to address the comments just made. He was assuming the individuals who spoke to Heileson were from across divisions. When he votes on the measure in a few moments, he will be voting from the past and the present with a hopeful eye on the future. When he votes a lot of documentation, confidential and otherwise, a lot of conversations will inform that vote from across campus, from multiple constituencies beyond the rush of the last 24 hours,

Zartman also wanted to recognize things the President said in his letter to the Senate and the press that this resolution opens up issues that must be considered. There have been many opportunities to address these issues –after the 2014 Senate Resolution, after the Campus Climate Survey. It is to be hoped that everyone listed in these documents can open up to these

issues to engage and operationalize them together. We have come together today because those words have not been actualized for the people who so thoughtfully offered this document today.

Selvester began by noting that in some ways, some of us are coming to the party late. This has been going on for years. She wanted to provide some background so that people can contextualize what is happening here today.

This resolution has been as many have said, “a long time coming.” Over the years, campus-wide trust in our ability to share in governing together has declined as a result of a lack of transparency and good-faith sharing during decision-making. Faculty, staff, and administrators have also indicated they feel a sense of instability here at CSU, Chico.

Here is a direct quote from one of the documents we sent out when trying to give feedback regarding the Response Team Efforts:

I believe it stills stands:

As a campus, we have been addressing critical concerns regarding campus morale and shared governance. To understand the issues, we have examined the results of our campus climate questionnaire, reflected upon recent and historical events, held discussions with the Senate, and gathered information by talking with current and former administrators, faculty, staff, and students. These conversations reveal a campus community stressed by the rapid turnover of its leadership and the lack of good faith efforts to engage campus and community constituents in decision-making, information sharing, and shared governance.

A widely held perception is that decisions are made without adequate consultation and therefore the quality of decisions has suffered. Furthermore, the high level of grievances on campus, public statements, and the climate questionnaire indicate that employees at many levels feel bullied, marginalized, and fear retribution.

Little has changed--

As many of you know, this Vote of No Confidence comes after a long history of instability and a dismissal of Shared Governance, transparency, good faith information sharing, and collaborative decision-making. However, some of you may not have a coherent timeline that leads up to this. I will attempt to give it here:

In the spring of 2012, our then Provost promptly left her job. In spring 2014 our Senior Vice Provost for Budget and Academic Resources in Academic Affairs left in the middle of his contract. In the fall 2014, three weeks into the semester our next Provost, left. Before she left within two years, all of the college deans had left through retirement, in search of promotions, or for other reasons. The average length of service among all new and interim deans at the time she left was about seven months. In spring 2014 our new Vice Provost for Budget and Academic Resources left after being on the job four months. In the fall of 2015, our Associate Vice President of Faculty Affairs left. I will not tell you how many of the staff have left---All of these people left in the middle of the academic year. Leaders don't do this when they are happy and

life is good in a division.

In spring 2014, in a spontaneous moment at the end of our meeting, senators began to talk about how concerned they were about morale on campus. Student reps, retired faculty reps, staff reps, college reps all said they felt burdened by learning that faculty groups were forming to discuss how to take action. They had lost confidence in Senior Management.

At that time the senate worked with the President to create a brief questionnaire that would be used to determine what the issues we should select to put on a more comprehensive annually given campus morale survey.

Four hundred people responded in the last week of the semester. When the results came in, they were extremely negative. Instead of embracing this opportunity and challenge to reach out to the campus, the President suddenly called into question the method, the tools, and the results. It took months to distribute the results.

The fall arrived and our Provost left the job three weeks into the semester. It was a blow. In order to address several groups on campus who were calling for a Vote of No Confidence then, we took an interim measure and wrote a resolution called *the Request for Review of and Assistance in Strengthening Campus Shared Governance, Communication, and Morale* (September 25, 2014). We could see that there were problems that no amount of talking could change. When it was brought to the Senate, and it overwhelmingly passed.

At that time we were expecting the appointment of an Interim Provost. We were concerned about campus morale as well as a commitment to consultation and shared governance during this process. We were concerned about the stability of Academic Affairs. We wanted the Interim Provost to succeed.

We were concerned also with the Vice President of Business and Finance's interpretation of EO 1000 as it regards the allocation of space and facilities on campus. The guidelines that the VPBF was using to implement EO 1000 excluded community members and dissuaded faculty from using for innovative projects and student groups from using it for their gatherings.

At that time, policies that affected faculty were being written and distributed with little or in some cases no consultation. For example, EM 13-078 Policy for Long-Term and Short Term Allocation was sent out that gave complete and total jurisdiction over every space on campus centralizing all control in the hands of the cabinet—with no faculty input (EM 13-078, EM 04-043).

We were concerned that there were reorganization efforts with no consultation. Enrollment management was moved from Academic Affairs to Student Affairs with no consultation.

We were concerned that The Director of Research and Sponsored Programs had given her notice for 6 months and there were no efforts to replace her. Instead, there was an attempt to reorganize without faculty input.

An Interim Provost arrived with little or no consultation as to her selection.

We created a new survey. It was comprehensive. 1200 of the 2000 eligible took the survey. The results again pointed to a lack of confidence in our senior management. Again the methods were challenged. Two Vice Chancellors came here to witness the open forum we had to discuss it. We received no feedback from them or the Chancellor.

In the meantime, we worked to meet as a response team. We tried to find out what the issues were from our constituents. We were met by demands to give names and departments and divisions of people who talked to us. We refused. We called meetings and spent much of the first half hour waiting for them to show up. Then when they arrived we argued for the first half hour to an hour about the minutes or the agenda.

Still, we have found stability elusive, we continue to see a dismissal of commitment to shared governance, transparency, shared decision-making.

The Interim Provost arrived and began her efforts to reorganize Academic Affairs with no consultation. She shared this in Chair's council and other settings that she had plans to change the position description of our Vice Provost of Budget and Allocation to a director position with no terminal degree required. She also said she planned to hire a Vice President of Academic Planning and move some of the responsibilities of Faculty Affairs to this new VP position along with other work. This was information not consultation.

Then, this fall 2015, the President in violation of his own Executive Memorandum (EM 04-043 (EMEDC)) attempted to install the Interim Provost without a national search. This decision was abruptly halted days later.

In the meantime, our campus received our allocation for our budget in August, 2015. We were told that our budgets would essentially be the same. Instead, we received our budget a day or two before Thanksgiving break. The budget cuts in some colleges amounted to 20%. Deans were clearly caught off guard. Chairs were worried about cutting many sections and hundreds of seats for students. There was no money for student workers. Roll over that had been planned for or already spent was gone. On Friday before Thanksgiving Break, the clock was ticking. Chairs were trying to decide whether or not to start cancelling classes. The only executive management that showed up to answer our frantic questions was the VPBF. She said she did not know anything about the Academic Affairs budget and could not answer any questions. Our Interim Provost was out of town and our President was out of the country.

Our efforts to reach out to the Chancellor have been met with silence. In the last two weeks, the Academic Statewide Senate Chair Steve Filling has emailed the Chancellor for two weeks to discuss our situation and he has received no response from the Chancellor.

I have suddenly however received an email from the Chancellor just yesterday. He has requested that I tell you that this is a mistake:

”Dear Betsy, Paula and Chuck,

I know we share a strong commitment to the successful future of California State University, Chico, and it is in this spirit I write to you.

I learned that the Chico Academic Senate is planning to take a 'no confidence' vote later this week regarding members of the senior administrative team. Betsy, I am glad we had a chance to have a short conversation about this late last week as I was boarding a plane.

While the senate of course has the right and responsibility to conduct its business, you have an added opportunity to inform the senate discussion because of your leadership role as elected members of the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President. Because we are in the process of assembling a pool of candidates for our initial consideration in early February and in your leadership capacity, I respectfully ask that you communicate to your senate colleagues for their consideration that taking such a vote at this time is, based on my experiences and observations, at best unhelpful - and in fact likely to cause deleterious consequences - with respect to the strength of the candidate pool (let alone for other important searches the campus contemplates in the future).

With best wishes,

Tim

CC: Doug Faigin, CSU Trustee and Chair of the Search Committee for the President of California State University, Chico
Steven Stepanek, Faculty Trustee and member of the Search Committee for the President of California State University, Chico
Lou Monville, Chairman of the CSU Board of Trustees and member of the Search Committee for the President of California State University, Chico

In the absence of any evidentiary materials, articles, journal references to support the conclusions that we will ruin the talent in our pool, I can not concede to this as a truth. In fact, Stanislaus welcomed a popular president after their vote of no confidence. Humboldt State received a popular and talented president after their vote of no confidence. In fact, I think it is an insult to any good leader to say she or he would be daunted by a challenge or that only untalented people would want to lead an institution out of a crisis. I would think that this is the kind of challenge a good transformational leader considers his or her wheel house.

In the Response Team our goals were:

GOAL 1:

Restore and renew shared governance principles: trust, transparency, shared decision making, good-faith information sharing, clear communication and cooperation.

ISSUES AND PERCEPTIONS: Stakeholders are not consulted prior to significant decisions. Stakeholders feel out of the loop and complain of violations of joint decision-making, information sharing, and appropriate consultation. Stakeholders feel uninformed. Stakeholders charge that there is no real consultation on campus. Decisions are made and there is little or no

interest in stakeholder opinion.

GOAL 2:

Address stress, failure to maintain well-functioning relationships, and loss of emotional safety and morale.

ISSUES AND PERCEPTIONS: Campus community claims of incivility, retribution, intimidation, bullying, secrecy, lack of trust, favoritism, and “cabal”. Lack of visible accountability of administrative executives.

GOAL 3:

Strengthen the position of Provost and ensure the primacy and stability of Academic Affairs and its role in the essential mission of the university.

ISSUES AND PERCEPTIONS: Leadership in Academic Affairs has been perceived to be unstable. The Provost position should be second to the President in authority. The division of Academic Affairs is the fundamental division supporting teaching and learning on campus. All other divisions should be in support of Academic Affairs.

Although some will say we have made progress towards these goals, it has not been swift enough. Many of our stakeholders have clearly lost their patience. I have given you background. This is for your information. It contextualizes this resolution lest someone call it a “witch hunt.” This is a call for competent, committed, inspired leadership. I do not come here with a grudge. I come with the voices of Former provosts, community members, staff, faculty, students (present and former) and administrators –all of whom have told me their wishes, their stories and their legitimate concerns as well as their heartfelt request. “Can’t you do something?”

To be honest, it isn’t just because of the lack of reliable leadership, stabilizing decision making, authenticity and transparency, adherence to shared governance and good faith information sharing alone that I am supporting this resolution. I am committed to voting in support of this resolution because I feel accountable to the people over the years who asked me to “do something” and I feel I represent all those ---(including my department and others) who have told me of their unanimous support for this vote. It took great bravery, patience, and commitment for the faculty to bring this to the senate.

— [Elie Wiesel](#)

“The opposite of love is not hate, it's indifference. The opposite of art is not ugliness, it's indifference. The opposite of faith is not heresy, it's indifference. And the opposite of life is not death, it's indifference.”

I have said before in this body, I am so proud of the passion, the care, the commitment people have on both sides of this resolution. Regardless of the vote you choose, please do not let it be indifferent. Our vote today is a call, it is a statement, and at the very least—it has started the conversation (with each other and our new President).---What are our gifts? What are our promises? What will we risk? To whom will we be accountable? What do we want for our

workplace and for our students? How do we show our student what it looks like to register our protest with civil discourse and resolve?

Thank you

Jarquin moved to strike the language in the Fifth whereas clause “faculty, staff, and student” and replace it with the phrase “faculty and staff”/ Second.

Jarquin explained how she was approached by the Provost and the Vice President for Business and Finance at the beginning of the semester and assured that she could bring any of her questions and problems to them at any time. This has been borne out by her experience. For example, on the Monday after Thanksgiving Break Jarquin was able to sit down with the Provost and discuss the budget for two hours and address any of her questions. Jarquin explained that most of her other officers thought that this language was just a tag on without any proper consultation about including students.

Cross wanted to report that of the 23 Lecturers who spoke to him about the Resolution, 22 were in support, and of the 34 students he spoke to 28 supported the resolution.

Pratt said that unfortunately he had to disagree with his colleague, because the Student Academic Senators do wish to include students within this clause.

Motion did not pass.

Ponarul wanted Senators to reflect on whether the Resolution is a means to an end, or is it a n end to itself? If we apply an Outcomes assessment to the Senate, we would have to conclude that it is not very effective. Now we must consider the Resolution as an end in itself. This reminded Ponarul of the conversation we had about limiting the ability to repeat a course for forgiveness. The Senate leadership has not been successful with all of its resolutions and we are being asked to adopt another one. Pointing fingers is easy, self-reflection is hard.

Sistrunk wanted to reflect on the academic mission a little bit since it is the context of what we are talking about here –the moment when people are in the classroom and their minds are engaged.. Everything else is subservient to that. This emotional sense and the spirit of our place is really what we are talking about when we discuss the decline in Academic Affairs and its position at the center of the University. This idea is not to denigrate other divisions because everyone is conscious of the mission.

Sistrunk wanted to reiterate that he has no personal antipathy for anyone involved in all of these discussions. But this is about a systems problem. How do we respond to repeated failure to make shared governance work? What is good management practice? Sometimes it is necessary to give someone a failing grade although it says nothing about them as a person.

Sager wanted to read a couple of things from the letter that President Zingg sent to the Senators. He wrote at “I have always believed that a University is governed by certain right rules of conduct, indeed the very definition of a moral code. These particularly include reason and

respect which begin with truth telling, for if anything the University is not a community where truth telling is paramount, it loses its soul and forfeits its purpose.” On the previous page (information reiterated by our Provost) it reads: The tenure density of our faculty is now back over 60%, a level it has not attained in many years. Here is a quotation from our own system about tenure density: Ratio of tenure track faculty to total faculty based on faculty workload assignment.

College	2011 F	2-15F
College of Ag	64%	63%
BSS	69%	60%
BUS	50%	53%
CME	55%	45%
EEC	67%	59%
HFA	80%	65%
	63%	53%

Where is the truth telling here? It is hard to believe any numbers that come from our administration. The numbers are just a fantasy and when you ask questions about it, you get more fantasy. This is why Sager will support the Resolution.

The speaker’s list is exhausted. Motion for secret ballot /Seconded.

Vote in favor of the Resolution as amended, yes 24 Opposed: nay 8.

Action item passed.

Boyd wanted to take a moment to recognize that everyone here has a tremendous commitment to our campus and that these circumstances are heart-rending. She thanked us all and despite how individuals voted, everyone came here and were part of what happened tonight and that is priceless. She thanked everyone for staying so long and the Senators who performed their due diligence to vote on behalf of your constituencies.

16. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 5:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Sistrunk, Secretary