

Colleagues,

On Tuesday, May 8, I was in attendance for Faculty Senate Chair Kolehmainen's report on her perceived failures of our administrative leadership team. It's disheartening when you repeatedly hear reports consistently plagued with fiction which also intentionally refuses to acknowledge all our positive progress. Our leadership team, as well as the Office of the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, has recognized and celebrated CSUSB's incredible efforts and remarkable success stories. But it is sad that years of unfounded criticism by the Chair and some members of the Senate have severely impacted campus morale.

The overarching message of Chair Kolehmainen's report was that the administrative leadership team has made "little progress" in the last year with advancing shared governance. Earlier this year, I shared with you a report of all major decisions of the university and how students, faculty and staff have been directly involved in their creation. We have added some updates, so I invite you again to [review this report](#) and please [let me know your thoughts](#).

So, how do we navigate through the same unfounded accusations which have been thoughtfully addressed again and again? The best way I know how is to continue to call out falsehoods and share the facts. Those of you who know me know that I will tell it like it is.

The Senate Executive Committee has no interest in acknowledging our achievements. We are now living in a time where accountability is required of all branches of the university, faculty leadership included. The vision of CSUSB is now clearly focused on student success, faculty scholarship and research, assessment, integrity and fiscal responsibility.

In that context, let me specifically address the Chair's report of May 8:

CHAIR KOLEHMAINEN: Several administrative decisions and actions during the last year are of deep concern to many faculty. Concerns about faculty workload under the semester system have not been addressed, and multiple faculty recommendations have been ignored. Course sizes have increased and tenure density has decreased, contrary to the goals of the Strategic Plan. Faculty were either bypassed or ignored in reaching several decisions, including the reorganization of international education, a change in the Open University registration policy, and the move of the administrative home of GE from the Office of Undergraduate Studies to the Office of the Deputy Provost.

RESPONSE: Each college was asked to appoint a committee to review reassigned time and many are developing models to address workload. We are committed to maintaining the same historic levels of reassigned time in the coming years and continuing through semester conversion. The Office of the Provost has presented to the Senate the faculty concern about serving on too many committees, which also contributes to workload. The Provost has offered to work with the faculty affairs chair to streamline FAM processes, but this was deferred by the faculty affairs chair until next year – at the earliest.

The Chair's report that course sizes are increasing is false. Average class size has remained flat from Fall 2015, Fall 2016, and Fall 2017 at 39. The Chair reports that Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) is increasing. In fact, it is decreasing. SFR stood at 28.9 in Fall 2015, 28.5 in Fall 2016, and 28.0 in Fall 2017. SFR and Tenure-Track Density (TTD) are significant issues at every CSU campus. But it is positive to note that CSUSB's TTD is higher than the system average.

To the reorganization of international education (an action taken in 2016) and a change in the Open University registration process, I believe both of these points were fully addressed by Dean Karmanova at the May 8 Faculty Senate meeting. With regards to the administrative home of GE, academic administrative reorganization is the sole responsibility of the Provost. But this decision was made to elevate the importance of GE by having it report directly to the Deputy Provost.

CHAIR KOLEHMAINEN: The search for the TRC Director was seriously flawed but continued nonetheless. Several faculty serving in interim leadership roles were treated shoddily during the searches for the permanent positions. A college Dean who was well liked by many faculty was abruptly fired. The administration interfered with the ability of the senate, together with our support staff, to determine whether some senate support work could be accomplished via telecommuting. As a result, a long-term loyal employee was forced to resign, and the senate office was left without staff support for several months.

RESPONSE: The search for the TRC Director was done by the book (as written by the Senate), with faculty members appointed by the Senate, a campus-wide search that sought inclusive participation, as well as open forums for faculty and staff to provide feedback. Per practice and written process, search committees serve in an advisory role, providing qualified candidates to the hiring officer for his/her decision. The Provost took their counsel, depending on the thoughtful feedback from the TRC search committee and from faculty across campus. In addition, she consulted with legal counsel and made her decision based on extensive consultation. Just because the Senate leadership preferred another candidate does not make the process flawed. It's time for the Senate leadership to stop campaigning and provide the appropriate support for the new director of the TRC.

With regards to the Chair's statement that, "Several faculty serving in interim leadership roles were treated shoddily during the searches for the permanent positions," there is no evidence to support that claim. In fact, it's both irresponsible and disrespectful to the selected faculty to advance that narrative.

The long-time employee the Chair refers to was never "forced to resign," but expected to work on campus. In the spirit of staff equity, we could no longer offer special benefits to a chosen few. She was encouraged to stay, but chose to resign. We have committed to helping her find a new position at a CSU campus closer to her home.

Contrary to the Chair's report that the Senate was left without administrative support for "several months," it is important to note that the support position was vacant from December 15 to February 5. Thanks to the Office of the Provost, the Senate was provided interim support for the three executive committee meetings and one full meeting that took place during this window of time.

CHAIR KOLEHMAINEN: President Morales, in your March 22 email to senators you discuss several areas in which you believe significant progress on shared governance has been made. In an attachment to that email, you list faculty representatives on a number of different committees, but meaningful shared governance involves more than bean counting and checking off boxes. Real shared governance means that genuine consultation occurs, consultation that sometimes affects the final decision.

One example of progress that you cite is the establishment of a shared governance task force consisting of two administrators, two students, two staff, and two faculty. However, the charge of the task force is very limited, consisting only of providing a recommendation on the choice of a shared governance consultant to be brought to CSUSB in fall 2018. Although I sincerely hope that we will identify a consultant who will help us in this area, I feel that plans to bring in an external consultant are being used as a stalling tactic to avoid discussing important issues now.

RESPONSE: Our leadership team readily embraces the importance and impact of a shared governance community, as demonstrated in all the decisions impacted by major initiatives (Strategic Plan, Master Plan, Branding & Identity, faculty and leadership hiring, budget, Quarters to Semesters, GI 2025, 50th Anniversary, etc.). These require a process where all voices are heard so as to inform decision-making. That is exactly what has happened throughout my tenure at CSUSB. The Chair's report is simply false. All major decisions are happening with thorough and meaningful consultation.

With regards to the Shared Governance Consultant Task Force (SGCTF), the Chair is right when she says the charge is to identify a consultant. As a matter of fact, Faculty Senate leadership have repeatedly requested that a consultant be identified. This was necessary to help the university community (especially the Senate leadership) come to a common understanding and definition of shared governance, something that is clearly needed. But what the Chair failed to mention is that the SGCTF has had several meetings, reviewed the time line, created an RFQ together, and is in the process of reviewing potential consultants and identifying individuals who all stakeholder groups agree can assist us with this critical initiative. In fact, we are making progress.

It's also important to note that the Senate Executive Committee repeatedly requested that the Task Force exclude Staff Council and ASI, two critical key governance bodies on campus. The Cabinet rejected that request, as it's critical we engage every leadership voice and stakeholder group in this decision.

CHAIR KOLEHMAINEN: You cite your attendance at senate and EC meetings as an example of progress, yet you have attended only 3 out of 9 senate meetings (including today) and 5 out of 18 EC meetings this academic year.

However, attendance at meetings is less important than engaging in meaningful discussion. Much of the business at EC meetings, such as committee appointments, probably wouldn't be of interest to you anyway. We never know ahead of time whether or not you'll be present; if we did, we could adjust the agenda to discuss items most crucial for shared governance in your

presence.

You also mention joint meetings between the President's Cabinet and the Faculty Senate EC as an example of progress. The last such meeting took place in November 2017. Before that meeting, you dictated that shared governance should not be on the agenda due to the existence of the taskforce. We have suggested meeting again since then, but you have used the existence of the shared governance task force as an excuse for not meeting.

RESPONSE: While I always hope to attend every full Senate meeting, my calendar is quite complex and needs to be accessible to the needs of students, staff and faculty. I spend a great deal of time off campus, attending system meetings, raising money in the community, as well as advocating for our students in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. This is the job of a President. Despite that, I have attended over 60% of the full Senate meetings in my six years as president.

Even when I am unable to attend, a full Senate meeting has never taken place without my written progress report. Members of the Cabinet are always in attendance and regularly answer any questions of the Senate. They also submit written update reports for each meeting.

With regard to the joint meetings of the Cabinet and the Senate EC, let me be honest. While I had hoped that such meetings could be productive, members of the Senate Executive Committee have demonstrated time and time again that they have little interest in a meaningful dialogue, resulting in unproductive conversations that only create animosity. This is why we are pursuing outside consulting support: to give all campus stakeholder groups an appropriate opportunity to express their concerns and move towards a campus culture where expectations around collegiality and shared governance are clearly articulated.

CHAIR KOLEHMAINEN: You also cite the restoration of quarterly open meetings with faculty. I agree that this was a positive step and I commend you for this. However, I was disappointed to read your email of April 11, in which you responded to the questions that had been submitted by faculty who couldn't be at the March 15 open forum. In your response, you stated that you would not answer any further questions submitted by email, in spite of the fact that you had originally promised to answer all such questions, and we had only sent you about half of the questions that were submitted.

In the set of email questions that you did answer in your April 11 email, question 4 concerned discrimination on campus. In your response, you mentioned alleged incidents of bullying by senior faculty against junior faculty, and you implied that the senate might be somehow responsible for this. I have no doubt that there are a few "bad apples" among the senior faculty (or any other sufficiently large group), but to suggest that the only incidents of bullying on campus are committed by senior faculty against junior faculty is disingenuous. Furthermore, the senate is certainly not engaged in a systematic program of bullying anyone. Indeed, in email discussions during the last year (more on this shortly), senators have been models of professionalism and restraint in comparison with certain other campus constituents. I would like to remind you that it was the senate-sponsored campus climate survey that first drew attention

to the problem of bullying on campus, and the survey results specifically call attention to the bullying of faculty and staff by administrators. The senate has offered repeatedly to help the administration develop an anti-bullying policy, but there has been no interest on your part.

RESPONSE: Creating opportunities for an open dialogue with all faculty remains a high priority for me and the leadership team, but the reality is that attendance at campus-wide faculty meetings has been weak (at best). What has been very positive are the local meetings with college-based faculty, giving people a safe place to ask meaningful questions based on their needs as educators. To date, we have hosted meetings for Social and Behavioral Sciences, Natural Sciences, Education and the Brown College. Many faculty, who would have never come to a campus-wide forum, are attending the college meetings and are taking part in the dialogue. In addition, the Provost and I continue to have smaller faculty group lunches to get better connected to their programs.

Since 2015, I have personally met with 225 faculty, including department chairs, over lunch or breakfast with Interim Provost Delgado or Provost McMahan. In addition, I have also connected with 88 administrative units, speaking with 640 staff members. To suggest that faculty are afraid to meet with me is simply untrue.

With regards to not taking anonymous questions by email, I agreed to accept the questions from the most recent campus-wide forum, an act that goes against my past practice. When you read a question in writing, it's difficult to ascertain the non-verbal cues or intent of the question. At the end of the day, we need to hear directly from the individual who wants the answer. No one has ever been insulted for asking a question and my [personal email address](#) is available to everyone.

The subject of bullying has been documented at CSUSB for over ten years and long before my arrival. The Senate leadership has heard (repeatedly) that the Office of the Chancellor has asked campuses to not develop an independent bullying policy and that this is to be addressed systemwide. But in the spirit of finding real solutions, we have launched a progressive approach to strengthen collegiality across campus. The campus-wide Collegiality Committee includes a breadth of faculty, staff and students, including tri-chair Karen Kolehmainen.

Yet the Senate leadership consistently refuses to take on a constructive examination and review of the issue of faculty bullying. This is an issue that the university needs to address, especially faculty leadership. The “bad apples” highlighted in the Chair’s report exist because of the Executive Committee’s refusal to take this issue seriously. Even one bad apple is detrimental to our campus community.

CHAIR KOLEHMAINEN: In an attachment to your email message of March 22, you accuse one of our statewide academic senators of “fabrications” and “blatant falsehoods” in her March 21 email to the senate listserv, in which she contrasted shared governance progress at the system-wide level with that on our campus. For the President of a university to make such charges against an individual faculty member strikes me as an example of bullying and the abuse of power. As President, you should be setting a positive example for others to emulate.

RESPONSE: When someone is not telling the truth in a public forum, correcting the facts is the responsible and ethical thing to do. It is sad that the faculty member in question continues to create these false narratives. Again, the Senate leadership remains silent and even worse, complicit.

CHAIR KOLEHMAINEN: The progress on shared governance at the system-wide level that was reported by our statewide senator may now be threatened by an issue that originated on our campus, namely the CO's new "interpretation" of EO 1100-R forbidding campuses from subdividing GE category C. In spite of the description of this as an "interpretation" of EO 1100-R, it is actually a new policy. The CO's hasty imposition of this new policy and the lack of faculty consultation are sadly reminiscent of practices at CSUSB. In fact, it is not clear that this new "interpretation" of EO 1100-R would have been issued at all, if not for the actions of administrators on our campus.

Unfortunately, the GE category C issue is not the only example of the CSUSB administration exerting authority over curriculum, an area in which faculty have traditionally held primacy. In our ongoing Q2S conversion, several college Deans have told departments that they need to reduce the number of units in their proposed programs, even though the proposed programs do not violate any policies and leave plenty of room for GE requirements and free electives. Program approvals are being held up for this reason.

RESPONSE: To state that CSUSB has influenced the new interpretation of EO 1100-R is false. The Chancellor's Office makes decisions for the entire system. All campuses are expected to implement the GE policy as outlined in EO 1100-R. The recent [updated FAQ](#) on EO 1100-R, as well as a memo from Vice Chancellor Loren Blanchard to Provost McMahan, states that campuses cannot institute further restrictions on student choices from the CSU GE Breadth Subareas. This standard is being upheld systemwide to ensure student choice, articulation agreements, and the same GE requirements for all students regardless of whether they transfer from a California community college or are native CSUSB students.

The College Deans have a responsibility to ensure that students are able to graduate in a timely manner. They are also responsible for costs associated with running academic programs in the colleges. A student-centered climate requires us to critically examine the impact of specific program requirements in the context of the student experience and student success. The deans were charged to communicate the new rules, not make them. Furthermore, it is important to distinguish CSU system and campus policies from curriculum. EO 1100 and the CSU GI 2025 Student Success Initiative are policies that frame academic programs.

The GE courses and pathways, for example, offered in general education should be developed by campus faculty within the policy framework.

CHAIR KOLEHMAINEN: Finally, one particular campus member (a strong supporter of yours) continues to post erroneous demographic data on the faculty senate membership on campus listservs, apparently in an attempt to discredit faculty members who have devoted their careers to teaching a diverse student body. I have explained the fallacies in these data several times, and

I have explained that your chief of staff actually asked me not to supply data to this organization. Nevertheless, this individual continues to post these data and belligerently attack anyone who questions them. This same individual posted many hostile and bullying emails to the campus listserv last spring during the period of time surrounding the vote of no confidence. In my opinion, you are complicit in the bullying perpetrated by this individual, since you have not spoken up and disowned the bullying that is being done on your behalf. Your continued silence in this matter indicates that you are willing to use dishonorable tactics to try to silence those who speak out about the dismal state of shared governance at CSUSB.

RESPONSE: First and foremost, I have never asked a member of our faculty to defend me. Ever. Universities have long been harbors for free speech. I am also deeply disappointed with your attack on this basic right. Bold people will speak their mind and call out injustice when they see it. But what has been clear is that the Chair and Senate leadership consistently go silent when racist remarks from like-minded faculty appear on the same forum, e.g., “notice that everyone who supports Morales has a Hispanic surname,” yet are angered when someone criticizes their commitment to diversity. You have to ask why. Based on the Chair’s report, it’s clearly important why we need to advance the dialogue on difficult subjects, such as race and culture.

CSUSB has long-standing issues where underrepresented faculty feel marginalized. Why does the Senate EC push back on addressing FAM language that would create a more diverse hiring body for new faculty? Why wouldn’t the Senate embrace actions that would increase the number of new hires from diverse communities? The only reasonable conclusion is that it goes against the status quo they have worked hard to build.

Let’s not forget that we are a nationally recognized, minority serving institution where nearly 80% of our students are the first in their families to graduate from college. This is our world, our real world – today and tomorrow.

Lastly, the Chair failed to mention is that my chief of staff wanted to verify with legal counsel if it was appropriate to provide the information. Dr. Kolehmainen’s subsequent correspondence with the Office of the President included a directive that said on the advice of counsel we should not produce such information.

I would encourage the Senate leadership to read [Inside CSUSB](#) and see the wonderful accomplishments of our university community. They should take pride in and ownership of the national recognition of our students, academic programs and administrative departments. Despite the Senate leadership’s lack of meaningful participation, our faculty, staff and student leaders are moving this great university forward.

Tomás D. Morales
President