

CSUSB Campus Climate Progress Report, One Year Later

March 2017

Janet Kottke, Kathie Pelletier, and Barbara Sirotnik

Recommendations reprinted within this follow-up report are from the following, previously distributed reports:

2015 CSUSB CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY, PHASE 1 REPORT (March 7, 2016)

2015 CSUSB CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY, PHASE 2 REPORT (May 10, 2016)

Below are links to these original reports that were distributed to the Faculty Senate and President Morales in March and May 2016:

<http://senate.csusb.edu/reports.htm>

or:

<https://sites.google.com/site/2015csusbcampusclimate/questions-and-answers-about-the-survey/reports>

CSUSB Campus Climate Progress Report, One Year Later March 2017

Executive Summary

In this follow-up report, we re-state the recommendations from the campus climate reports (Parts 1 and 2) that were provided to President Morales in March and May of 2016. We then provide a status report on whether the recommendations, as specified in the reports, have been adequately addressed one year later. The full list of recommendations, their status, and further explanation is on the following pages.

We believe it important to preface this report by noting that President Morales pledged to “implement the recommendations outlined in the report” (May 10, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting minutes).

To date:

- Some recommendations have been implemented, to a limited extent. The President has acknowledged in e-mail to the campus that a problem exists. He has engaged in a listening tour on campus, although it appears that these discussions have not centered on the climate survey results or recommendations.
- Shared governance has not been addressed. The President’s report of February 6, 2017, correctly noted that faculty serve on a variety of committees; membership, however, on a committee does not equate to shared governance, particularly if committee meetings consist predominantly of sharing information about decisions that have already been made. Despite requests by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to meet with the president to discuss concerns about the lack of shared governance, President Morales has yet to clear time on his calendar for this crucial discussion.
- Issues of favoritism and confidentiality that surfaced about Human Resources have not been resolved by the administration. Though the President’s report of February 6 suggested “If there were specific issues of favoritism, they would have come forward during the 360° reviews,” the survey results clearly indicated there were issues of favoritism and confidentiality, and there is no evidence that these have been addressed.
- Most critically, one year later, there is NO anti-bullying policy to regulate the behavior of campus leaders. President Morales pledged at the May 10, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting that he was going to develop an anti-bullying policy via a task force. No task force with that charge has been constituted; instead, a committee (titled the “Collegiality and Respect” Committee) was constituted whose stated aim is to develop a values statement, but not an anti-bullying policy.

CSUSB Campus Climate Progress Report, One Year Later

March 2017

The results of the campus climate survey released a year ago indicated that there had been a breach of trust between administration and the faculty and staff. We proposed several general recommendations to help restore trust, and President Morales pledged to “implement the recommendations outlined in the report.” (May 10, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting minutes). The purpose of this report is to evaluate the progress made on implementing those recommendations.

Throughout this report, we have *italicized* the recommendations as they appeared in the original reports; we have retained the original numbering from those reports. We have set in **bold print** the status of actions on those recommendations.

General Recommendations (from Part I)

1. *Top leadership must acknowledge that a problem exists.*

Status one year later: Yes, to a limited degree (see below).

- After the first phase of the report was released and a meeting of the campus climate survey authors was held with the President on March 17, 2016, the President sent two e-mails to the campus community. In the first email, he expressed his disappointment in the survey results and his willingness to take responsibility for the state of the climate. In the second email, he informed the Faculty Senate that he had met with the Executive Committee (EC) of the Senate and that discussions he felt were positive were taking place with deans, department chairs, and select faculty and staff.
- Despite these communications, key recommendations of the report have seemingly been ignored; thus, the extent to which the problems have been acknowledged is unclear. As we shall see with instances described in the remainder of this report, the campus leadership has not yet fully acknowledged its role in contributing to the poor campus climate.

2. *Second, top leadership should genuinely listen to employees—**all employees**—and address their concerns.*

Status: Action has been taken to listen to employees, but the “listening tour” has not been focused on a discussion of specific issues outlined in the campus climate survey report. The Senators on the climate survey team made repeated requests to the President to make public the *specific* questions posed in these meetings related to the

climate survey results and faculty responses to those questions. To date, he has not provided these data to the Senate. Further, he has not held open town hall meetings to discuss the campus climate survey results.

- The campus climate survey report provided all the data that leadership needed to respond to the recommendations, and the climate survey team relayed this to the President when he asked us how he should proceed. Top leadership decided, instead, to embark on a “listening tour” which continues one year later.
 - At the May 10, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting, the President stated that he was going to hold meetings with faculty to “listen and discuss the issues outlined in parts 1 and 2 of the reports.” Based on reports from multiple faculty and chairs who have attended these meetings and the wording of the e-mailed invitations to faculty, it appears that the administration has NOT asked questions directly related to the campus climate survey results in these meetings of small groups. At this time, it is impossible to state with any certainty that these “listening tours” are being conducted with the intent to address the climate survey recommendations.
 - The President has not held any open town hall meetings since the climate survey results were presented; yet, he did hold several open town hall meetings prior to the release of the climate survey results. When asked if he would reconvene the town hall meetings so faculty and staff could discuss concerns in the climate report, he declined, stating he was going to continue meeting with small groups of people. The EC learned recently that the President stated that he “might” conduct a town hall meeting at the conclusion of the “listening tour.” He has provided no timeline for these tours, nor has he set a date for a town hall meeting.
3. *Finally, top leadership must demonstrate that all employees are valued, not just a select number who support the leadership already, and show that active steps are being taken to restore trust.*

Status: Limited progress.

- With regard to valuing employees, there appears to have been an increase in individual employees highlighted on the campus’ homepage, as well as in the campus news. The President has engaged in social opportunities and celebrations that are customary and annual events (e.g., campus picnic). However, there must be more effort beyond social events to demonstrate that the leadership values ALL employees (as opposed to select individuals). Admittedly, this is a difficult task, one which requires intense focus on the issues of greatest import to constituencies (e.g. the faculty issues of shared governance

and genuinely following existing faculty policies, and staff issues such as bullying and IRP processes).

- With regard to active steps to restore trust, President Morales vetoed a policy (FSD 15-03; Academic Freedom for Faculty Use of Information Resources) on email and communication surveillance, passed by the Faculty Senate late in AY2015-16. This policy would have created a system of checks and balances in cases of electronic surveillance and monitoring of faculty communications.

Specific Recommendations from Part II

Recommendations Regarding Bullying

1. *Create an explicit anti-bullying policy that clearly defines bullying conduct and the consequences for bullying behavior (the consequences should also apply to every employee who is found to have bullied, from the President on down). Rationale: Policies obligate employers--mission statements do not. We suggest that the President and his cabinet go on record as endorsing the policy and pledge to follow it themselves.*

Status one year later: The campus has no anti-bullying policy despite pleas from the Faculty Senate and climate survey team to do so, and despite President Morales' pledge to do so at the Faculty Senate meeting on May 10, 2016 and in his May 11, 2016 e-mail to the campus.

- The President has instituted training on microaggression and created a committee on Collegiality and Respect. These actions fall short of the pledge to create an explicit anti-bullying policy.
- Below are the duties assigned to the Collegiality and Respect Committee as described in the Committee Book:

“The charge of the Committee on Civility and Respect is to develop a comprehensive value statement regarding these two important behaviors - tying together CSUSB’s mission and goals, strategic plan and values on the institution. The statement should address how we treat each other on campus, what a respectful work environment looks like, and how a positive campus culture can influence implementation of strategic goals. The committee will propose this values statement, ideas for implementation, and messaging to the cabinet in the spring quarter. The committee may also recommend other action items to strengthen campus engagement with one another.”

- In a recent conversation with one of the top administrators on the specific question related to the development of an anti-bullying policy and whether such a policy was in progress, the answer was “no,” as the goal of the administration is “not to prohibit behaviors,” but to “encourage the behaviors we want to see.” Bullying should be taken as seriously as sexual harassment and handled with the same urgency and care. Furthermore, bullying behaviors should be expressly prohibited.
2. *Develop credible enforcement procedures (failing to enforce the policy will likely lead to employee cynicism).*

Status: It is impossible to create enforcement procedures for a policy which has yet to be developed. Thus, no action has been taken to address this recommendation.

3. *Treat the bullied target or complainant as credible unless proven otherwise. Believe the targets as readily as you accept supervisors’ complaints about “difficult” employees.*

Status: No known action has been taken to address this recommendation.

4. *Ensure all complaints are handled fairly, promptly, and objectively, by appointing a trustworthy ombudsman or forming a committee (trained in bullying investigations and also representative of all employee units) to investigate thoroughly and handle any complaints.*

Status: No known action has been taken to address the recommendation for complaints to be handled fairly, promptly, or objectively.

On March 13, 2017, the President’s Office announced that the ombuds position had been filled; however, there is no evidence that this employee would be independent of the President’s office, given the current reporting relationship of this position to the President. Further, in the President’s congratulatory e-mail, there is no mention of qualifications or duties related to investigating incidents of bullying.

5. *Require all employees in leadership positions, from the President on down, and including the HR Director, to attend training on bullying. Similar to Executive Order 1096 on sexual assault/harassment training, training on bullying should be offered regularly.*

Status: There is no regular, mandatory training on anti-bullying. Although microaggression training has been adopted, it does not satisfactorily address this recommendation. There is an important distinction between microaggression and bullying.

6. *Provide ongoing training to any staff responsible for investigating allegations of bullying and to professionals who counsel those who have experienced or witnessed bullying. In short, if we are to rebuild a culture of safety and well-being, training on bullying should be on the top of the list of annual training workshops.*

Status: No known action has been taken to address this recommendation.

7. *Ensure a safe environment for the bullied target throughout the process. Special attention should be paid to the supervisor or person above the complainant to ensure there are no adverse consequences to the target for reporting bullying.*

Status: The survey report team met with the AVP of HR, and we asked directly about protections for bullied targets. No concrete actions were presented and no policies were provided that would suggest the complainant would be protected from any adverse consequences for reporting bullying.

Recommendations to Resolve Charges of Favoritism

1. *Immediately sponsor an audit of HR's practices and policies by an independent party, who will make the report directly to top leadership, the Faculty Senate, and representatives of the staff employees.*

Status: VP of Administration and Finance Doug Freer reported at the November 22, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting that an external consultant had been engaged to review the offices of Human Resources and Academic Personnel (the latter at the request of the current provost). The report has not yet been made available. Further, without the consultant having been identified, it is impossible to determine if this individual is an independent auditor.

2. *Follow the policies already in place with regard to fair employment practices. And, be consistent in applying policies regarding employment procedures. It is clear that many staff employees especially do not believe they are treated fairly; in particular, many believe that their jobs are improperly classified, that their requests for help, whether with regard to bullying or reclassification are not being taken seriously. Further, employees need to believe that all are being treated fairly, and that requires that the policies be applied systematically to all. With regard to recommendations specific to staff concerns, we strongly suggest that the Vice-President of Administration and Finance evaluate IRP practices in HR to improve the speed of the process, assess any perceptions of favoritism in the decision-making process, and ensure employees receive timely and adequate feedback on their proposals.*

Status: Limited progress.

- According to the presidential report of February 6, 2017, 243 employees had been awarded an IRP. The report fails to note how many of these were across the board equity raises that were accorded all employees--without filing an IRP application--who were at the bottom of their respective pay steps.
 - Possibly the external report commissioned by the VP of Finance and Administration will address the issues of favoritism.
3. *Permit the committees and other established mechanisms for making employment decisions to operate without interference from superiors. To re-establish trust means trusting employees with the autonomy to do their jobs.*

Status: There has been no administrative communication on this issue.

Other Recommendations for Top Leadership, based on Phase 1 and 2 Results

Recommendations Regarding Use of the Survey Data

1. *Read Phases 1 and 2 of the Campus Climate Survey Report in their entirety with special attention to what employees are saying when they are given an opportunity, as with this survey, to speak freely (see appendices in addition to comments within the body of the report), as their comments provide the roadmap for the actions that will be necessary to restore trust and improve morale. Holding meetings with a selected few is not an efficient use of time in this cause. Consider the survey results as the feedback, and focus your efforts on changing behaviors that will demonstrate a commitment to the campus community and its people.*

Status: Limited progress. See pp. 3-4 regarding general recommendations.

Recommendations Regarding Specific Actions to Rebuild Trust

- a. *Invite input BEFORE decisions have been made. For staff especially, ask for this input in ways that do not identify the contributors so people feel safe in providing ideas. This may take the form of having people offer input via an anonymous survey sponsored by an independent party or writing cards that are given an independent party to read at a town hall meeting. Send administrators to the faculty to invite input; town halls on a Friday afternoon are NOT an effective mechanism to invite input, for example; go to where the faculty are already gathering, such as college and department meetings.*

Status: Limited progress. See pp. 3-4 regarding the use of small groups to collect feedback. More on shared decision-making and shared governance follows.

Recommendation Regarding Shared Decision Making

- b. *Based on the issues raised with shared governance and shared decision making in Phase 1, we recommend that top leadership work more closely with constituents than has been the practice thus far with this administration.*

Status: We have seen no evidence that this recommendation has been addressed. More detail follows.

Several of the behavioral methods through which shared governance is enacted are by the President attending meetings of the Faculty Senate, reporting information vital to the educational objectives of the university, soliciting and most importantly, incorporating feedback from faculty on any initiatives related to the educational quality and experiences of our students *before* decisions have been made.

- Before the climate survey, President Morales' attendance at monthly Faculty Senate meetings was very good, averaging 9 of 11 meetings. During the year of the survey (AY 15/16), he missed nearly half of the meetings, and for AY 16/17, thus far, he has missed as many meetings as he has attended.
- On October 13, 2015, the President was asked to provide information relevant to issues of concern and interest to the faculty in his report, rather than repeating information already communicated via the events calendar and the campus' homepage. The President indicated he would do so. The President's reports continue to be devoted to re-announcing campus events and awards that have already been communicated by the Office of Strategic Communications.
- Between March 2016 and January 2017, only one visit was scheduled by the President to meet with the Faculty Senate leadership and it was in AY 2015-16 (April 5). One meeting was scheduled for February 14, 2017, but was devoted to a presentation on a proposed campus center. It must be noted that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has requested meetings devoted to crafting a shared agreement on the meaning of shared governance/shared decision making. These meetings have not taken place. Decisions that are made before faculty has a chance to provide meaningful input are examples of a lack of shared governance.
- There have been four trustee visits since February 2016 to the current date. As illustrative of how little the top administration appears to regard faculty voice, let alone shared governance, members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee have not been consistently invited to meet each of these trustees. In the previous administration, it was a standard practice for the trustee to meet with members of

the Faculty Senate, or the Executive Committee. The EC was notified of each visit in advance and did not have to ask to be included.

- At the March 7, 2017, Faculty Senate meeting, senators learned that President-Emeritus Ortiz from the Cal Poly Pomona campus would be installed as a Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) faculty member in the College of Education at the CSUSB Palm Desert campus. The President, who approves all FERPs, declined to consult faculty within the department prior to this appointment, a clear violation of shared governance.

Recommendation Regarding Specific Policy to Address Electronic Surveillance

- c. *...we recommend that the administration clarify what surveillance and monitoring is taking place on the campus and provide the rationale for such monitoring. In addition to providing evidence that administration is striving to eradicate the climate of fear, supporting the Faculty Senate's electronic use policy would also evidence support for collaborative decision making with the key constituency, faculty.*

Status: No progress; the President vetoed the proposed policy passed by the 2015-16 Faculty Senate regarding monitoring and surveillance of employees.

- As noted earlier, President Morales vetoed a policy (FSD 15-03; Academic Freedom for Faculty Use of Information Resources) on email and communication surveillance, passed by the Faculty Senate late in AY2015-16. The proposed policy acknowledged that there might be times when surveillance is warranted, but would prohibit monitoring e-mail and other electronic and telephone communications without just cause. VP for Information Technology Services, Sudhakar met with the Education Policy and Resources Committee in an effort to bring the proposed policy into compliance. The revised policy was presented to President Morales who subsequently vetoed it; when asked why, President Morales did not offer any specifics or assistance to bring the senate's policy into compliance.
- At the November 22, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting, a member of the EPRC asked VP Sudhakar if the decryption module of the Palo Alto Networks firmware had been implemented. Sudhakar indicated that it had not and that there were no plans for it to be implemented. If there is no electronic monitoring, as this response indicates, why not approve the policy?

Recommendation Regarding Budget Transparency

- d. *...budget information should be readily available and provided (within reason) readily when requested*

Status: Limited progress.

The President has indicated that budget materials are available on the web site, yet there has been no attempt to explain the differences between these figures and those provided by an outside independent auditor. Moreover, at the March 7, 2017 Senate plenary, the President was asked to explain why the budget continues to present conflicting information and why the budget is reflecting a structural deficit. The Senate was told that the Administration and Finance VP would look into it.

Recommendation Regarding Workload Inequities (Staff Employees)

- e. *...we also recommend that workload audits be considered to identify the departments for which there are imbalances in work distribution and expectation. This audit should be conducted by an external, independent party (i.e., not by HR, which is not widely trusted).*

Status: Mixed evidence for progress.

The aforementioned presidential report of February 6, 2017 indicated that the administration has devoted significant resources to training (e.g., Leadership Development and Employee Enrichment). We support more opportunities for staff career development, but remind top leadership that these do not address the issue of workload inequity that was expressed in the survey.

Recommendation for Ongoing Assessment of Campus Climate

2. *Commit to an ongoing process of data collection to track campus climate over time. The process might include repeating this campus climate survey in a year or two to determine if positive changes have been made relative to the issues raised in the Phase 1 and 2 reports. It may also be beneficial to implement 360-degree feedback reviews for all administrative staff to diminish the probability that issues such as those which came to light in this survey would not stay hidden in the future.*

Status: Unable to ascertain. There has been no evidence that the administration intends to support an ongoing process of tracking campus climate over time *and responding to the results*; we again recommend that the President implement an ongoing survey, done by qualified professionals, as it would illustrate a willingness to assess progress. The President has reported that all VPs had undergone 360° feedback.

Recommendation for Executive Coach

3. *Finally, we suggest an executive coach be hired who specializes in the area of authentic, ethical, and relational leadership.*

Status: Unable to ascertain. If an executive coach has been hired, that individual has not reached out to the faculty on the campus climate committee for elaboration on our recommendations.

Recommendations for Faculty Senate Leadership

- *Support the President when he is authentic, and when his behaviors model our core values as a university.*

Status: As of the date of this report, the President has not met with the Faculty Senate leadership to discuss shared governance.

- *Communicate to the President and to the VPs what they are doing well, and continue to be forthcoming in advising what the President should do to enact shared governance, transparency, and collegiality.*

Status: A review of the Faculty Senate meeting minutes indicates that Senators are providing positive feedback to the top leadership on the occasions it is warranted, e.g., support for undocumented students.