

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-3075-12/
Shared Governance Committee (Rev)
March 15-16, 2012

Procedures for Dealing with a Vote of No Confidence

WHEREAS, The principle of shared governance in the California State University (CSU) has been explicitly recognized by HEERA, affirmed by the CSU Board of Trustees (BOT), and supported by the CSU faculty; and

WHEREAS, shared governance only functions when it is acknowledged and actively practiced by the university administration and faculty governing bodies; and

WHEREAS, confidence in the leadership of the chief executive of a campus or the CSU system is integral to the effective execution of the CSU mission and its absence gravely damages the institution's ability to operate; and

WHEREAS, faculty of more than one campus have become so concerned about the state of affairs on their campus that they have expressed their lack of confidence in the ability and willingness of their campus President to lead in an environment of shared governance¹; and

WHEREAS, the Chancellor's response to those expressions of deep and continuing concern by campus faculty has not included transparent investigation of the ongoing conflicts on these campuses or open and meaningful discussion of faculty concerns about campus leadership²; and

WHEREAS, the impact of the Chancellor's responses has not been an increase in faculty confidence in CSU leadership or a restoration of effective shared governance; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU once again urge the BOT to adopt a policy guiding their and the Chancellor's response to votes of no confidence in presidents by campus faculty, and that said policy include the following:

1. That when a campus president has ignored or refused to respond to concerns raised by faculty, and campus faculty have expressed their lack of confidence in the ability and willingness of their local presidents to lead in an environment of shared governance and have formalized this position in a vote of no confidence, the BOT actively respond to this vote with an evaluation and investigation of the issues surrounding the "no confidence" vote.

¹ Bakersfield 1982, Sacramento 2007, Sonoma State 2007, Humboldt 2009, Stanislaus 2009.

² Written communication from Chancellor Reed to HSU Senate Chair and General Faculty, May 29, 2009
<http://www.users.humboldt.edu/jwpowell/gfp.htm>

2. That the BOT form an investigative committee, including at least two faculty members jointly selected by the Chair of the Board and the local campus senate; at least two members of the BOT- one of whom shall be the current faculty trustee; and a local student selected by the Chair of the Board and the local student government, and the Chair of the Board and the local staff representative group to investigate the conflict and, within six months, publish the results of the investigation and the committee's recommendations to resolve the problems.
3. That, if there is evidence that appropriate remedial action has not taken place within two years (the evidence may include a second referendum of the faculty), the full Board convene a formal performance review of that president.

; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That a similar procedure be used by the BOT when a vote of no confidence in the leadership of the Chancellor is passed by the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU)³; and be it further

RESOLVED: That ASCSU requests that the Chair of the Board of Trustees forward to the ASCSU a formal response to this resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, the Executive Vice Chancellors, the Campus Senate Chairs, the California State Student Association (CSSA), and campus Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs.

Approved Unanimously – May 3-4, 2012

³ Stanislaus 2001