Faculty Senate President Stein and Faculty Senators,

May I accept the invitation to share my thoughts regarding the three issues coming to the Faculty Senate for consideration?

**CSU EXECUTIVE ORDERS:**
Regarding the EO 1100 (and related orders) I am unclear on what student’s win or lose with these orders. [Many of the arguments I’ve heard from other faculty seem much more focused on job preservation and department numbers than their benefits to students.]

The Executive Summary document, which has been floated around for the past couple of weeks, defining options to the Executive Orders, is too simplified. [BTW who is the “Executive”, the Chancellor, the faculty?] It does not state what the cost and benefits of what each plan would offer for students, particularly what they might mean to improved student learning and success. What do students gain and what might they lose with each plan? Is there some way to get this information in the near future? As it is now, it’s all data with no learning value statements.

I would urge continued dialogue with the Chancellor's office on these orders, with a sharper focus on how to better manage the many students who are not college ready, (which I believe was behind the creation of student remedial course work in the first place.) The "No Child Left Behind" philosophy has bit us in the behind and I worry that part of our Student Success initiatives may be more of the same, where we push students through the system at any cost and let the market place figure out what to do with them later.

**CONFIDENCE, YES OR NO:**
The two documents proposing a vote of "no confidence" seem one sided in a way that makes one wonder how these folks were ever selected in the first place! My limited experience with Chancellor White and President Harrison paints a much different picture of the two people than what the No Confidence petitions seem to imply. Something is missing and I believe that we need to appreciate the whole story to know if, in fact, there is negligence on either part. The two documents, as presented, I do not believe impart that important information and seem to ignore the work they have done in the students favor.

I wonder, would our situation be any different if other people were in those administrative positions? Certainly, under the current conditions, where the Chancellor answers to the Governor and a University President answers to the Chancellor, matters to what they are obligated to do - under any circumstance. Both jobs trying to function in a desperate situation where our CSU system is dynamically underfunded, I suspect may garner the same results, no matter who is in those positions. In a way these two people are messengers for the Governor and Legislature and I can’t help note how much we like shooting the messenger.

What I am most worried about however, is the seeming loss of integrity for how our community is navigating this contentious situation and the example we are setting to students and new
faculty. The integrity of the democratic process we work under is being tested and this matters because, like it or not, we are the bastions of the higher values of our society. Like it or not, we are teaching lessons in how to live with diversity, how to navigate the waters of difference and not kill each other; and lots of people are watching. History notes that democracy is more of an experiment than a guaranteed process and historically, as a process, it has not lasted long, something we ought to pay attention to. To abrogate the process is frightening to me because of what comes next.

The dichotomy is that we cheer for shared faculty governance yet we live in a hierarchical system. Most of what we do must be approved up the hierarchical chain. In tough times like these, those who have administrative tasks - and who have final say - are not necessarily obligated to share in actual decisions themselves. It is a handshake cooperative system. The opportunity for the possibility of shared governance is that of having ongoing dialogues, sharing ideas, having creative debates which will likely end with a compromise. Given this system, if we were to boot Harrison and White, what would change, especially if the system we work under doesn’t change?

So, for what it is worth I support voting down the "no confidence" charges and as for the EO stuff, request more information specific to what our students win or lose in the EO equations, looking for more conversations to this effect.

Thanks for listening and for your hard work

Michael Hoggan
Professor, CTVA