

**STATEMENT OF CONCERN
REGARDING THE LEADERSHIP OF CHANCELLOR CHARLES B. REED**

The CSU is a system in crisis. Many campuses have taken votes of no confidence; others are considering similar action; some have stopped short of expressing a general lack of confidence but have questioned specific actions or positions that the chancellor has taken. That faculty are taking these steps is symptomatic of a profound disjunction between the chancellor and the faculty. They respond to and result from actions and statements of the chancellor that have brought us to believe that he does not fully appreciate the mission of a public comprehensive university and that his commitment to the values of higher education is narrow. They respond also to a pervasive sense that he is more concerned with making political points than with enhancing the quality of the education and services CSU provides and that his solutions are more illusory than substantive.

The Academic Senate at San Francisco State University has reluctantly come to the conclusion that the chancellor has lost the faith of the faculty in general, of its collective bargaining agent (CFA), and of many on the local and statewide Academic Senates. He has all too often appeared to us to be mean-spirited and hostile in his dealings with faculty and dismissive of faculty values and concerns. His actions regularly undermine the autonomy of the campuses and the principles of shared governance; they threaten the financial stability of our campuses and system. Many faculty, we believe, now feel that the various initiatives emanating from the chancellor's office divert enormous amounts of faculty time and talent from teaching and scholarly or creative work to activities that maybe attractive to external observers but are peripheral and even antithetical to the goals of the academy.

The Academic Senate of San Francisco State University offers the following examples to illustrate the basis for our concern:

1. **CalState TEACH.** One of the most publicized one-time budget augmentations secured by the chancellor was for the program that became CalState TEACH. This program cost, at the outset, \$5 million. It has, to date, produced a few hundred new teachers-as compared to the need for tens of thousands. In creating CalState TEACH, the chancellor picked a major public issue, used it to gain one-time budget augmentation, and only then considered how best to spend the money. There was no serious consultation with CSU education faculty in advance of his actions. Instead, he imposed a solution that has proven highly costly and that has not significantly benefited the CSU education programs to educate the vast majority of the state's new teachers. We suggest that this program is a glaring example of the chancellor's failure to consult with the experts (in this case, the CSU's own education faculty) before committing the time and resources of the CSU.
2. **Common Management System.** This is yet another example of failure to consult before committing the resources (in this case, of individual campuses) to pay for the installation of a system that may not be as effective for campus needs as those currently in place. We acknowledge that the computer systems of a vast university need to be able to "communicate." What we question is the fiscal wisdom of committing, without adequate prior consultation and research, the resources of already under-funded campuses to a computerized management system whose efficacy is, at best, questionable. At the very least, we would have expected him to try to obtain funding for such a costly undertaking in advance from the Legislature and Governor.
3. **Year-Round Operations.** In public comments the chancellor announced that nearly all problems of access over the next ten years could be solved by operating CSU campuses year-round. He did not consult with faculty and campus administrations before taking his case to the press. Statements such as that in the Sacramento Bee (February 3, 1999) that "classrooms, offices and laboratories that sit empty during the summer months could well be filled with students and teachers," created a false impression of wasted time, money and space. In truth,

CSU campuses have offered summer sessions for many years. The need for most faculty to do research and most students to work in summer means that the issue is far more complex than that presented by the chancellor. Unfortunately, his hyperbole was taken as a reality, and the result is that the Legislative Analyst's Office has declared that there will be no new construction in the CSU so long as our facilities sit "empty" during the summers. The chancellor's approach not only appeared to question the CSU faculty's work ethic, it also seriously misrepresented the reality of what happens on campuses during summers. As a direct result of the chancellor's actions, campuses' long-term planning to accommodate the Tidal Wave II of new students through new construction is seriously endangered. Once again, we have seen no evidence that the chancellor did any serious research into the state of affairs on CSU campuses or that he consulted with campus presidents or academic senates before he announced that the CSU could accommodate nearly all the coming surge of new students without new construction.

4. **The Independent Ed.D.** The chancellor's efforts in Sacramento to secure permission for the CSU to offer an independent Ed.D. degree illustrate his usual behavior of acting first and consulting later. The chancellor asked the legislature for permission to offer the Ed.D. before he consulted with the faculty who will have to develop and offer such programs and before he secured final approval of the Trustees for this action. Weeks after his first initiative, and under criticism for his failure to consult in advance, the chancellor has pointed to an obscure 1985 Trustee resolution as the basis for his action. That the chancellor of the CSU should seek permission to offer additional graduate degrees when current successful graduate programs are under-funded further increases faculty concern regarding the chancellor's priorities and understanding of the mission of the CSU.
5. **Faculty Compensation and Workload.** Two major problems faced the chancellor when he arrived: the faculty's compensation-and-benefits package had failed to keep pace with comparison institutions, making it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain new faculty; and the student-faculty ratio had risen dramatically in the 1990s and has yet to come down. The chancellor has failed to resolve these issues during his tenure. In addition, although faculty salaries have increased during recent years, not once has the chancellor requested an increase sufficient to bring CSU salaries to parity with those at comparison institutions. In fact, using CPEC's own data it can be shown that the average CSU faculty salary today has significantly less purchasing power than ten years ago!

An effective academic leader should seek consensus, should seek to unite his/her constituencies - faculty, students, staff, alumnae/i, trustees - in support of a measure before going to the legislature. The chancellor has consistently done the opposite. He first launches an initiative and then tells everyone else to fall into line. When we complain or raise legitimate concerns that he should have known about in advance, he dismisses us as nay-sayers who resist change. This is not effective academic leadership. We at San Francisco State University wish to voice our discouragement; we in the Academic Senate have taken extraordinary steps to work with the chancellor and to demonstrate to him the importance of shared governance and the effective results that a collegial and consultative process can bring, but he has chosen instead to misrepresent our statements and continue to act as if the opinions of faculty have no relevance to the California State University.

Chancellor Charles B. Reed has lost our confidence in his leadership. As a result of our stated concerns and numerous others, the Academic Senate of San Francisco State University calls on the Board of Trustees to take seriously the votes of no confidence in Chancellor Charles B. Reed, to which we now add our voice. There is an urgent need for the Board to take initiative in rethinking and restructuring a positive, collegial relationship among all the constituencies within the California State University. The situation could not be more urgent: the future of the CSU is at stake.

*****APPROVED MAY 15, 2001*****