

PCC Notes – April 10th, 2019

Attending: Rick Miranda, Ben Withers, Shannon Wagner, Sue James, Tony Frank, Beth Walker, Barry Braun, Tom Biedscheid, Toni Zimmerman, Mary Ontiveros, Pam Jackson, Katie Kalkstein, Kelly Long, Tim Gallagher, Cori Wong, Laura Jensen, Lynn Johnson, Wayne Hall (Sub for Megan Skeeahan), Diana Prieto, Kathy Sisneros, Blanche Hughes, Tonie Miyamoto, Jenny Morse, Vance Payne, Dan Bush, Cara Neth, Claire Clemens, Shannon Archibeque-Engel (guest presenter), Jennifer Schneider

Absent: Megan Skeeahan (represented by Wayne Hall), Sonia Adame, Zahra Al-Saloom, Shalini Shanker

Communications Plan

Blanche and Sue co-authored a guest column for SOURCE. Intro was revised to reflect recent issues around culture with students. There were 600+ page views in the first day.

If you have comments/edits to the communications plan, please email to Pam/Cara.

Communication goals are the most important piece of the plan. Everything should tie back into them. Goals can always be changed but all communication must serve a purpose.

One main thing to do is to break through a culture of distrust.

The next communication item will be an email from Rick about non-tenure track faculty.

Goals currently center around what PCC is up to. Should we include a way to message values to campus? When there are big issues that affect the culture of an institution, people expect to hear something from someone in an authority position reiterating values. Currently the expectation falls on the President's Office and Diversity Office. It may be better to have PCC as a central authority.

One thing to be cautious about is making sure council does not become an appellate/judiciary body. That is not the purpose of this council. This is not a reason not to proceed as suggested, but it is a risk.

May be an opportunity to push harder on certain issues to alleviate the political constraints of certain campus offices. However, with the President so closely tied in, we want to be careful. We also don't want to have this group act as surrogate for the presidential voice.

This group is also not supposed to be a conscience for the university as commissions are supposed to be, so we want to be careful around that.

We contemplated initially what we would do if student issues arise – would PCC comment? Decision this time around was to nod to recent incident (but not focus on it) in communications piece.

Diversity has been included in many communications thus far, and that is important, but diversity should not overshadow all other parts of culture

Also want to emphasize need for informal one on one communications from PCC members to others around campus.

Guest Presentation on Campus Climate Survey – Shannon Archibeque-Engel, Jennifer Schneider, Rachel McKinney

Campus Climate Survey is now Employee Climate Survey, reflecting broader concerns of those located away from main campus.

Our approach to transparency is unique in that everyone gets to see it at the same time, rather than just Cabinet first

Only one person sees raw data. It is very important to never reveal who said what.

There are some downsides to that policy; for example, we can't show Native American women faculty data because there aren't enough of them to show data without revealing who they are.

In the past, feedback was that people couldn't use because wasn't sure if it was representative. Now we have broken it down to be more usable, so please use it!

Goal of the survey is action and questions asked are intended to be actionable

Assessment shown here is the quantitative part of the survey

Link to survey is on the VPD website

Presentation shown here is aggregate for CSU

This year, VPs and division heads sent out invite emails

There was a 58.5% response rate, which was very strong compared to previous years

Racial demographics well represented. Women are a bit overrepresented for gender

Men have statistically higher perceptions of culture than other genders

Trans, nonbinary, and gender non-conforming respondents have lower perception of CSU. This is a trend throughout the data.

Respondents feel greatest sense belonging to department, least sense of belonging to division

- Higher for admin pro compared to other classifications, no differences by race, gender, race and gender

There is a high perception of respect for liberal perspectives, lower for conservative

Perception of favoritism is high. This is perhaps the greatest area for growth and includes recognition, promotion, hiring

There are higher perceptions of leadership and accountability within departments rather than divisions

Respondents checked boxes in the misconduct section if they perceived an issue as problematic.

Responses are not reflective of those reporting or experiencing misconduct directly.

- Perceptions are more problematic at CSU than at department/unit level
- Data may be reflective of daily environment – could include interactions with people other than colleagues, particularly those in customer service roles. This may be something to distinguish in the future
- Trans/gender non-conforming respondents actively avoid people because of bias

Most employees are familiar with the Principles of Community

Respondents believe in the importance of freedom of speech, but only half know where to go

Perception items were asked for each CSU and department/unit

- Generally perception of CSU is higher than department level
 - o This is different than leadership, in which people find department level leadership more positive than division
- Gap between CSU and department is closing over time
- Over time, perception is becoming more favorable
- Other institutions have requested instruments

Discriminatory attitude questions were asked at department level

Key findings –

- Gender: women had less favorable perceptions on all factors except overall CSU perception and sense of belonging
- Transgender/Non-binary/gender non-conforming – had less favorable perceptions and more concerns about misconduct
- Race/ethnicity – minorities had less favorable perspectives, more concerns about bias
- Employee type: state classified had less favorable perceptions for all factors compared to admin pro, faculty had lowest perceptions of all

Please use the data!

Concern – is it easier and more acceptable just to avoid people altogether? This may be reflective of culture, that there's an idea that confronting the problem/person won't fix it

Question about division being treated respectfully within CSU is particularly low for CLA – why is it that one college has such a low response?

- May be that some departments are more in tune with intent of question than others
- Needs follow up

Thanks for breaking data down – hopefully can use data and increase participation by doing so

What are the things that are driving why people would recommend CSU as a place to work?

There is a need to be actionable around the data. The next question is: are our actions making a difference? If not, what else do we do and how do we do things differently?

There is a sense of pride, but we acknowledge that we still have room to improve. Consider that there are people who fear physical assault.

Even those who are not proud of their results have been responsive to data.

Summary of Presidential Listening Sessions

Blanche sent out results of listening sessions via email so you can look at them

In November, there were five listening sessions for qualities desired in the new president

Tried to look at common themes and bring them in to discussion of what our culture is. Themes are:

- International activity
- Transparency/communications
- Community, inclusion, diversity
- Land grant focus
- Support/develop CSU staff and faculty
- Affordability for students, faculty and staff
 - o What is our responsibility as a university to help with this?
- Sustainability

Recent Incidents with Ram Handler and Admissions Ambassadors related to culture and accountability

Reminder of purpose of council: it is not a commission or a body to undermine action arms of university

We intend to hold selves accountable, but stick to processes in place

We need to use our voice, but exercise caution

Not looking to pass judgment, and must respect confidential parameters, but also need to acknowledge things that happen on campus and deserve attention

Discussed recent incident with Ram Handler. Key conclusions:

- Demonstrates need for organizational accountability, transparency
- Also demonstrates impact of social media
- Also need to formalize when to elevate an issue
- Bottom line is students need to feel cared for throughout the process
- Should PCC communicate about anything we learned?
 - o There needs to be one point of accountability
 - o Help educate the campus about being part of a major culture change – tradition vs change to become a better place for everyone
 - o What does it mean to value history while becoming more inclusive?
 - o Discuss our values – what do we value about “rich in tradition” ?
 - o Doesn’t have to be either/or
 - o Opportunity for us to share the story about how we navigate the challenges
 - o Consider culture of distrust in messaging and understand that we only own half the message – how to navigate genuinely and authentically

Consider the context we are in, in which higher ed is becoming increasingly politicized

Consider how to avoid putting higher ed into political crosshairs

Still not a reason to not legitimately engage in these issues

Discussed admissions ambassador issues

- Will discuss more at a future meeting

Social media will be a continued area to understand and address