

September 23, 2016

Faculty meeting with Tim Wynes

Present: Tim Wynes, Suzie Brusoe, Steve Erickson, David Riggs, Kathy DeDeyn, Patrick McAleer, Shannon Marting, Laura Funke

Wynes: Patrick are we recording this?

McAleer: Yes

Wynes: I'd appreciate it when we are in a meeting like this that you'd say so.

McAleer: ok

Wynes: Thanks Uhm, I'll start out unless you guys have anything to say, no nope ok thanks for responding to me today, uhm, you sent letters to Chancellor on April 25 and July 25 and uhmmm

Wynes: So you sent a couple of letters and you posted them on your website, the union website and on July 28th he responded with a letter to you dated myself and Kevin Lindstrom and that letter read in part I'll quote a few sections hereDavid did you share that with your faculty?

Riggs: Uh, I think with this group I did, with the executive committee

Wynes: So stated succinctly, President Tim Wynes continues to have my unwavering support. Nothing that has happened since the January Board meeting demonstrates to me that President Wynes is the wrong person for the job. Being a college president is not a popularity contest. I believe it would be a serious mistake for me to act as if it were.

Please be assured that I take seriously the concerns that you have raised. You have made it clear that the IHSCFA seeks the removal of President Wynes. As indicated above, I will not acquiesce to the union's demands to remove President Wynes he talks about my other duties

For the sake of the college and its students, I ask that you and your colleagues set aside your reservations and sit down with President Wynes to work out your differences. For this effect to work you must accept that President Wynes will remain as president of Inver Hills and Dakota County Technical College In the letters of resign they do ask to set up this meeting, the overurging question I have is that something your faculty are interested in doing? Setting aside differences and working in the interest

Riggs: Yeah, yeah that's why we are here today, we are really curious to see what you have to say.

Wynes: Well that's the same way from here well I've got nine months of pretty negative stuff, the website, facebook page plus the no confidence vote. We can go on that way but you are the ones who put that out there you could either move forward with us collaboratively its not just going to be me saying I'm going to give up on something so it's a two way street

Riggs: Right and we've been asking for information for the last year about how we can move things ahead, you know the conversation days, all that stuff and we've been asking for you know improvement.

Wynes: I guess I don't see it that way, did you, you quit participating in conversation days, you did a no confidence vote, you pulled your people out of the conversation days, those who were in there willing to stay and there's been nothing in the last nine months between you and I. I don't think we've even been in the same room together except for shared governance so I don't see how what kind of conversation we're having

Riggs: I think you are misinterpreting what we were doing at conversation days I think that when we were sitting there in August of 2015 and we were going through faculty and staff, listing our concerns that we had we were in the room and we were talking and nobody, now we don't have any authority, we don't have any power, we're not , you know the leaders of this particular...

Wynes: Dave, that is so not true

Riggs: What authority and power do we have?

Wynes: You passed a vote of no confidence with your faculty members, you went to the other unions and had them join you. I'd say that's power.

Riggs: Really

Wynes: Yeah

Riggs: yeah. Well we're talking about the power and the authority of running the campus, you know of making decisions on the campus and we don't have any power or authority of that and we don't have any power or authority to tell faculty to attend or not attend meetings, you know that's their choice and we always make that very clear that that's their choice to attend meetings

Wynes: And someone mistakenly informed you

Riggs: So we're talking about a series of really hopeful events that happened going back to last spring when we started the conversation process and we had Melissa Erickson on campus and we spent hours and hours and hours talking with her in lots of faculty kinds of different situations and that led to the creation of the conversation days and that conversation days stuff was, you know, you remember the themes that were associated with those and all those themes it was like, ok what's next and next is what actions can be created to meet those themes, meet the issues that those themes addressed and that's what we've been waiting for, and then, and then, the other things happened during the fall

Wynes: What are those other things?

Riggs: Is that a serious question?

Wynes: Yeah

Riggs: That is a serious question. See now that, now that seems to be kinda disingenuous

Wynes: No I'm just getting your interpretation to the other things that happened

Riggs: Well, I think since you've mentioned the website, take a look at the website inverhillsunited.org and take a look at the list of the things that happened in the fall last year from Shioling Peng to the commencement issue to the you know everything else that was associated to that and it's all kinda laid out right there and in our view those actions were contrary to the spirit of what we talked about with conversation days and with the idea of making this place a better place to work

Wynes: We would have a substantive disagreement on the commencement issue I'd see that issue totally different and your website and Shioling Peng that is a personnel decision

Riggs: Sure, yeah

Wynes: There are things on that website that are hearsay, some that are slanderous to former employees so there's a lot on there that I would flat out disagree with ...the web the facebook page I won't even go there, um, so the things you got on there that's your website that's not here at the college so bring forward in shared governance, so what do you want to do

Riggs: So it's the same thing we've been asking for the last couple years, what actions can you take as a leader of this college to make this a better place to work.

Wynes: With you fighting me every step of the way

Riggs: No no we are 100 percent behind creating an environment of respect, creating open and transparent and honest communication. We are 100 percent behind that. And we stated that really clearly through the conversation days and in shared governance in the meetings that we've had we've been very clear about that. We, you know in speaking of the commencement issue you asked us in shared governance if we would consider going off site and we said yes, we brought it to the faculty and we talked about it with them and faculty said yes and we said, ok you know this is part of the process we were then completely left out of the loop, no communication at all with faculty on that and then it was the Grace Church decision it was just you know thrown at us and you know, that was some serious issues. It was just kinda there wasn't an opportunity for us to even respond until you raised it at shared governance

Wynes: I would, the committee issue in terms of that I guess we disagree on the process of that

Riggs: Yeah, yeah, yeah and we do and I'm just asking you know, like I said with the authority and the power and you know you have the authority for discipline you have the ability to you know deal with the purse strings you have the ability to do all different kinds of things that we have no ability whatsoever, we are in this in a very unequal power situation here and we have the contract and we have the collective bargaining agreement and that's pretty much that's it in terms of power. We do have the power of a voice and when we see things that we think that are issues, are issues we will speak up about those issues and that seems to be what we would hope everybody would want to strive for is you have open and honest communication and

Wynes: the website what I see is not an open and honest communication I mean inverhillsunited.com is not open and honest it's your version of events. Is his letter posted on there, no.

Riggs: You are more than welcome to make that letter public and do whatever you

Wynes: You guys got 2 letters on there saying you never responded to Steve, yeah he responded July 28th

Riggs: Yeah 6 months after we first asked. And yeah, see you are right this is just the kind of communication and transparency we are trying to improve here and you know it's

Wynes: I'm not seeing you here though

Riggs: Yeah I know, I know you're not and that's why you know we're asking you and your cabinet to you know tap into your leadership training and you're your expertise in that area and provide us with information about how we can make this a better place and we are more than willing to listen. We participated voluntarily in the conversation days stuff.

Wynes: Going back to conversation days is not helpful, once you did your no confidence vote posted your website started facebook page that killed that

DeDeyn: Another example of program prioritization I mean this is a huge program that affects every faculty on campus, some will be negatively affected yet we were not brought into the development of that at all it was thrown at us hurry up do this 3 weeks and then we we're brought in after the fact and basically said that uh this is the way it is

Wynes: Did you get a heads up in the spring

DeDeyn: no

Riggs: At the March 22nd meeting

Wynes: More notice that any college give faculty

DeDeyn: It's not about notice it's about being part of the development of it then people wouldn't have been so up in arms about it as opposed to here it is do it right now as opposed to what

Wynes: did you meet with Christina over the summer

DeDeyn: That's beside the point because that's post mortem that wasn't about developing a process

Wynes: Do you have good data?

Riggs: No the data has been very flawed

Wynes: Have you talked to Christina about that

Riggs: Yes

DeDeyn: Yes I had to redo my department's data from page one because it was all wrong and then I presented it to them and they were like oh yeah

Wynes: Is it still incorrect

DeDeyn: No they fixed it but that's not the point the point is the process was developed without any input from faculty even though it directly affects us more than anything else on campus

Wynes: At what point should you have been brought in

DeDeyn: The first time we decided maybe we should do program prioritization like MCTC because we just took their model and tried to make it fit here without any communication and that's our biggest issue no communication what so ever on major decisions and then we react and that's what you don't like cuz we react badly because we didn't know anything we didn't get to tell you anything so then we're coming at it from the other side saying wait a minute this isn't right

Wynes: So going back to that it's gotta start somewhere in the academic affairs department. I mean it has to start with Christina, it just has to

DeDeyn: not in my mind it should start in a committee with equal voice and then it goes forward she's going to be the ultimate decision maker I agree with that but we should be heard as opposed to here is what we are doing period

Wynes: As you are working it through since she announced that last March are you aware of what the process is? What's going to happen now to what the decision bases is

Riggs: Until Tuesday because she said the nomenclature is going to be changing so the whole program prioritization is going to be changing

DeDeyn: We weren't brought in on what those changes are or why they are being made unless she heard a few things we heard over the summer and we don't know yet

Riggs: And we're going to hear those maybe Tuesday

Wynes: On Tuesday? Did she listen to you during the summer?

DeDeyn: I don't remember that we spoke a lot we were told a lot of things don't you is that what you yeah so it was more of a formality here's what we are doing here's how it's set up here's what we're going to do over the summer it wasn't really about asking our views

Erickson: Well one of the things you did hear is about communication and so she got notification out to those areas prior to that

DeDeyn: Yeah so the Friday before duty days

Riggs: Yeah the Friday before

Wynes: You realize the process doesn't end next Tuesday it extends the entire school year

DeDeyn: Oh I know, we know that uhm like I said this is probably the most important process that's been developed without any of our input even though it's the one that affects us the most across

campus and it's the one causing the most fear and outrage right now there are people very afraid on campus because of this process

Wynes: Do you think it's clear or are you waiting for Tuesday for how she's making her decision as she is going through this

DeDeyn: We have no clue as least I don't on how the decision making has happened in fact over the summer when we were told the deans were going to read all these reports that we had to write read our program review and then when we met a lot of deans didn't have the same feedback that we had presented and I know there has been issues where that with the dean turnover an then we still don't have the third dean

Wynes: Steve and Ann have been here

DeDeyn: But still yeah but my dean was on the way out and didn't have the new dean in I hadn't been transferred to me new dean you know it was kinda in flux and I know with a few departments nobody read anything we submitted or talked about it

Wynes: So you articulated these frustrations to her

DeDeyn: No I was waiting for Tuesday

Riggs: We don't know any more information until Tuesday

Wynes: But during the summer the thing you're telling me now did you tell her this now

Riggs: No because in the summer everything was in process and they hadn't decided anything yet they were waiting for the deans to meet over the summer to make determinations on program prioritization

DeDeyn: Right but until we came back well we got the email on 5 o'clock Friday before duty days

Riggs: The Friday before the duty days

DeDeyn: and then duty day on Tuesday we were waiting to hear the more information

Wynes: The stuff that she did

DeDeyn: yeah right so no I haven't met with her since then about that

Riggs: and this speaks to the trust on campus or the lack of trust on campus

Wynes: So if she had done that differently if there would have been a committee

DeDeyn: that set the whole thing up, yep

Wynes: how long would that taken

DeDeyn: Since we had a model to work from I'd say probably not that long because we basically took a lot of MCTC's things and put it here so once you have a model to start with it's just a matter of getting input and buying in so maybe a few months. Why did we wait till March to even thing about it I don't know maybe it wasn't the that's what it seemed to me it was just a quick here it is let's do it

Riggs: And now it's already changing without faculty input

DeDeyn: Yeah so evidentially somebody has decided that we are going to make changes but again our voices aren't heard

Brusoe: I'm struggling with this because I believe that Christina has been extremely transparent in the process in what she is doing and I feel that she's shared with you on multiple occasions where we are at with that. What I'm hearing you say though is that we didn't get she didn't get your input buy in

DeDeyn: well not even buy in but input so to tell me we are going to meet here here here and here and make these decisions I don't care don't ask me about anything here here and here in the process we weren't invited to the table so to know that you are meeting in July and August and September big deal if we're not there to give you input we don't care your time line, really because we don't get to give you the input that might help develop the process into something that we would feel valuable

Erickson: Talk about that process that she was going through where the information was given out last spring and then you go and look at the criteria that was developed there and the data and then send in a request in terms of

Riggs: Were you at the May duty days and the presentations when the deans were up there describing what the criteria were? That's when we were first given it too so it was the same thing then

DeDeyn: And we were told this is the way it is there was no changes nothing

Riggs: And if you were in the room on the duty days you heard all the questions from the faculty and they were and Christina was not able to be there for something for some other reasons but aw, there were no answers on that and the answers were not coming in the July meeting either because the answers haven't been arrived yet. You are right Christina has been very forthcoming and transparent when the decisions are being made but the whole decision made about using this particular process and the criteria they selected and any input on the upfront and that you know it's the managerial decision to do that that's fine it's you know your right to do these kinds of things but it's not been communicated

Brusoe: Ok so to back up you're saying it's our right to do that and then it's not been communicated but we have communicated

Riggs: And what's been and sure and what's been communicated is it's constantly changing and administration doesn't seem to really know what they are doing with this and it's a fly by the seat of your pants kind of thing and it's changing again before Tuesday and because layoff notices have to be out by the end of October you know and it's just kind of it's constantly a moving target and when the target is being moved it's being communicated but nobody has any idea from the faculty perspective of how those decisions are being made and why and again that is your prerogative that is administrative prerogative but this is this would be a different environment if we had a stable dean population with a you know a history here on campus and we had a pattern of communication over open and honest and

transparent decision making and we haven't had that you know for the last several years and that's where everything's kinda come to a head that lead to the January vote. You know we were talking about as you know we were talking about this vote of no confidence in May of 2015 and we did not do it with that hope of making things better through the conversation day product

Wynes: How do you know I know that in May?

Riggs: You told me that I don't remember what the context was but you told me that um and this was after we had the consultants in who were doing the campus climate survey and all that kind of stuff you know we had that conversion after the Brothers did the presentation um and it was discussed through Melissa Erickson as well too you know it was kind of common knowledge and it wasn't that, we've been pretty open I mean we haven't been secretive.

Wynes: Nah it wasn't imminent that we need these things

Riggs: no, no of course not, that's not

Wynes: Again it was secretive Dave

Riggs: No, we've been very open with our faculty about you know in our union meetings we've been very open

Wynes: That's great I'm not in your union meetings

Riggs: That's right that's right and we are not in your administration meetings and that's the way it should be so

Wynes: So actually there are colleges that are not like that

Riggs: So are you going to invite us?

Wynes: No, not currently

Riggs: Yeah and it's never been that pattern its never been that pattern where there's been that shared communication uh you know in the last several years

Brusoe: Can you give us specifics of what you're looking for how things might look different where you would feel that we have that open transparency

Riggs: Well first of all be honest be open be transparent

Brusoe: Honesty is in the eye of the beholder, correct

Riggs: No that's not correct

Brusoe: So that's already today disagreed in what you realities are so it is different

Riggs: uhm um

Brusoe: So if I say I am being honest in my communication and you're saying no you're not I can't fix that unless I understand what that is so that's why I'm asking the question you and Tim today had that example so you don't agree on something that happened Tim believes he's being honest you believe you're being honest is your view of what that honesty is different

Riggs: If you're asking us to say what do we want?

Brusoe: yes

Riggs: Moving forward?

Brusoe: open and honest communication

Riggs: correct

Brusoe: I need to know what that means to you

Riggs: First of all I think that there's a core level of decency that we are asking for in terms of how you treat people um and that comes in interpersonal relationships. We are a people business and that right there I think starts at an individual level but can also come up with things at a group level um and we've not seem much of that

Wynes: I'd feel exactly the same way

Riggs: Yeah but see you're the president of the college, you're the leader of the college, and part of your job is you know to take these slings and arrows to a certain extent because you're the public face of the college in that sense and that is part of your job. I think you know as the public face of the college and I I uh hear what you are saying but on the other hand if we look at what's been happening to faculty and what's been happening to staff and the way people have been..

Brusoe: stop stop

Wynes: Stop, what's happening to staff?

Riggs: Again I would refer you to InverHillsUnited if you want a list of

Brusoe/Wynes: No we want to hear from you, in the room, what

Riggs: Anybody want to pipe in on this?

Marting: I would say two things struck out for me one is umm no one can really get a response from human resources in a timely manner there's a problem that we can not we can not get the information that we need it's happening it gets dropped we don't get responses to emails that we send to human resources the second is I I do not understand why in the middle of the semester there would be some kind of change in faculty offices on campus if there is a reason for that there should have been a communication there is a case where there should have been some communication ahead of time of about why this was happening but this did not happen this fall some people were told to move out of

their offices which is an odd odd odd situation we've never been asked to do that during the middle of the semester when we're settled in we've got our office number on our syllabi so again this I feel for me there is no communication there and say what you will about graduation but we would have never had that problem last fall if after we asked you to communicate with us in shared governance about what we were going to do about graduation we didn't come back in the fall and find out that you already made a decision about without any faculty input so there's three I think three

Riggs: But with staff I'd refer you to what MAPE said in their letter supporting us and I would refer you to what AFSCME said too and they laid it out right there and I'm reluctant to talk about specific things with MAPE and AFSCME because they are really afraid of losing their jobs

Wynes: We've been meeting and conferring with them way more often than we have with you

Riggs: Well...

DeDeyn: Maybe they're afraid to speak up.

Wynes: No their regional reps were in the room

Erickson: Have you talked to them recently

Riggs: Yes yes I have, yes I have

Erickson: And that is the information you are getting

Riggs: Yes that is the information I'm getting, we're getting and that vote was just last spring I mean that was just the other day and the vote that MAPE took and then the vote that AFSCME took so

Brusoe: So we met with AFSCME this week, it was a great open meeting

Riggs: Good, good

Brusoe: It was a great open meeting they have no concerns

Riggs: Really???

Brusoe: We met with MAPE less than a month ago

Riggs: Great, great

Brusoe: Same situation

Wynes: Terry Nelson came over to DCTC to recruit people to join their AFSCME

Erickson: They've got their state union person intervenes and we're addressing those issues

Riggs: That's great that's great

Erickson: We're going through the document they've said

Brusoe: Um I want to go back to that HR piece because HR reports to me and I've not heard any of this so I can't fix things or try to make things better for you if I don't know they're a problem so I would ask if you have issues like that with any of our areas that you bring them up to us so we can fix the problem. I, there was a problem with HR a year ago I don't believe that problem's there today. I could be wrong but I don't know about that so I want to be able to fix those things to me that's good transparent communication. If I'm hearing about it now and you're all ticked about it that's not open transparent honest communication so it goes two ways so if you can give me specifics and if its recency that would be really helpful to me, uhmm, also, uhmm, the middle of the semester change of faculty offices. You guys aren't back on campus until the semester starts we did not want to disrupt during the first few weeks of the semester so we, no office moves were made during that time. That's all I can tell you about why

Marting: Exactly, exactly that's all you can tell us exactly. I think that sums it up right there I really do

Brusoe: This doesn't feel to me that we're getting any where

DeDeyn: Nope, nope

Brusoe: I'm not understanding what you all want and I don't think we're able to articulate what we need. I you keep saying open honest communication but I don't feel like we're getting any where

Riggs: No, in the first conversation day when we had the debrief afterwards do you remember that?

Wynes: Not real well

Riggs: Yeah well you were gone for most of it you weren't in the room, ah you left when we were talking about all the themes that we were putting up on the screen and everything and then when you came in on day two of that uh, you looked at what we were talking about in terms of trust and honest and open communication and you said those are just a bunch of buzz words

Wynes: And the idea was what can we do to get beneath that what does it really mean

Riggs: Yeah what actions can be taken and we got and we asked you that specifically, what actions can be taken and we haven't had a response since, instead the responses have been your actual actions

Wynes: Such as

Riggs: Such as well the commencement to

Wynes: Now the commencement you got a committee we gotta relitigate this because I disagree with your view

Riggs: Well, see Tim there's a pattern here, ok. There's a pattern that goes back to the first major initiative you brought on campus which was CTAC . You remember that? CTAC was the complete strategic plan for the IT department. You know you asked for volunteers on campus, we had

Wynes: I didn't call it that but yeah. Term it that

Riggs: Yeah, and yeah we had like forty people who put thousands and thousands of hours, well minutes

Wynes: No

Riggs: Thousands and thousands of minutes into that plan and we put a detailed strategic plan together and nothing happened from that

Wynes: You're absolutely right

Riggs: And, yeah

Wynes: The person who was responsible for executing that no longer works at this college

Riggs: Well but that's where I disagree because you ran into me in the mall that May after nothing got done with that and you apologized to me specifically saying you dropped the ball on that one and you didn't implement the plan

Wynes: Right

Riggs: So, I mean so when you say we're re litigating everything uhm it's a pattern it's a pattern that goes back to whether or not what you say can be believed and whether or not what you say in front of a large group or on an individual basis can be trusted and that's what we've been asking for in terms of words matching actions and actions matching words and that's what we've been asking for for the last several years and that. You know, we've talked about this before too when you ah, you know stand up before duty days and berate the entire faculty for refusing to accept change and you put big NOs up there on the screen in your power point slide and say very clearly that faculty need to get on board and stop being so resistant to change

Wynes: I think we're disagreeing on tone a hundred percent here

Riggs: Well, you know ah, you don't have to disagree on tone because you surveyed all the faculty and staff about these attitudes and you know what the survey responses were so it's not just not me and it's definitely not just the people in this room. It's a broad group so you know if you think everything is going great now with AFSCME and MAPE and faculty and everything let's redo that campus climate survey

Brusoe: I think we think we have a good working relationship with the leadership of AFSCME and MAPE, yes. Do I think every employee on campus every single employee on campus is sunshine and rainbows, no but we all choose our attitude when we come to work every day. I don't know about you guys but I get a paycheck every two weeks and I have a job that I'm expected to do to earn that. I choose every day to come to campus with the attitude that I choose and I think we need to stop judging. If we want to be really respectful and have a civil environment we need to let go of some things which is what the Chancellor also asked us to do, let go of, you're talking about things for I don't know about how many years you've been here Tim, seven

Wynes: Seven

Brusoe: Seven years ago, things that happened, at some point we gotta let go and say ok fresh start.

Riggs: This is what you said in our off the record shared governance meeting in January of 2015 you said, you said just forget the past, you know and you said you'll forget the past and you know we'll forget the past and you just said forget the past and the problem is the past can't be forgotten because the past keeps repeating itself. So, you know, I understand what you're saying Suzie, I understand it entirely.

Wynes: David from my perspective I feel like you've made up your mind it doesn't matter what I say. You're in a place where you're right and there's nothing I can do or say because.

Riggs: I haven't heard anything that is is anything towards asking or working towards creating action steps that build trust

Wynes: What would those look like?

Riggs: That's what I'm asking you for you're the president of the college

Erickson: Can I go back to the graduation issue in that uhm

Riggs: Well I think that we want to leave that behind in the past

Erickson: Well I just want to, well, you know, we had announced that it was going to be at that off site church, correct? We heard faculty and then it was changed it went to Aldrich. That was an action on our behalf to show

Riggs: Do you remember how it was announced?

Erickson: Well I know it was announced but we did change the outfit

Riggs: Yeah yeah sure, yes and there was a lot of student and faculty upheaval

Wynes: And and student?

Riggs: Well

Wynes: Uhhh

Brusoe: But that was a positive action

Erickson: We're trying to show her

Marting: But you should have never even scheduled it at the church in the first place that conversation should have taken place before that schedule actually

Brusoe: I'm saying, you're saying there's no positive action that we're not listening and not asking no matter what the situation. We did listen we did make a change and we get zero credit for doing that because you're stuck on you didn't ask us first

DeDeyn: And I think that's the pattern that we see. You don't, administration makes a big decision tells us what it is and then you're upset when we don't like the decision whereas in the past it would have been let's talk about this decision, what'd ya think, come up with a decision and then announce it and most people would say ok fine because they were at the table during the decision making process. How many times after you had to back track in the last 5 years? Here's a decision we're going to do this, either us or MAPE or AFSCME or somebody students are up in arms, ok, we won't do that we'll do something else. That's not leadership that's reacting to chaos

Riggs: And you know and when you interviewed for this job in your forum Jeff Greenwood asked you a question about your decision making style. Remember what you answered?

Wynes: No

Riggs: So you said that you know the way you make decisions is you get input from all stakeholders and then you ask those stakeholders what would go wrong if this decision was made and then you make the decision from there and we haven't seen that, you know, we haven't seen that in the last several years, so again you know we go back to the past but like I said the past keeps repeating itself here. But you're saying we haven't or we've already made up our minds and there's nothing you can do, but again it's this power shift here I mean you could just you know sign your name to a letter and terminate all of us right here just like that

Wynes: That's not true

Riggs: It wouldn't be without consequences and legal actions and all those kinds of things but you know we can be suspended indefinitely or whatever the case may be. We don't have that power over you. We don't have the power over other faculty. We don't have any supervisory responsibilities over anything, you know and so

Wynes: Yet you're sitting in the room talking

Riggs: Yeah, yeah because you asked us to come in and

Wynes: Right

Riggs: And talk

Wynes: That's not true because I asked you to come in

Riggs: Yeah because you asked us to come in because the Chancellor wants us to kinda sit down and get together

Wynes: Let me ask you this, who do you think the intended audience is right now?you know

Riggs: Pardon me?

Wynes: Who do you think the intended audience is of that letter?

Riggs: The Chancellor's letter?

Wynes: Yes

Riggs: I don't know. I, I have no idea. I've never met the Chancellor I have no idea what his motivations or his thought processes are

Wynes: Just interested

Riggs: Yeah so, but it's, you know, but again I think leadership, you know it's, it's like, yes labor management relationships are tense so what do management leaders do about it when those relationships are tense.? What what are the things that you can do about that? I haven't heard any solutions. The solution last year was the conversation days and we were very hopeful that would work

Brusoe: And we were in the process with teams which included faculty in going through and looking at the, what are the actions we can take and do on this campus to realize those things and do you know what happened somebody told the faculty that were on that group that they were not to participate any more. Now whether you say you have no influence over other faculty or not you can believe what you believe. The folks that were in the room partnering and working with us very hard to try to figure out the things to make this campus a better place left.

Riggs: Yeah. And we had a big meeting with them in November in our chapter meeting with everybody in the room and the discussion really pretty much revolved around the fact that it seemed to be pretty clear that the conversation day, ah, was, ah, lip service only. It was

Brusoe: I spent enough hours in rooms

Riggs: So did we

Brusoe: Working on solutions

Riggs: Yeah

Brusoe: And I don't believe lip service is a part of it

Riggs: Well, and you know what we're doing and what we are doing here is we are representing the faculty. And when, this this was not a close vote this was not something that was even, you know

Brusoe: Ok you're getting away from what I asked though. I said someone, someone told those faculty to not participate anymore in the committees trying to make this campus a better place.

Marting: That's not a question.

Brusoe: Do you agree that's

Riggs: I do not

Brusoe: You do not, so you don't believe anyone in leadership in your union leadership influenced those people to say don't participate anymore.

Riggs: That's a loaded question, I mean influence?! We've been trying we've been trying to communicate with our faculty and be very honest and open with our faculty about our perceptions, about what's been going on here. And then faculty are left to make their own decisions

Erickson: Why won't the faculty see the Chancellor's letter then? All faculty

Riggs: It hasn't been necessary. Nobody's asked for it.

Erickson: But they don't know it's available?

DeDeyn: The letter hasn't been shared but the intent that we meet with Tim and do this meeting has been

Riggs: Yeah

DeDeyn: Was shared so the faculty are aware that Rosenstone replied and that he asked us to meet with Tim and leadership to figure out working relationships. So we, the faculty was told that

Erickson: Why won't you share the letter with them so that they could

Riggs: Why should we?

Erickson: agree or disagree?

Marting: Who was the letter to?

Wynes: To Dave to me to Kevin

Wynes: I guess I would say this...the thing is I'm trying to be careful because it's not an open conversation when you're being recorded so this is hard. Kathy was president for how long?

DeDeyn: Two years

Wynes: Two years. And how long was Laurel president?

DeDeyn: two

Wynes: And we can disagree about this but it felt like a tenor changed when you [Riggs] came on board. Uhm I agree there are things I've been reactive to and I also think we try to move forward. I go back to the resolution when I suggested out loud that we might think about how we can get people through transfer curriculum faster and a resolution passed internally, union meeting, the one that got defeated is the one that got surveyed by staff and if you don't remember that Kathy

DeDeyn: I remember a resolution about concurrent enrollment, I remember that.

Wynes: Ah, it was way before that. Anyway, let me work Kathy, let me work this through, so that to me was the beginning of the distrust. That one person, oh Dave, Dave Berger was passing out fliers because when the defeat of the resolution came along the commons and then comes down to the softball game like he's my best friend. That, that was hard.

DeDeyn: Well I remember that Joan called me at home that night, yep or you did.

Wynes: I did yeah

DeDeyn: Yeah

Wynes: But the whole point was it was a good intent, and frankly since that moment, it was horrific, at least for me, now I have to, I really have to keep an open eye, things are not always what they look like. That I've admitted to you that the CTAC thing didn't work the way we wanted it to. I was going to take the responsibility, yeah, ultimately I do. Mark didn't do his job. Mark parked that somewhere else, shelved somewhere and let it sit. But he worked for me. You guys are in the same situation. Your faculty mess up you don't even think that they do, it's not your fault, I'm in a different place. So I'm doing the best I can under these circumstances but the vote of no confidence was one step, the website's another, and the third one is the comments on the facebook page. Since that time has occurred what's happened at this college and you can disagree with me about how I do my job in terms of the external world, number 7 in the country in adult learners, what is it 25th in terms of value, Title III Grant that the only one in the state that got one, my board and my community, my boss, look at that and go good job. Concurrent enrollment's a good plan to bring up we had a meeting with the superintendants last spring that I wasn't at the superintendants was basically told that we don't want to do the things you want to do. Their interpretation. The call I got from the superintendent of the largest school district in our area was your faculty don't care about poor people. And you can laugh at that and he goes out and tells people that. And the other thing was he goes now I get to see what you were going through so we're sympathetic. So you know it's a double edge sword. And you have marketing you guys have brought that up in the past, you know marketing part of its relationships, it's all relationships and the perception is the faculty is not in the same place that everybody else is at. You know it just is what it is. So I know, you can disagree with everything that I do you can say I'm 100 percent reactive, I disagree with that. We're trying to move forward and want to work with you. My solution would be, honestly it has to be something we both agree on, you can't have your own truth. I'm willing to start with that but if we keep going back to this or that you're so hardened that you can't come in a room with an open mind and an open heart, if you can't we aren't going to get anywhere but I will tell you I didn't have to do this, Steve didn't make me do it.

Riggs: We didn't have to attend it either

Wynes: I know you didn't so good for you, good for me I mean you know that's that's where we are at. I'm willing to do as much as I can to go forward to be honest about things but it's gotta be communication at best, if I don't get every fact or detail rightit's just not fair

Riggs: Ok, yeah that sounds good. I think that you know we'll continue to go through the process through shared governance, we are fortunate in the fact that we have, you know the uhm collective bargaining agreement that's what you have to kinda revolve around when uhm there's nothing else to

revolve around except that contract and uhm we've been working really hard to live up to the terms of the contract.

Wynes: Understood

Riggs: Yeah and I think with the shared governance meetings that happen on Tuesday and future shared, you know, it's, we're, we're really curious about, you know, where we are going as a college from the perspective of, of you, and the leadership here. And I think some of the questions that we have are, uh, somewhat specific but then some of the questions are really kinda about, you know, direction and where we are going, and, and

Wynes: And if you really want to have that conversation,we can move forward you gotta allow for people to talk out loud. Obama thought he was going to go into office and he was going to have open hearings on ObamaCare people would throw out ideas everybody would debate it. He found out very quickly that when someone says something out loud and in public they get stuck with that thought the constituents hold it against him if they don't do it. So he didn't do it in public he did it privately he got blasted for that. My point is Dave, is that we can have a really good debate, conversation and strategize about where we're going to take this college but if I make a mistake or say the wrong word or I did something a little bit off, if I'm going to read about it on the website or the Facebook folks that's not open honest communication . Bad for you guys that's so that's in a way this has to, if you really want to debate this and talk about the way this is a mistake or you're wrong about a fact or you're wrong about something or a strategy is tried that doesn't work that it's ok but if it's not then, it's going to be like this.

Riggs: yeah

Wynes: That's your call. That's not me, that's your call. I'm willing to do that it's up to you whether you're accepting or not. I can lead this college with or without you, right now I am without you and as far as I'm concerned I've got 3.2 million dollars coming in and I want to do it the right way I'd like to have you with me but if you're not with me we'll do it, to implement the grant we'll apply for more grants we'll do more work without your help, we'd love to have your help. And that's the best I can do at this point.

Riggs: Humm, ok. I guess we are done here then.

Wynes: Sounds like it