

From: Clare Weber

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2026 6:38 PM

To: Office of the Board of Trustees <trusteesoffice@calstate.edu>

Cc: anissa rogers

Subject: Concerns Regarding President Morales's Eligibility for the Executive Transition Program, and Provost Mohamed and others' "Good Standing"

Importance: High

Dear Members of the Board of Trustees of the California State University,

We are writing ahead of the July 20–21 Board of Trustees meeting, where we understand a transition plan for President Morales of CSUSB is expected to be announced. We want to raise concerns we believe the Board should consider before finalizing any such plan.

Under the CSU's Executive Transition Program policy, an executive is eligible to participate only if certain conditions are met, including that the executive “be in good standing at the commencement of the program.”^[i] Separately, in 2022 the CSU announced reforms to the retreat rights policy, stating that “the opportunity to retreat should be extended to individuals in good standing with the CSU, not to individuals who have engaged in significant misconduct,” and that the revised systemwide policy would “prohibit an administrator's return to the faculty under certain circumstances, such as when the administrator has been found to have engaged in sexual harassment or other significant misconduct.”^[ii]

We jointly filed suit against the university in *Weber and Rogers v. Board of Trustees of the California State University, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 23STCV05549, bringing claims for gender pay discrimination and retaliation. Our cases were later bifurcated: Dr. Rogers's claims proceeded to trial. Following her trial, we reached a joint settlement of \$12 million.

Based on the trial testimony and transcripts from Dr. Rogers's trial, as well as our own experiences, we do not believe President Morales meets the “good standing” standard these policies require. The record from that trial, in our view, points to a cover-up, and Dr. Weber was terminated after raising a complaint connected to these same underlying issues. We believe the Board should scrutinize President Morales's eligibility for the Executive Transition Program in light of this before any transition plan is approved.

Based on the trial record from Dr. Rogers's trial, it is our understanding that Provost Mohamed characterized Dr. Rogers's complaints as “low-grade bias” and did not

report them to Human Resources or the Title IX office. It is our assessment that this reflects a role in the cover-up, along with other administrators who served at that time, and we do not believe anyone involved should be considered in good standing.

Dr. Weber requested a gender equity pay raise, was retaliated against, and was fired. The gendered pay disparities were later confirmed by an expert witness and raised serious questions about how the CSU falsified data to deny her gender equity raise, for example, assigning a male counterpart a salary of \$0, and including women's salaries and managers of lower rank than her in the analysis. These events are among the claims we brought in the litigation described above. We believe the facts from Dr. Rogers's trial, taken together with Dr. Weber's claims in that same case, demonstrate a pattern of protecting male executives who violate CSU's Title IX and civil rights policies at the expense of the women who raise concerns about them.

We are asking the Board to take this pattern seriously rather than allow another transition, appointment of a new President, or retreat-rights arrangement to move forward without genuine scrutiny.

Respectfully,

Clare Weber, PhD

Professor Emerita

California State University San Bernardino

Anissa Rogers, PhD

Professor and Chair, MSW

Pacific Lutheran University

California State University San Bernardino