



Academic Senate

General Faculty Meeting May 13, 2010 Minutes

- 1. Call to order**
2:39 PM
- 2. Approval of agenda**
Agenda Approved.
- 3. Approval of September 8, 2009 General Faculty Minutes**
Approved as distributed.

4. Remarks by President Shirvani

Thank you and good afternoon. I think this is a moment when I hope we can all realize that the tensions of last year have not been very productive for anyone. Dr. Strong and I are here today to work with each and every one of you in paving a new road. I would say a new road to a more thoughtful and productive approach where we can discuss differences and solutions to the problems. Dr. Strong does truly represent a new beginning, and I am beyond pleased to have him with me here today as our new provost. We are both committed to promoting an open exchange of ideas and making positive change in a forward direction. I would like to stop here and pass it on to Dr. Strong.

5. Remarks by Provost James Strong

Thank you for inviting me to speak at the general faculty meeting today. I am extremely pleased to be on campus and honored that President Shirvani offered me the position of Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. I would like to thank the Search Committee for their support and all of the hard work they put forth during the search process. I would also like to thank the faculty, staff, and administrators who participated in the interview process. You have my total commitment of energy, talent, and values to advance the mission of the University and, in particular, provide leadership and support to the Division of Academic Affairs. That commitment began with my arrival on campus in record time after I accepted the offer. I accepted the offer on Wednesday night, April 28th, and I was on campus as a CSU Stanislaus employee on Monday, May 3rd. Arriving that fast is unusual and surprised a few folks, I imagine. And, no, I did not leave Dominguez in a difficult situation. Its President and Provost were comfortable with the fast transition, and I plan to assist them with any matters as needed.

I have been an academician for 24 years, and during half of that time I have been an academic administrator – 5 years as an associate dean in the College of Business Administration at the University of Akron and nearly 7 years as a dean at the College of Business Administration and Public Policy at CSU Dominguez Hills. The touchstone during my academic career has always been long-term student success. Student success in academics prepares students for productive careers and, more importantly, prepares students for healthy and meaningful lives. All of the things we do as academics should ultimately result in student success. Instruction, research, creative activity,

service, grant work, fundraising, working with various communities who support the University, and all the myriad activities of academics – all of these things should ultimately lead to student success. Whenever I have faced a difficult decision as an administrator, I have gone back to the touchstone – student success – and I ask myself, “What is in the long-term, best interests of current, past, and future students?” The answer to that question is always the right answer for whatever decision faces me. And it is the right answer for all of us. I suspect it is the reason that most, if not all, of us decided to enter academe.

We cannot achieve the appropriate level of student success without the good work of all of the stakeholder groups that support the University. Faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, donors, friends, the Chancellor’s Office, legislators and various elected officials, employers, and taxpayers all have a vested interest in student success, and we must coordinate efforts and be aware of and respect the role each group plays in the success of our students. Students define the success of the University. These stakeholder groups have different perspectives on how best to effectuate student success and the overall advancement of the mission of the University. Sometimes these stakeholder groups have very different communication styles that sometimes lead to miscommunication and conflict. Some level of conflict is healthy and productive as it puts issues on the table and stimulates a richer dialogue, which leads to more effective alternatives and better solutions. A reasonable level of conflict and disagreement also helps groups avoid groupthink, a phenomenon that has led to such disastrous decisions as the Bay of Pigs invasion and the Challenger disaster.

Just as no conflict in a group is dysfunctional, excessive conflict is equally dysfunctional, leading to goal displacement and poor decisions. Excessive conflict leads to hard win/lose negotiating tactics that severely damage relationships. Strong relationships among group members are critical to “expand-the-pie” solutions to thorny complex problems and new opportunities that require creative problem solving. Certainly the academy faces unprecedented complexity and challenges requiring an integrative approach to problem solving, negotiation, and maximizing opportunities.

My first order of business in the first month of my time as Provost is to meet with as many faculty, staff, and administrators as possible so that I may listen and learn and determine how best I can help these stakeholder groups improve student success and advance the mission of the University. Given that I am the chief academic officer of the University, the faculty are a key constituency, and I am endeavoring to meet and dialogue with as many faculty groups as possible before the semester ends.

I have asked all the deans to consult with the leadership of their colleges to determine how best I can meet with faculty in the remaining weeks of the semester. I look forward to meeting and speaking with all you, and I want to thank you for the warm welcome you have offered me since my wife and I arrived on May 2nd.

If there is time, I will answer questions and if not, I am happy to speak with you after the meeting or at another time.

J. Mayer asked about how we go about meeting with the Provost. Strong said to call his secretary for an appointment. He will also be speaking again in this room on May 25th on vision and expectations which is a broad topic that will be narrowed down before then by B. Eudey.

Regalado said we have had our fair share of disastrous decisions. He asked the provost what weight he will give to faculty on the area of curricular oversight and decision making.

Provost Strong noted that it's clearly stated in the university policies and in Title 5 that the faculty owns the curriculum. He will count on faculty to develop and own the curriculum as they play the key role.

Hejka-Ekins asked the provost what was his experience at Dominguez Hills and Akron in working with faculty governance. What will be your approach to faculty governance on this campus which is highly committed to it?

Provost Strong said that he is planning to engage and dialogue with faculty leaders and follow the governance policies. He's looking forward to an open exchange of views and using an integrative approach to problem solving. He believes in a straightforward approach. We'll know his opinions and what he thinks and he'll answer your questions in a straightforward fashion. We won't always agree, but you will find him to be consistent.

B. Carroll asked a hypothetical question about RPT. Assume that in a given year there is a great discrepancy between views of former levels and the provost. Say it's 40% of the RPT files. How would you interpret such a situation?

Provost Strong clarified the question, and then said hypothetically speaking there is a clear difference in terms of how the standards are being interpreted. You would have to review the policies and see why or what the discrepancy is. That certainly is a red flag that there is a problem. What the problem is he doesn't know unless he looked at the cases and determined why it was occurring. You'd have to ask why the provost was in such a different position on 40% of the cases. You would have to look into it and find out as it is unusual and merits further attention.

Thompson asked if the provost had read the 5th recommendation from WASC. He's curious about the Provost's interpretation of it and the importance of it.

Provost Strong said all recommendations in WASC are important. We have to take them seriously and trust them so that WASC is satisfied. Beyond that, he has to defer and can get back to this group with his particular thoughts on the WASC recommendation #5. He generally recalls it but without looking at it specifically he doesn't want to say. He will send an email and talk about what his thoughts are. All WASC recommendations are important and need to be taken seriously, and together we need to address the concerns of WASC and satisfy the recommendations and the accrediting body.

Thompson asked if he thinks we can make movement on the other recommendations before we respond to recommendation #5. Please include this in your response. Strong agreed to do so. Thompson thinks that we can't do much with the other recommendations until #5 is addressed, and he would appreciate the Provost's response to that idea. Strong said he would respond.

Garcia asked Strong about his impressions of UBAC and where it's going with the budget scenarios.

Provost Strong thought the meeting was productive. He liked what he heard about where UBAC is headed. UBAC is taking a more strategic approach which makes a lot of sense in terms of meeting the outcomes and recommendations from the committee rather than specific number crunching when we don't know the numbers. He thought it was productive and not dissimilar from other budget meetings on other campuses. He's looking forward to co-chairing and working with faculty and staff to effectuate this committee.

O'Brien welcomed Provost Strong. He asked a question concerning UBAC and the co-chairs of the UBAC. O'Brien was on UBAC for two years and noted that one of the recommendations from two years ago was that one co-chair should be a faculty member. He asked that the provost give this some thought. Strong said he would consider this.

T. Carter asked the Provost what kind of approach to budgeting and accountability the Provost preferred. Is it a decentralized budget with dept's handling of the budget, goals and accountability or a fully centralized budget which is kept at the provost level?

Provost Strong said it depends on the situation. Centralized vs. decentralized budgets, the organizational structure etc. Does the unit do the analysis etc. as both have pros and cons. He leans towards decentralized but it depends on the size of the organization. There is some duplication with decentralized budgets and it requires higher levels of broadly spread expertise which can make it more challenging. Any time you can make more decisions in a smaller group it has some advantages in terms of motivation of the front lines. The issue is the amount of control and making sure that the group is in sync with the mission of the organization. Every organization struggles with the appropriate level of decent. It depends on the task, the size of the institution and the evolution of the institution, but he leans towards decent with some accountability.

B. Carroll said regarding getting tenure track searchers for next year; do you have any idea what is possible? Assuming something happens this year or in the future, what kinds of priorities and criteria do you weigh when deciding what is to be approved?

Provost Strong said student success is the touchstone. We need to ask what we need to do to best serve our students and where are the shortfalls. What programs are growing and do we need to supply faculty and leadership to those programs. Those questions and criteria would be looked at. He's not sure if we'll have any new tenure track searches next year.

Hejka-Ekins asked what is the provost's view of the Liberal Arts and GE in terms of student success. She sees us today in a battle to provide a Liberal Arts public education for all students. Her approach with students is that they need a foundation to think, critique, and be citizens in a society and not just business consumers with technical skills.

Provost Strong said that he was an English major as an undergrad which is in the Liberal Arts. He thinks it's critically important that students have a broad base of liberal education to be good citizens and human beings. Students need a broad understanding of Liberal Arts education. You can't be a successful practitioner, doctor, business person, or whatever field you choose without a good strong base of Liberal Arts education. He believes this is very important. He also believes that we have majors in many fields in the university and need to support those majors. Part of supporting them is to look at student demand and societal demand in terms of economics and where jobs are. You can't be a successful individual without a reasonable economic base as well, so he will take a balanced view to that issue.

R. Savini welcomed the provost and asked if the provost has a calendar yet for decision making over the summer months. Savini explained that there is general concern about whether the budget decisions and plans are underway.

Provost Strong noted that they're working with UBAC. The problem we have in California is that they don't come up with a budget and don't give us numbers soon enough. The CSU system doesn't

get the actual numbers until they are given to the Chancellor's office. We're flying blind some of the time and get the numbers at the last minute to make it work. We need to anticipate likely scenarios to adjust on a short time frame. The difference for us is that when you have so many budgets tied to personnel it's not a flexible organization. No university is flexible in that sense which makes it different to respond to shocks in this system like the cuts last year which were extremely difficult to adjust to. We are working on it with FBAC and as soon as we get the number we will come up with more specifics that will be based on general principles. Deans and other administrators have been asked for 5%, 10%, 15% scenario plans and those will be presented to UBAC next week. We will be using those trying to identify some additional principles as recommendations by UBAC which will go to President Shirvani for his review.

Provost Strong thanked the Speaker and the faculty applauded

6. Remarks by Speaker Filling

Filling noted that we allocated time at the end of the meeting to engage in discussion. There are cards and pens on the tables so you can send forward comments and Filling will read them. Filling noted a petition related to the art gallery's future was available for signatures.

Filling asked some people to stand. He acknowledged the current SEC members as follows:

Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Speaker-Elect

Betsy Eudey, Clerk

Ken Schoenly, Chair of FAC

Ian Littlewood, Chair of UEPC

John Garcia, Chair of FBAC

Randy Brown, Chair of GC

Paul O'Brien, SWAS

These are the people who have been working diligently since last May, so let's recognize their efforts. Applause. Filling asked Isabel Pierce to stand. Ovation. He noted that Isabel stepped into the un-fillable shoes of Diana Bowman. She did so in the midst of a hell storm, and the reason she is standing here today is due to her expertise. She has worked nights and weekends and deserves a day at the Spa. Filling presented Isabel with a card and gift certificate. Ovation.

Isabel thanked Steve Filling and SEC. She really has enjoyed the year even though it's been a lot of work. She's pleased to be a part of this group and is looking forward to next year.

Filling said that he stands before us now in the persona of Marley's ghost. The past, present and maybe a happier future. Talking about our meeting today, he got the short straw and will share with us the things that went on this past year that need to be remembered to go forward.

Speaker Filling's remarks reviewed a number of critical events from the past year including the creation of a committee to eliminate the winter term, the vote of no confidence in President Shirvani, continual turnover in administration and other issues.

Filling asked if he's done a good job as Marley's ghost yet? Apologies, as this wasn't what he hoped to be saying last May. In pursuit of a brighter, sunnier future, Filling introduced Speaker -Elect Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl. Ovation.

7. Remarks and introduction of new faculty officers by Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl

Speaker Jaskek-Rysdahl thanked Steve Filling for his outstanding leadership this year. He's known Steve for a while, but never had the opportunity to work with him as closely as he has this past year. There is much he can say about the year and how impressive Filling has been but he will save some of that for later. For now, he just wants to say how grateful he is for the passion Filling has shown for this university.

Filling got the assignment of reminding all of us of the many struggles we have been through of late. But in spite of all of those, there have been significant accomplishments that have resulted from the hard work and dedication of many faculty, students, staff and even administrators. Many devoted thousands of hours to the WASC reaccreditation effort. There is much in the final report from the visiting team that shows we successfully communicated who we are and what we value, and they were impressed.

A number of programs also went through their own disciplinary based accreditation processes. Nursing, Art, Social Work, Public Administration, and the College of Education all received positive feedback about their programs. Much of this work went unrecognized and was certainly underappreciated.

Department chairs stepped up and supported faculty governance efforts to get more information from the administration. Their efforts did result in some additional information from the administration and even a seat in the room during a number of budget discussions. Jasek-Rysdahl thinks a more valuable outcome of their efforts was increased communication across the university with our colleagues. The chairs continue to communicate and share information, and we all benefit from that.

Faculty serving on numerous committees devoted many difficult hours trying to have an impact on university decisions. The work of UEPC regarding the winter term is just one example of a committee that performed extraordinarily. The members worked over the summer to collect and analyze data in order to determine the value of winter term. While the report of their results appears to have been largely ignored in the final decision, it did provide important information about what will be lost. Now we need to continue to work together in order to minimize the negative consequences of that decision.

He realizes that he has not even scratched the surface of the wonderful accomplishments that so many of you have achieved, but this meeting is not meant to be a bunch of long speeches.

Over the past year he has often been reminded of something Mark Thompson said as he was beginning his first stint as Speaker "the title is Speaker OF the Faculty, not Speaker FOR the Faculty." It has taken him awhile to understand exactly what that statement means, but he's getting close.

What he gets from Thompson's statement and Filling's actions over the past year is that his first priority will be to listen. He and the other members of SEC need to listen to our colleagues so that we know what concerns you have, your frustrations, successes, and the list of what we need to know goes on. Once he and the others on SEC have listened, SEC needs to talk about how to respond, communicate that back to you, listen some more, revise as needed and act. The outgoing SEC thought that this meeting would be a good opportunity for the incoming SEC to listen. Let me introduce them.

Koni Stone, Speaker-Elect
Betsy Eudey, Clerk
Kurt Baker, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee
Chad Stessman, Chair of University Educational Policies Committee
John Sarraille, Chair of Faculty Budget Advisory Committee
Dawn Poole, Chair of Graduate Council
Paul O'Brien, SWAS
Steve Filling, SWAS

As we end this academic year and begin to look to the next we would like to hear from you.

What are the issues we need to be on alert for?

What action should we be considering and planning?

We have an offer from the SWAS of support. What should we do with that offer?

8. Open discussion of issues

Shawna Young stated that the COE faculty wishes to share a report to the general faculty regarding the state of affairs in their college. The College recently underwent a 5-day accreditation site visit in April. It was a joint review by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Each organization makes a separate recommendation. We are pleased to report that at the exit meeting, CTC verbally recommended continued accreditation for each program under review in our college. We are also pleased to report that we received at the exit meeting a verbal recommendation from NCATE for continued accreditation of the entire college.

We would like to publically acknowledge the contributions of our Dean, Dr. Ruth Fassinger, for her contributions over the last 2 years toward this accreditation process. She dedicated tremendous time and effort to the process, recognizing the exigency of the required work. Her leadership has been instrumental in our success as a unit.

The College of Education faculty have had several concerns regarding support for the College. We invited President Shirvani and Interim Provost Lujan to a meeting with the college faculty to discuss those concerns. President Shirvani accepted our invitation, though during the period between the invitation and the meeting, the transition between the interim provost and our new provost occurred. Therefore, we met with President Shirvani and our new Provost, Dr. Strong, on May 3rd. The President responded to each of our expressed concerns, and demonstrated interest in and willingness to consider our perspective. Discussion of some of our concerns continues within the College.

This is a critical time for the College of Education. Dr. Fassinger is our fourth dean in 6 years. Over the past 2 years that Dean Fassinger has been with us, we have made substantial progress as a unit. We have much post-accreditation visit work that we need to accomplish in order to galvanize unit-wide accreditation processes that we were commended by the NCATE accreditation team for developing in these last 2 years. It is crucial that we maintain continuity in our College leadership. Having four deans in 6 years takes a tremendous toll on a college. Our college faculty overwhelmingly has provided positive feedback about Dean Fassinger in our formal college faculty annual dean evaluations, which we have shared with Provost Strong.

Again, the College publically acknowledges the contributions Dean Ruth Fassinger has made for our unit over her last 2 years here, and we emphasize the importance of her continued leadership.

S. Young recognized Dean Fassinger for her many contributions over the last two years. Dean Fassinger is not on campus today to share in these sentiments. This is a critical time for COE as Ruth Fassinger is the 4th Dean in 6 years for COE. It is crucial to maintain continuity in our college. Ovation.

Filling will try to manage discussion while others in SEC take notes. It's time for all of you to talk.

S. Marshall wants to thank all for the help with the General Education and for getting the Academic Program Review thru and Provost's office continued support for us. She thanked Scott Davis for his support and his leadership in the GE Subcommittee, as he's stepping down after many years as chair.

M. Tynan said the Social Work faculty and two others from the Research and Evaluation committee did a stellar job on our reaccreditation.

Regalado wants to thank the Academic Senate leaders for the proclamation for protecting the faculty academic integrity Palingate.

Sarraille thinks we ought to give Steve Filling a hand for all he's done. Standing ovation.

Jasek-Rysdahl reiterated his questions for which we hoped to obtain feedback.

Sarraille said that we need more budget transparency and a more inclusive budget planning process. He's afraid that he can't really agree with the implications of some of the statements made and the remarks that UBAC will take this matter up and UBAC will look at it fully and make recommendations. The situation is that there is probably not nearly enough actual hearing and heeding of the points of view of various stakeholders. There is not nearly enough information sharing and openness. He asked for more clarity on the intent of the individuals participating in budgetary decisions. We need to focus on greater transparency and openness.

He asked what would the Statewide Academic Senate (SWAS) be supporting if we say they would support us. It's good to get support but what are they supporting.

Filling said we are devoted to genuine shared governance; academia has historically been driven by academies because as a profession we have information on how this project might work better. Their statement was "tell us what we can do." The statement is asking us to open an investigation and make the outcomes public; they chose to issue statements in support of shared governance as we think it should be done which has a pretty strong history here.

Savini has been here a while, for a few decades, and noted that over various contract negotiations and State Wide Academic Senate policies, he's seen again and again a gap between the functions of the Union and the Senate that leads to difficulties and failures. The issue of commercializing the system has always been around and is now resurfacing.

There was a description in a recent CFA newsletter about what courses are being offered by UEE and under what terms. Now intersession and summer session are consistently referred to as 'special sessions'. The dramatic changes in terms of commercialization are an assumption that required

courses for degree programs will now be available via these special sessions. It's hard to overstate the importance of this kind of a change. People generally don't know that what was traditionally offered by UEE was limited to supplementary studies of various kinds; and that depts. had prerogative over courses for degree programs in order to maintain standards, accountability, faculty oversight, credentials of faculty etc.

This seems on the verge of changing and could happen instantly with an overnight dramatic change toward administrative choices for commercialization of the required courses for degrees. This could be the equivalent of requiring a certain number of winter terms for students. Faculty is off the clock outside the fall and spring semesters. Policies and procedures for accountability in special sessions are not in effect. Academic accountability seems to be gone in special sessions without relevant faculty expertise in the course approval process. We can't wait on this and we need statements from the administration about it.

Savini noted that at a recent college faculty meeting with President Shirvani and R. Giambelluca, he was struck that they have great interests in this area. The president talked about tripling the costs of courses for students. This is dramatic. This should be brought to the attention of the Statewide Academic Senate as they can say how it will affect governance and contract matters and must be addressed immediately. We need to draw a line on this issue.

Mayer would agree that this is a discussion that needs to take place but cautions us about generalization about this issue. The marketplace has changed and we should be open to different options. There are viable issues within the larger issue that we need to discuss. Our students need something we have to offer that is limited by state funding. The response to summer is overwhelming in terms of student need. This may not ideally be the course we would choose to take, but we have to deal with marketplace and look at ways to deal with a changing situation as it goes.

Sarraille said maybe the question is where we stand with our belief in public education. If we believe that higher education should be a public good in California then that puts you in one camp. If you're in favor of privatizing public education you're in another camp. What strategies should we follow? In his case, he's in favor of public support for higher education. What he is trying to do in this situation is take a course that in the long term will help ensure that we don't progressively slip into a privatization of public higher education. Some things we might do in the short term as beneficial, in the long term they may not be. The point about not generalizing is well taken as no one who is a scholar would admit to believing in making rash generalizations. We do have to consider long and short views and consider what to do in terms of where we stand.

B. Carroll thinks it could be discussing the market as if an entity outside of decision makers. People and decisions determine where the market goes.

Savini said the primary issues, whether the funding is commercial or public, have to do with accountability. The decades of development in policy and procedure and the culture of accountability on this campus is the issue. The faculty doesn't have in place processes that govern accountability of decisions for courses that are offered and how they apply to the academic requirements in special sessions. If left open ended and driven merely by administrative interests or commercial-profit; how do we apply the standards developed over the years? This could be a quick and dirty change that would remove accountability. In what way will this affect faculty governance, and accountable decision making with records of discussion on procedures and issues?

Billions of dollars are at stake. There would be job training requirements where typically companies would like to see this happen at the public trough. We need to make note of this in Union statements about the consequences related to this issue. The Union and Senate need to state where we stand with maintaining accountable governance procedures and standing by them.

Dean Moore echoes what Mayer said about an over-implication or generalization of these issues. Savini has touched on a broad number of things in his comments. It's not as simple as one camp or another regarding how to figure out a way to sustain programs. We have to stay open to possibilities. While all embrace public education, he also knows what public education is facing and it has only gone down for the last 15 years. It's not as simple as 2 campuses. We have to be provocative in ways to develop courses. There's no indication as an administrator that we're trying to push the development of curriculum and programs out of the hands of faculty. This has been coming across in comments he's heard. He's open to differing opinions but has not seen that in any college since he's been here. Any program developed is driven by faculty as to how to get it off the ground and sustain them. This is political for the obvious reasons.

Filling asked folks to pass cards forward.

M. Tynan read her card that states that we should pay attention to the strategic plan. The strategic plan should be guiding decisions and should be brought back into the forefront.

Nagel thinks SEC and SWAS should keep an eye out for encroachment of the deliverology programs. Filling said that Michael claimed never to use the term deliverology.

Thompson thanks God we see that our provost is still the Chief Academic Officer. At the same time the incoming provost arrives at a very difficult time, and what makes that more problematic is that we had only one faculty representative on that search committee. Search processes have been varied, creating chaos. Chaos can be a way to function, but it also creates distrust and divisiveness, including divisiveness within the faculty. COC has had a difficult time this past year and still faces a difficult situation. Thompson encouraged SEC to support COC and asks that COC hang in there to get some stability in the search processes because authentic faculty representation on search committees is very important.

Provost Strong said that he is planning to engage and dialogue with faculty leaders and follow the governance policies. He's looking forward to an open exchange of views and using an integrative approach to problem solving. He believes in a straightforward approach. You'll know my opinions and what he thinks, and he'll answer your questions in a straightforward fashion. We won't always agree, but you will find him to be consistent.

Hejka-Ekins said this is a trust issue. How can we rebuild trust as trust is hard to build? It's a process and we do have a new provost and we have an opportunity to share a few suggestions. One is to respect and work in collaboration with faculty governance processes. That means you legitimize the academic governance approach because all of us as faculty believe in that process. When it's marginalized it creates distrust. This is an opportunity to work thru regular governance processes to begin anew to rebuild trust.

Hejka-Ekins also mentioned the strategic plan. The strategic plan includes the mission and the means of providing public education. She's not sure we have the same mission among administration and faculty. Using the strategic plan is an opportunity to come together and to come to grips with our

mission. We may disagree on the means, but she is not sure we have the same mission or means. She thinks that it is a great idea to bring back the strategic plan approach to get us working collaboratively. She supports the idea of working with governance in terms of following policy. We have extensive policies and processes and can use them. When these are not legitimized that limits trust. She suggested that the new provost can start building trust by working with governance and the strategic plan. Strong said he plans to do that.

Filling indicated a card suggests that since this is the first full faculty meeting we have had since the RPT process, people might like to revisit things brought up at last Thursday's RPT meeting. Last Thursday SEC convened a meeting for folks undergoing this year's RPT review in an attempt to build support in the face of some fairly understandable events. Among other things, CFA has filed a grievance regarding the process engaged in.

Sarraille said a grievance was filed by Grobner and Schoenly on behalf of the faculty. It's basically a grievance concerning the process followed and criteria applied when producing the judgments as to merits of faculty in the provost's recent letters, and this will go forward in a preliminary stage as a level one meeting. They'll ask local administration to find in our favor and will seek a remedy as yet to be decided. Certainly, it would involve in some way a promise by administration to adhere to local policy and criteria. It's going to be pursued via statutory process. There are two ways to handle grievances, statutory and contract process. If we go beyond level one it will be a local hearing with 3 faculty.

Thompson asked if it was really 40% of the RPT letters that were adversely affected or is there a different number? Filling said given privacy constraints we can't know for certain. Shirvani said the answer is absolutely not 40% and it's far less. Filling said we should know and we're talking about the provost's letters. Shirvani said even the provost's letters were not at 40%.

Filling said more than one person had information in their letters that were factually incorrect. He thinks that someone might have to revisit those letters since the author of the letters is no longer here. The president can override decisions by the provost, but in the spirit of justice and fairness some probationary colleagues will have misinformation in their files and we would hate to have that taint their careers.

Filling also got a comment on Dean Moore's comment about curriculum being in the hands of faculty. At least in the case of the College of Business Administration, we learned about the online MBA program at an awards banquet and not at a curriculum committee. Dean Nowak convened a group of faculty to try to get involved in the curriculum and whether it made any sense.

Filling read a card which echoed the need to revisit the Interim Provost Lujan's RPT letters that will go into faculty member's personnel files.

Another card asks SEC to pursue information regarding the profit and loss of the "Palin event"

Another card asks about the presidential and provost's scholarships. Filling asked the provost if some scholarships would be funded.

Provost Strong said 2 presidential and one provost scholarship will be funded. There has been some discussion about possibly exploring giving out more scholarships and reducing the amounts. They're looking at feasibility, and he will consult with the appropriate bodies. Filling asked if it was clear how many students received the denial letters.

President Shirvani asked Russ Giambelluca to respond to this question. Giambelluca said we had 2 presidential and 1 provost's scholarship, but we are looking at ways to cover tuition only and provide more scholarships. Provost Strong said that was the recommendations of the chair of the committee.

Filling said that he thought that in the past they had provided 10-15 scholarships and is wondering how many. Giambelluca said this is not accurate. Filling said that's what was in the college magazine. Giambelluca said there have been years when there haven't been that many when people were not qualified. That figure may have included all scholarships in the system because these are four-year scholarships.

Filling noted a question about FTES needs and minimum course enrollments. SEC will pay attention to that.

Wendt said while he can't address cases under review, if there is the perception in any case that there is factual error and it is not a difference of opinion, that the immediate recourse is the 10 day rebuttal period that candidates have at every level of review. If it hasn't been addressed then at the next level there is another 10 day rebuttal. You have a combined 40 days to get factual errors addressed.

Filling said that errors weren't changed, and the faculty wrote rebuttals.

Filling read a card with a question for the Provost on the place of graduate education and what support he would provide for it.

Provost Strong said that graduate education is very important, but primarily the CSU mission is the undergraduate programs. Although, there is an important place for graduate programs, and we will provide as much support as possible. We can use special sessions to do that. For any for-credit-program via special sessions under control of faculty in the dept. just like the state-side programs.

Regalado would like to make suggestions to SEC, and he applauds the courage of the committee members to try to do things advantageous to the university while dealing with a dysfunctional system. The problem is that the president and the faculty are not playing by the same rules. The faculty process for dealing with the mission of the university has not been respected by the upper-level administration over the past year. He appreciates anything that SEC can do working in this dysfunctional system that is governed with a different set of rules. He's not sure how anything can move forward. He's not sure how that can happen unless a firm commitment is made that we're all playing by the same rules so we can move forward. Otherwise we're spinning our wheels.

9. Passing of the Turkey Leg

Filling presented the turkey leg to Jasek-Rysdahl. Filling noted that people should contact Jasek-Rysdahl with more information.

R. Brown wanted to make a quick address about the Graduate School. We had a deal at SEC not to talk about the past. It has been an honor to be chair of the Graduate Council. He recognized Dawn Poole who will be the new chair in 2010/11. Rather than read off names of the great group on the Graduate Council that he served with, he'd like to ask that faculty at this meeting acknowledge their committee members for their work when they see them. Brown supports the excellent graduate

programs we have here. Lots of hard work goes into planning and developing them. Our graduates serve us well and make us very proud.

Jasek-Rysdahl moved a commendation for Speaker Steve Filling. Seconded by all. Standing ovation. Jasek-Rysdahl read the resolution as follows:

1/GF/10/SEC



Commendation for Speaker Steven Filling

Whereas, Professor Steven Filling has steadfastly and admirably fulfilled his duties as Speaker of the Faculty during a difficult year, and

Whereas, Speaker Filling gave voice to the concerns, frustrations, and fears that members of the campus community shared with him, and

Whereas, Speaker Filling labored tirelessly to preserve meaningful faculty input into the decision making processes of this university, and

Whereas, Speaker Filling faced challenges with courage and conviction, and

Whereas, Speaker Filling strove for inclusion, broad consultation, and open communication, and

Whereas, Speaker Filling worked to maintain respectful and constructive conversation throughout the year, be it, therefore

Resolved that the General Faculty express its heartfelt THANKS to Speaker Filling, and be it, further

Resolved that the Faculty wish Speaker Filling all the best in his future endeavors on behalf of the California State University Stanislaus.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that it is past practice that SEC gives the outgoing Speaker a nice gift but we went with something with sentimental value. This is something for Steve to look back and remember fondly this year. Jasek-Rysdahl produced a gas mask with a carrying case.

Jasek-Rysdahl looked at what previous new speakers have said, and he noted that Melissa Aronson said that faculty are the long-term backbone of the university. He doesn't have an agenda other than to ensure that the faculty is the long-term backbone of this university. He is sure that SEC will be thankful for all the support they can receive.

10. **Adjournment**
4:11PM