



General Faculty Senate Meeting

Time: 11:00 am – 12:15 pm

Minutes

12/17/2020

In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Elizabeth McNie (Vice Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Steven Browne, Tamara Burbach, Colin Dewey, Matt Fairbanks, Margot Hanson, Mike Holden, Christine Isakson, Tony Lewis, Keir Moorhead, Ali Moradmand, Julie Simons, Cynthia Trevisan, Wil Tsai, Margaret Ward, Frank Yip

1. Call to Order

- Chair shares Zoom Protocol for General Senate Meetings: During Zoom meetings non-senators should turn off their cameras to ensure that only senators are visible during the meeting. This will ensure that senators who cannot use the “raise hand” function on Zoom [because they are co-hosts or because they’re having technical difficulties] will *not* be overlooked if they raise their hands in person.
- Guests who wish to speak should type a message in the Chat box, which will be monitored throughout the meeting by the Vice Chair and Secretary. Guest comments will only be recognized *after* the senator speaker list has been exhausted. If guests are not recognized by the Chair they can email comments/questions to SenateExec@csum.edu after the meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes

- Browne moves to approve the minutes from November meeting. Fairbanks seconds.
- Browne moves to approve the minutes from December meeting. Fairbanks seconds.

3. Senate Chair Updates

- Course evaluations will close today at noon,
- Faculty Development committee is seeking suggestions/ideas. Send comments to Sam Pearson, Ariel Setniker, Nipoli Kamdar, and Michele Van Hoeck
- Service Opportunities: faculty are needed to serve on LRPG’s Academic Pathways Task Force and the Gender Equity Committee is seeking faculty members to be part of a focus group with TNG Consulting Form. Send self-nominations to Elizabeth McNie.
- Update on Spring 2021 Senate Elections:
 - o ASCSU Senator needed to fill in for Sarah Senk, who will be on maternity leave starting in January
 - o ASCSU Senator election will be held mid semester.

4. MT Curriculum Revision Discussion

- Pinisetty asks Curriculum Committee Chair to clarify what the committee is asking of the Senate.
- Parsons explains that the MT curriculum change was substantial and they put in a lot of work. Most forms in place right now are for “medium sized” changes, and Parsons thinks that perhaps created some issues. One of the points of contention was the part about consulting other departments. Parsons reports that she worked a lot with the MT chair over the summer but it was possible incumbent upon her to require them to meet with the S&M department. But the email Parsons sent indicating that MT should meet with S&M dept stated “this is a recommendation, not a mandate.” [The current policy only mandates that departments seek a response through the Department Questionnaire form.]
- Chair invites Curriculum Committee members to comment.
- Scott Green says that “Amy’s point is that the existing forms that we use for general changes aren’t really set up currently to address multiple courses all at once. Really the CCR form itself is supposed to only be for one class, so I don’t really see a form for when you have a full curriculum change. We’ve done this before; the earliest one I can remember is the Masters Program, it was one form that said ‘here’s all these courses we’re gonna do’ and the courses didn’t exist yet, and that’s a problem. And that’s sort of a problem with the MT proposal. It lists all the courses but some haven’t been developed yet. The problem is, “how do we use that structure to look at an entire curriculum?”
 - o Kazek (Guest) adds in chat: “I think Scott’s point was that a major curriculum change such as this is cut apart and sent out to the departments that are impacted but no one is overseeing the entirety of the change. E.g., I only saw the changes that affected STCW. ET only saw the one course that affected ET...and so forth.”
 - o Parker (Guest) adds in chat: “The CSU has a specific process for new programs... this could be used as a template for revisions to existing programs.”
 - o Senator Browne notes in chat: “We did the same when we changed the MT curriculum to comply with the new EO 1100 a few years ago. We submitted CCR that said, ‘See attached sheets’. It worked fine.”
- Chair invites Senators to comment:
- Moorhead asks what’s in the works to prevent this from happening again. What did we learn from this and how do we prevent this from happening again?
- Parsons responds that committee plans to review policy and make clear the steps for communicating with impacted departments. Senk has already drafted a beautiful CCR form that will include steps for major changes.
- Moorhead asks if these changes would be in place if we were to reevaluate the MT program change.
- Parsons says the changes would need to be approved before they became official policy. Can’t see they would be in place because there’s time-pressure. Changes like this need to be completed by February. So Parsons says if we revisited the proposal, it would be under the current policy.
- Burbach wants to speak to Green’s statement about the forms being inadequate. Although they are built for course-specific changes, what MT did in order to facilitate the curriculum revise was file a ton of course specific change forms. So it’s not that we put the whole curriculum on a form that didn’t fit; we just submitted a ton of forms for each change, for each class, as per policy. It was bulky but I would argue it was adequate.
- Lewis suggests that idea about trying to achieve focus would be helpful.
- Hanson reports she collected feedback from Library faculty about recommendations to possible changes to the process. Part of it echoes what Alex put in the chat: the process for drastic revision to entire curriculum uses same form as individual courses, but it’s not set up in a comprehensive way. Using template for CSU template like Alex did for the OCN program as a model for what we could do if there are dramatic changes to a program, that could be a model. From perspective of

Library Curriculum Committee rep, we've seen proposals to OCN, GSMA, ME, and each had a different way of approaching it, so recommends clear guideline from the curriculum committee to programs what would help the departments but also the curriculum committee to have clear expectations about the guidelines. Hanson says they would also like to see general clarification of the relationship between the GE committee and Curriculum Committee.

- Green says in chat: "What I am asking for is a form that spells out the process of interaction with all departments affected. Just as Margot is suggesting. As an example, I think we could use the way Wil Tsai presented proposed changes to ME. It was very clear. Then, all the course CCR's are easier to track and to congeal."
- Parker says in chat: "The most instructive part of OCN program development was comparisons with other programs. ME also used this approach."
- Parsons asks Lewis for clarification, does he mean for *future* proposals. Lewis says yes.
- Burbach says she is willing to work on that moving forward but strongly opposes halting the changes that were approved. "I would love to work for continuous improvement and am available to respond to the issues, but I don't think it's enough to revisit the changes that were approved already."
- Registrar Julia Odom adds in chat: "CSU East Bay has a workflow and policy for revisions. So folks don't have to reinvent anything. Here are a few examples:
<https://www.csueastbay.edu/aps/curriculum-development/cpm/request-for-approval-of-revision-of-a-degree-programmajor.html>"
- Chair asks for any other questions.
- Trevisan says she is puzzled because last time we met it sounded like the Curriculum Committee had met and found they had not dutifully performed their roles, and it sounded like it was more than just not having the right form. It sounded like it was beyond that. What I heard last time was that the Curriculum Committee felt they didn't perform their role properly. Sounded like there were people who made assumptions about consultations, other assumptions about the time voting occurred. Now it seems like the conversation has turned into something completely different. Last time I was under the impression that the Curriculum Committee was saying, "we screwed up; what do we do?"
- Parsons says she believes these two things aren't too far apart. The members did what they were supposed to do; they read the material I didn't want this to be presented as a case of negligence. But the process available, the ambiguity in the policy created a situation in which a large change came through and possibly some of the kind of interrogation of the material created a situation where there were things that the Curriculum Committee perhaps wanted more information on but weren't answered. I don't think the two things are completely different.
- Trevisan asks are the Curriculum Committee members satisfied with the oversight they had, then we should just let this lay. But if they were, I don't understand why they could come to us with the question. And if they feel they made assumptions about consultations happening when they did not, that their departments looked at all the changes when they did *not*, that's the type of clarify I seek. Do you think you need to look at this again, or not?
- Parsons says this is not unanimous: some members want to move on, other members say that there was scrutiny that didn't get performed.
- Moradmand says one of the things that seemed problematic was mismatches in the documents that Yip presented in the last meeting, the fact that total number of units were changing mid-stream. Guidance should be that everyone agrees on what they're looking at. Would like CC to make sure everything was consistent in every step in the process.
 - Dewey adds in chat, "For the record, I did get the entire MT proposal with impact statements via email from Dan Weinstock Feb 21, 2020."
- McNie says she is on the curriculum committee and "thinks it's safe to say that there appears to be consensus that we need to review our policies moving forward. I think the issue at hand though is one of whether what has happened is substantial enough to force the MT department to redo the

process or not, and it's about evidentiary levels. Are we talking about reasonable doubt? Preponderance of evidence? Conversation has been ambiguous for quite a while and that for me suggests this is an issue about moving forward and making sure this doesn't happen in the future. The MT Department followed past practices in what it had done and we would like to continue to move forward with our proposal. In my mind there is no glaring problems that everyone seems to be rallying around that suggests there was negligence on the MT department's part."

- Lewis suggests there may be an overreach of Senate oversight here. We need a trial by fire sometimes to figure things out. Lewis thinks the Curriculum Committee can have at least as much flexibility as a court of law, and laying out a standard of what an appeal would look like would be enough moving forward. If majority of committee thinks an appeal is warranted, that's enough for the Senate to authorize it. But absent some repeated problems like this I don't see what's being gained here.
- Yip adds in chat: "These inconsistencies can be resolved in any action to revisit. And give the Curr Comm members the opportunity to apply the scrutiny they now deem must be done"
- Browne agrees we've been using this current CCR for major changes for years. Three years ago when EO1100 was revised, MT revised curriculum then and used the CCR and submitted about 15 different changes including the creation of a new course, and it went through the Curriculum Committee using current procedures, and it sounds like from what most people have said that the MT department has followed current procedure, the CC followed procedure, and voted in favor, and sent to Provost for signature. Even though policy could be clarified, it would be inappropriate for MT to follow a policy that didn't exist at the time. Any changes should impact the future but not the previous decision.
- Burbach agrees with what Browne said, does not believe we should halt the process. Burbach says if we look at the three main issues Parsons presented in her emailed materials, we should *not* force the MT department to go back and work according to a policy that doesn't exist yet.
- Ward says that from the beginning there has been not enough specific evidence or not even a specific thing that went wrong. Everything was followed to the letter of the policy; notifications were made when they were supposed to be made according to the policy. As Parsons said earlier, although it wasn't unanimous, in light of the scrutiny this decision is now coming under, perhaps there could have been more oversight. I understand but echo my colleagues that it's unfair to overturn a decision when everything was done technically the way it was supposed to. If one looks at it from the outside there is no specific reason (the voting confusion was solved [when Parsons followed up with Committee Members]), the size of the meeting was addressed and is not enough to account for
- Yip notes there were material changes, the CCR form changed over the summer. It seems like if we view this the way RTP happens, nothing should change. Order of operations need to happen in correct process, not just moving forward but in this case.
- Simons asks in chat: "Amy, is there a feeling by committee members that they got everything documented necessarily? I am concerned about institutional memory and being able to document reasons for choices so that we can study changes and their effects a posteriori. It seems like this level of documentation should be happening at the CC level, but I could be wrong. This doesn't mean a new vote should necessarily be taken, but just additional documentation could be gathered."
- Chair invites Senators to propose motions
- Browne: "I move that the MT curriculum changes be forwarded immediately to the Provost." Burbach seconds it.
- Senk asks for clarification: haven't the changes already been forwarded and approved by the Provost? Provost confirms in chat she has already signed the changes.
- Browne revises motion: "I move that the MT curriculum changes be implemented."
- Simons asks Parsons if there is sufficient documentation justifying changes to MT curriculum.

- Dewey asks in chat: “Minutes of senate meetings should document the ensuing conversations, yes?”
- Trevisan says I don’t think this body is the instrument to implement the changes in the MT department. This isn’t a race to have the department vote on whether we can implement this. There needs to be room... we started this meeting trying to respond to the curriculum committee about how to proceed in this case. To implement these changes is not something we vote on as this body.
- Browne says he appreciates Cynthia’s statement but it’s equally the purview of this body to move this process along as it is to stop this process and move it backward. IF we have the ability to stop the process we have the ability to decide not to stop this as well, which is the intent of my motion. It is not for the senate to implement it but to allow the process to continue following the normal curriculum change procedure which goes from the Provost to the catalog, etc.
 - Moradmam adds in chat: “If the appeals court analogy is valid, then the Senate really does only look backwards.”
- Lewis wants to echo Senator Trevisan’s concerns that this feels rushed. If we expect multiple motions on the floor we should hear them.
- Chair explains that we need to bring closure to this issue now given the timeline.
- Yip adds that S&M has put forward a counter-motion. Fairbanks pastes it in chat: “The Faculty Senate directs the Curriculum Committee to re-visit the MT curriculum revision that passed the Curriculum Committee. Because most of the necessary documentation has already been submitted to the Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate directs the Curriculum Committee to engage with the MT department directly to obtain answers to their questions and engage in any subsequent dialogue required to render their recommendations regarding the MT curriculum revision. This dialogue shall continue until the CC is satisfied that their normal standard of review has been met. However, this dialogue should also proceed in a timely manner, with the understanding that there are proximate deadlines for the implementation of the new curriculum if it is to be in place for the incoming MT students in Fall 2021.”
- Browne clarifies that according to Robert’s Rules the committee will need to vote on Browne’s motion first.
- Discussion in chat about how By-Laws specify that votes are public. Senk asks members to record votes in chat:
 - Yes: Browne, Burback, Dewey, Holden, McNie, Senk, Tsai, Ward (8)
 - No: Fairbanks, Hanson, Lewis, Moorhead, Moradmam, Simons, Trevisan, Yip (8)
 - Abstain: Isakson (1)
- Pinisetty [tie-breaker]. Motion passes 9-8-1 after Chair’s tie-breaker..

5. Discussion of President’s Response to IBL Chair Resolution

- Lewis notes we’re running low on time and moves that we table this until a time when we can have adequate discussion. Browne seconds Tony’s motion to amend the agenda.
- Chair asks if there are any objections.
- No objections.
- Hanson asked if a draft letter was shared.
- Senk confirms a draft was shared this morning.

6. Good of the Order

- Lewis reads statement:
- “I regret that the IBL chair situation and the President’s remarks about my professional qualifications have taken up so much of the Senate’s time. When multiple sources of reliable data pointed to financial malfeasance, I, along with my colleagues on the Budget Advisory Committee, brought that information to the Senate in earnest. When the President

relayed false information to the Senate, information that we all eventually agreed was false, I noted that in the Senate. That is all I have done. The reason we are in this awkward position is completely due to the President's actions and not anyone else's. The President can undo this problem any time by simply withdrawing his false statements as I have repeatedly requested.

Moreover, I am not the only target of the President's baseless slander. Specifically, he claimed that IBL had the lowest retention and enrollment rates in the university and that this was the fault of the department chair. These false statements unjustly impugn the integrity of our former chair and the integrity of the entire IBL department who have labored so hard under desperate resource scarcity these past several years to ensure the success of the IBL department.

While I appreciate Senate Exec's understandable hesitance to get into the business of reviewing HR records, there are important factors to consider here other than faculty privacy rights. For example, why is the President repeatedly bringing information to the Senate that we all agree is false? Does he know what he is saying is false? Or was the President unaware that all of the shifting reasons he has given for one of the most consequential HR decisions to have happened on our campus were false? Is that better?

I agree with Senate Exec's statements about this disclosure being dangerous for me personally. Despite this risk, I think it is essential to determine if the President's word, delivered on the floor of the Senate, can be relied upon. Moreover, it is critical to the orderly functioning of this body to determine if the President is keen on assaulting low ranking faculty members with the aim of silencing or unjustly discrediting them. If the President's shifting reasons for overriding the Chair vote are uniformly without merit, it points to the likely conclusion that his actions were taken in retaliation for the budget advisory report that I delivered to the full Senate.

Putting all personal matters aside, these are important questions for the Senate to answer going forward. If we cannot count on the President's word, what does that say about the shared governance situation that has already deteriorated significantly since the drafting of the shared governance report? What does it say about the likelihood of others sharing important information with the Senate if they are likely to receive the same treatment?

Therefore, I am going to release my HR record to the full Senate. My aim is to fully wipe away the mud that the President has thrown on my integrity and to demonstrate that the President is reliably bringing false information to the Senate. Senators will receive an email from me containing my HR record. I will see to it that identifying information like my social security number is redacted from the record. No other edits will be made to the document. I ask that Senators treat this disclosure with the seriousness it deserves. Of course, there are some embarrassing anecdotes in my file that I would rather not have my colleagues see, but I feel compelled to clear my name and this is the only way I know how. I ask that my colleagues recognize the awkward position I have been placed in by the President and not further the personal harm already done to me by engaging in gossip when details about my HR record that are sensitive, but unrelated to the President's claims, inevitably surface.

When it can be shown without a doubt, that Tom Cropper is using his status as President to repeatedly bring false information to the Senate; information designed to undermine and silence much lower ranking, vulnerable faculty members, that assertive action be taken to combat this. The question of whether the floor of the Senate is safe for faculty to share information is Senate business. I hope we do not shy away from our responsibilities here, even though public examples have already been made of the faculty who have challenged the President.

Thank you."

7. Meeting Adjourned

- Before adjournment Tsai adds that this [the Curriculum discussion] was difficult, and "it's a crappy end to a crappy year," but he hopes that we can rebuilt the burnt bridges in this process. Pinisetty explains that Provost has already signed this, and he explains that he voted to move forward because he believes that if we overturn the Curriculum Committee vote at this time we'd be setting a wrong precedent. He adds "I understand the concerns that S&M brought. I know how this impacted S&M in terms of workload issues, but I hope that MT can work with S&M and figure out how to best help the department. I strongly believe in policies and that's my major concern."
 - o Browne notes in chat "We would be happy to work with S&M."