



General Faculty Senate Meeting

Time: 11:00 am – 12:15 pm

Minutes

11/19/2020

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

I. New Agenda Item

- Chair explains that he asked in a recent meeting with the President and Provost for an update regarding Resolution 20-21/01 (IBL Department Chair Override). Before sending out the agenda for this meeting, that Chair asked again in a meeting with the Provost whether anything was settled and she informed him that nothing was worked out. After the agenda for this meeting was sent out on Tuesday, Chair learned that Dean Don Maier had a response to present today. Chair asks if Senate will move to approve change to the agenda. McNie moves to approve. Browne seconds.

II. Chair asks to applaud Dan Weinstock for his service to Cal Maritime

- [multiple comments and congratulations posted in the chat wishing Dan best wishes in retirement]

III. Campus Facility Projects Update (Tom Van Pelt)

- Van Pelt introduces himself and apologizes to cabinet members in attendance for redundant presentation
- Van Pelt reports that Construction projects never stopped during the pandemic because they were considered an essential service.
- Van Pelt reports a priority is protecting the campus from outside visitors and making sure people on campus know the rules and adhere to them.
- In terms of impact of COVID-19 there have been supply chain disruptions, funding uncertainty due to budget shortfalls.
- Faculty Drive rehabilitation was completed on schedule (funded by the state).
- Academic A feasibility study involves planning next major academic building. Estimated cost is around 90M, seeing funding from the state.
- Parking Lots: Lot A EV Chargers have been installed. Fire mitigation and tree hazard mitigation has been underway and 17 Eucalyptus trees have been removed; Van Pelt identifies other Fire Damage Repairs (Lot E and F)
- Classroom Annex plans have experienced COVID-19 delays due to outbreak at Mare Island factory. Estimated completion is early part of next year.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY MARITIME ACADEMY

200 Maritime Academy Drive, Vallejo, CA 94590-8181 • PHONE (707) 654-1000 • FAX (707) 654-1001 • www.csum.edu

- Projects in design and planning: largest project is Mayo Hall renovation and addition. Van Pelt presents planning concepts, etc.
- Holden asks in chat: “It’s been a few weeks since I was on campus, but at that time all the EV chargers were offline. Has this been resolved?”
- Van Pelt responds in chat: “Mike - The asphalt for the ADA chargers in Lot A is being repaired. That only impacts about 4-6 chargers. All others are open and operational to my knowledge.”
- Chair notes we have no time left for questions but Senators may email Van Pelt after the meeting to follow up.

IV. Vice Chair Updates on New Standing Senate Committees and Call for Service for CSI Orientation Working Group

- McNie begins by explaining that when the new bylaws were ratified they included three new committees.
- McNie identifies Faculty Senate Committees in need of volunteers to draft policies:
- Judicial Committee, Budget Oversight Committee (independent for university-wide committee), International Experience Oversight Committee, Sea Training Advisory Oversight Committee (independent from university-wide committee)
- McNie clarifies what needs to be done: define membership, leadership, and elections. And answer the questions what the committee does and how do they do it.
- McNie adds that Senate is also looking to populate the Cadet Success Team Orientation Working Group that really needs faculty representative to serve on that group. [Senk is currently serving through December 2020.]
- Dean Mandernack doesn’t understand why a new International Experience committee is being created when a senator was added to the university-wide committee
- Senk clarifies that this committee is not *new*. It was included in the new senate bylaws ratified in Fall 2019. The reason it was created is because faculty agreed that the existing committee was *not* doing certain things, including conducting annual debriefing and not communicating directly to senate. Senk explains that 1) this committee has an explicitly academic focus because the Senate is a faculty body, and the faculty have control over curricular matters, 2) the original proposal was that this committee be staffed by one member from each department whose students go on International Experience and 2-3 members who have led IE trips in the past 3 years, 3) the explicit purpose of this committee is to make sure we have some group that is accountable for holding an annual debriefing of faculty trip leaders and working with the relevant departments toward the continuous improvement of academic programming on IE. Senk explains that since the curriculum *is* the purview of the faculty, this is why this is an explicitly faculty committee. The university committee deals with things like trip logistics, etc. outside the purview of this committee’s work. Senk notes that one thing to work out in the committee bylaws is how often and in what capacity the faculty senate committee reports to and from the university-wide committee.

V. Review of Academic Integrity Committee Policy

- Hanson reports feedback from library faculty, who noted that process needs to be more formal in terms of maintaining documentation to maintain consistency and institutional memory. Hanson notes that “the current policy draft has the Chair maintaining a private “archive” and passing it along to the next chair, but the process needs to be more formal

- to maintain consistency and appropriate institutional memory. There are also state requirements for records retention of student records, which our campus should be following.” Hanson advises we align the policy with student handbook definitions of academic misconduct “and add some sort of mechanism to make sure the two documents are reviewed/revise concurrently in future as well.” Hanson also suggests adding to the definition for plagiarism “resubmitting work for credit in more than one course.
- Hanson notes “that the policy requires accusers to submit an allegation by email to the AIC chair” but “this requires the accuser to know who the chair is,” which could be a barrier to the process. Suggests instead setting up a general email like academicintegrity@csun.edu or a website with additional information about academic integrity is provided
 - Hanson asks whether allegations should be made visible to all faculty members of the AIC rather than just the chair to guarantee oversight.
 - Hanson suggests that an annual report made to campus of how many allegations and hearings (both restorative and formal) have occurred. No confidential details would be shared but the report could “create awareness and accountability if there was a better sense of how prevalent allegations are and the efforts of the AIC to resolve them through hearings” and “would also help to see trends over time.”
 - Inoue says it is true that the Chair maintains an electronic archive, but these are not the only forms. The reports go to the Faculty Senate and the Provost’s office. So there are multiple archives for past AIC results to be stored in. The Chair passing down his/her individual archive is a courtesy for future chairs to make sure they can access information immediately.
 - Inoue says Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Provost’s Office have the ultimate oversight.
 - Pinisetty says that he can request IT creates an email address and data storage platform for AIC data.
 - Fairbanks notes he shares Inoue’s concerns about a public report but recommends that it could include things like the number of cases
 - Hanson clarifies not personal identifying information.
 - Browne moves that this item be tabled until the next meeting. Fairbanks seconds.

VI. IBL Chair Resolution Response

- Maier reports that he has proposed a series of internal and external candidates.
- Senk asks to confirm that this means Maier has been placed in charge of the process and that given that a new search is being conducted this means the President has vetoed the resolution which recommended the appointment of Dr. Lewis.
- Maier responds, saying that after getting to know the IBL faculty over the past couple of years he understands their preferences.
- Lewis: in the spirit of shared governance can we have information about the unfolding process of the search with the department
- Maier says they are looking with someone with academic experience, administrative experience, experience with enrollment, and strategic planning.
- Hanson notes that the criteria Maier mentioned are not included in the draft policy about department chairs
- Dewey: it sounds to me like you’re describing a search for a candidate, like a faculty position. Are you talking about a new tenured hire to solve this issue? Because that seems like a pretty extravagant step to take in a budget crisis.

- Maier: No, we're not looking for another hire. (Provost writes in the chat: "Not a new tenure-track hire.")
- Senk: does that mean hiring someone "external" from another Cal Maritime department or someone external from another university?
- Maier: we have considered both options.
- Chair says in the interest of scheduling we have to move onto the curriculum committee update.
- Senk and Dewey express confusion in the chat and ask if we can revisit this issue during the good of the order.
 - o Secretary emailed Dean Maier after the meeting to clarify his response. On 11/21 Dean Maier replied to say: "In his role as Senate President [*sic*], Dinesh had asked Lori and Tom to provide an update on the process of finding an IBL Chair. Since the chair represents a program in my school, they had some time ago asked that I act as the point person for the search. As such, I was also tapped to give the update at yesterday's meeting. As has been clearly established, it is within the president's authority to appoint or not appoint a department chair. Nevertheless, chair, President Cropper has sought the recommendation of Lori (Mike Mahoney prior to) and me from the beginning. He and Lori have also been adamant that the selected person have extensive experience in a faculty role. I have relied on my best judgement, based on experience, in considering possible candidates for the role. The institutional objective is to find the most qualified person best equipped to meet the unique needs and challenges of the department while continuing to move us forward. I do appreciate the opportunity to provide the update on the search to campus yesterday. The discussion topics will all help us develop and maintain a stronger Cal Maritime."

VII. Curriculum Committee Update

- Parsons explains the process by which the Curriculum Committee approved the MT Curriculum Redesign. Parsons reports that the decision to approve the curriculum was an 8-0-2 vote, but after the meeting some committee members privately expressed concern that others 1) did not understand exactly what motion was being voted on and 2) may not have had their votes recorded accurately due to technological issues with Zoom. Parsons reports that she reached out individually to each committee member and they all confirmed that they understood the motion and their vote was recorded accurately. Seven voting members reported they understood the motion and their vote was recorded accurately; one member confirmed they were confused about the motion but said that their vote would not change; one person had trouble with the "reaction" feature and their vote was not cast, so Parsons updated the record to include that person's uncounted vote [*post-meeting clarification*: their intended vote was an "abstention."
- Parsons reports that the Science and Math Department later sent her a memo, which she forwarded to the whole Curriculum Committee on October 7th, in which the S&M department expressed concerns about whether proper procedure was followed. S&M noted that MT was told to schedule a meeting with S&M and didn't, and asked to provide feedback from alums, industry leaders, etc. Parsons says she is happy to share her response with senators. Parsons called a meeting of the voting members of the Curriculum Committee on November 5 to discuss the S&M memo and the questions about procedure, particularly whether the Curriculum Committee had "properly

- performed our mandate to vet a curricular redesign.” Frank Yip attended as a representative of S&M and Dan Weinstock as a representative of MT.
- Parson reads statement written about the Curriculum Committee’s discussion, explaining that the Committee “took up the matter of proper procedure, based on possible errors in that process and ambiguity in our policy about what it means to consult with affected departments.”
 - Parsons reports there was not total consensus on the severity of this point but committee agreed that “in the meeting in which we voted on the new roadmap, we did not function normally, and the work of our committee was not properly performed.” Parsons reports that a majority of the voting members of the committee expressed concern that they did not ask the kinds of questions that would have provided a clear picture of the new program.
 - Parsons is now bringing the matter to the Senate for discussion to ask whether Senate believes the procedure was followed and, if not, what to do. Parsons says that the committee does not feel equipped to come up with a remedy for this situation; we have no policy to guide us in this situation, and the proposal has recently been approved by the Provost. Committee therefore refers this matter to the larger Senate: “We did not perform our duties to the standard that we do under normal circumstances, and we ask the Senate to take up the issue of what should be done about this lapse.”
 - Parson reports that the other action was to pass a Resolution “to request some of the information that we would have liked from Marine Transportation.” Information includes questions that were not answered before the note: “How does the updated roadmap make Cal Maritime a better choice for students than the other academies?” “Were other things proposed (that we didn’t get to hear about) for reducing student stress?” “What industry leaders or advisors provided input?” Parsons adds that “These questions are not intended to suggest that this info was not part of decision-making process, but to acknowledge that due that CC didn’t get a chance to hear about these features of the redesign before we voted.”
 - Parsons reports she spoke to Dan Weinstock, who asked the Curriculum Committee to send these questions to whole redesign committee in MT, which Parsons will do after this meeting.
 - Parsons reports that this Resolution passed 7-1 (Elizabeth McNie voted No, and two members - Amber Janssen and Curtis Allen – were absent).
 - Parsons says she hasn’t yet sent Resolution to senate but is introducing it now and invites questions.
 - Trevisan moves that Senate reopens the case. Trevisan says Curriculum Committee is one of most important committees because it oversees quality of all programs. So, if role was not properly performed, why not reopen the case after careful consideration of the changes? If the committee arrives at same outcome it will have done so after thoughtfully considered the implications. Trevisan moves to reopen the case and the CC re-evaluates all the information that it did not receive. Fairbanks seconds.
 - Tsai shares the concern that if due process wasn’t followed, that’s a problem, but is unclear about the motion. Ideally questions about procedure would be referred to the judiciary, but since that doesn’t exist now it gets kicked back to us. Tsai expresses concern about a motion to revisit the decision and suggests adding a definite action steps because of the timeline and the Registrar deadlines. Tsai would like to see what corrective action would be for the Curriculum Committee from repeating a similar mistake. Tsai says he is reticent to vote today because he wants to know how other folks in the department feel; as a senator his job is to report this information back to his

- department and return with consensus. He adds that to this end it would be nice to have a document to lay out.
- Trevisan says she is not suggesting this is a vote on the proposal, but it's a vote to reopen the case.
 - Tsai says he is still not clear on what the outcome would be on the revisit.
 - Lewis writes in chat: "I agree with the appeals argument. We can be at least as flexible as a court. I think it's intuitive that the general senate would have the authority to approve an appeal of a subcommittee decision."
 - Trevisan says she does "not know if process can be stopped. But imagine what happened if you wrongfully sent someone to prison. If you get new evidence, you reopen the case. There may be the same outcome, there may be a different outcome." Given devastating impact on S&M department and the faculty who will lose their jobs, Trevisan asks that the case be revisited with all information considered, says "it's not enough to say this was a mistake; we don't want the quality of our programs to degrade."
 - Dean Neto expresses confusion. She says members of a committee have a duty to read documents and ask questions before they vote. Looking at whole process, it's very unsettling, fact that we keep coming back or people that weren't prepared or didn't read documents or didn't follow process. That's the job of committee members.
 - o Green writes in chat: "As a member of CC, I certainly did read the documents. My vote was my vote and governed by the opinions of my department upon review of the proposal"
 - o Kazek writes in chat: "Scott, we only were presented the MT changes that reflected ET and not as a whole in the ET department."
 - o Green writes: "Yes. And the department vote indicated that it was not ET's place to dictate MT's path."
 - Senk notes in chat that Burback and Ward's comments should be prioritized since they are senators.
 - Dewey (in chat) asks Chair to intervene and allow Burback and Ward to comment before Administrators and non-senators.
 - Burback states she was on original redesign committee and that she attended curriculum meetings and answered questions, but a lot of the concerns and comments mentioned here were not asked in that space. There were documents that showed that people on campus did not agree with the changes and had major concerns, but the committee reviewed those and voted to accept the curriculum changes. Burback says "I think due process was followed; the communication was not great but due process was followed." Burback fully supports revisions to the curriculum and Burback expresses dismay at the statement that the change will degrade programs, that it "dumbs down our curriculum in any way."
 - Ward asks what specific due process occurred, if there was one, as opposed to it being a hasty vote or discussion. You don't reopen a case that's been adjudicated unless there's been specific evidence that would warrant it. It sounds like the concerns were brought up. Understands frustration over hasty process but unless there is something specific that didn't happen that should have happened, it doesn't seem I like it should be reopened.
 - Parsons says when CC reflected on own process. Parsons says "our job is to ask questions and get answers, and for complicated reasons we feel like we weren't able to perform at the level that we normally perform, and that prevented us from getting answers. We're not saying that MT violated any process. We're just talking about our own process and concern that we weren't effective. We work for the larger senate and want to be clear that we feel like we didn't.

- Don Maier writes in chat that people voted to approve the change twice. Parsons clarifies that there was only one vote.
- Chair calls for emergency General Senate Meeting during the first week of December given that meeting must be adjourned for people to teach and apologizes for running out of time. No objections to emergency meeting.

VIII. Adjournment 12:29 PM