





to maintain consistency and appropriate institutional memory. There are also state requirements for records retention of student records, which our campus should be the policy with student handbook definitions of

ting work for credit in more than one course.

barrier to the process. Suggests instead setting up a general email like [academicintegrity@csun.edu](mailto: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.

tenure-

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.

Secretary emailed Dean Maier after the meeting to clarify his response. On 11/21 [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

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

## 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

*[post-meeting clarification:*

Parsons reports that the Science and Math Department later sent her a memo, which she forwarded to the whole Curriculum Committee on October 7<sup>th</sup>, in which the S&M department expressed concerns about whether proper procedure was followed. S&M, 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

Frank Yip attended as a representative of S&M and Dan Weinstock as a representative of MT.

Parson reads statement writt

took up the matter of proper procedure, based on possible errors in



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