







process or not, and it's about evidentiary levels. Are we talking about reasonable doubt?

- 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..
  
- 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.
  
- 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 E xec'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 E xec'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?